

A COMPARISON OF TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS
AND TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS:

PART II
DETAILED RESULTS

Prepared by:
Linda E. Lee
Research Branch
April, 1982

COMPARISON OF TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS
AND TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: PART II
ABSTRACT

The purposes of the study were to determine: (1) whether teachers were being asked to teach subjects for which they were not trained; (2) if this occurs, what areas are affected; and, (3) what future directions might be considered for teacher training and retraining. French and Special Education were identified as potential areas of concern.

Part I of the study, completed in October 1981, addressed numbers of teachers who might be used for French language instruction, who were presently teaching other subjects.

Part II of the study was conducted in seven selected Manitoba school divisions. The study utilized the following data sources: Media File data; existing Departmental data (eg., permits and letters of authority issued); teachers, principals, superintendents, special divisional co-ordinators/consultants; and, professional development chairpersons in the seven divisions; as well as, representatives of teacher training institutions and the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

The conclusions and implications of the study are discussed under the following topics:

1. Shortage Areas - A shortage of teachers still occurs in certain subject areas (eg. French language, Music). A practical way to combat these shortages would be to emphasize channelling preservice students into these areas.
2. French Language Instruction - As indicated by analysis in Part I of the study, a potential "talent pool" of French language teachers may exist. Increasing demands for French language teachers may necessitate utilization of this talent pool. The high demand for immersion teachers in divisions in close proximity to Winnipeg may draw teachers from other divisions. If teachers are moving from Francais to immersion classrooms, some inservicing or retraining may be required.
3. Special Education - The consensus among the groups surveyed was that many classroom teachers were not prepared to deal with special needs students. More exposure during preservice, as well as special inservices for classroom teachers, might help to rectify the situation.
4. Teacher Qualifications - Approximately 85% of teachers surveyed had a post-secondary major related to one of their teaching subjects. However, analysis on a subject by subject basis, revealed that teachers had varied teaching loads, which included both subjects for which they did and did not have training. Long-range planning, or perhaps a reallocation of present staff within divisions, might decrease this occurrence.

Three-quarters of teachers who did not have a post-secondary major in any subject taught, indicated a desire to change their teaching assignment, usually to their area of expertise. These teachers, as well as those with varied teaching assignments, are potential users of specific inservicing and retraining.

5. Teacher Training and Retraining - Concerning preservice training, better information dissemination to high school students might help to channel students considering a teaching career into shortage areas. Also, special opportunity bursaries could be used to encourage students into areas of "critical need."

A clientele which could take advantage of retraining opportunities appears to exist. Teachers appear predisposed to inservicing, but they would like it to be more specialized. This suggests greater individualization in retraining/inservicing offerings. Utilization of new modes of interactive technology might aid in the development of individualized options. This might also help to equalize retraining opportunities for teachers in rural and remote areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
DETAILED RESULTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	i
List of Tables	iv
Section I: Discrepancy Between Teacher Qualifications and Teaching Assignments	1
A. Objective	1
B. Methodology	1
1. Limitations	1
2. Sample Selection	1
3. Data Collection and Analysis	2
C. Results and Discussion of Findings	3
Section II: Specific Areas of Discrepancy Between Teacher Qualifications and Teaching Assignments	7
A. Objective	7
B. Methodology	7
1. Limitations	7
2. Data Collection and Analysis	7
C. Results and Discussion of Findings	9
1. Existing Department of Education Data	9
2. Perceptions of Administrators and Consultant/Co-ordinators	13
Section III: Attitudes Towards Teaching Assignments	17
A. Objective	17
B. Methodology	17
1. Limitations	17
2. Data Collection and Analysis	17
C. Results and Discussion of Findings	17
1. Teaching Assignments	17
2. Special Education	20

	<u>Page</u>
Section IV: Numbers of Teachers Required in the Area of French Language Instruction	25
A. Objective	25
B. Methodology	25
1. Limitations	25
2. Data Collection and Analysis	25
C. Results and Discussion of Findings	25
Section V: Teacher Training and Retraining	28
A. Objective	28
B. Methodology	28
1. Limitations	28
2. Data Collection and Analysis	28
C. Results and Discussion of Findings	29
1. Administrator Suggestions for Dealing with Discrepancies Between Teaching Assignments and Qualifications	29
2. Retraining/Inservicing Opportunities	30
3. Special Areas	34
4. Optional Delivery Methods	38

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1:1	Divisions by Populations of Teachers Based on Media File Data	4
1:2	Number of Teachers Within the Selected Sample, by Division Who Are Not Teaching Any Subjects for Which They Were Trained, Based on Survey Data	4
1:3	Whether the Teacher Has A Major In Present Teaching Subject by Subject Taught 1/3 Time or More	6
2:1	Number and Percentage of Teachers from Outside Manitoba Certified For Teaching in the Public School System in 1980/81 by Geographic Area	10
2:2	Teachers Certified From Outside Manitoba in 1981 by Geographic Area and Subject Area of Employment in the Public School System	10
2:3	Percentage of Teachers From Outside Manitoba Certified for Teaching in the Public School System in 1981 by Subject Area	11
2:4	Divisions by Letters of Authority and Permits Issued in 1980-81	12
2:5	List of Permits Issued to Divisions in the Study in 1980/81	12
2:6	Enrollment in Correspondence Courses by Grade Level and Year	14
2:7	Ranking of Enrollment in Correspondence Courses (Grades 9-12) by Subject and Year	14
3:1	Teachers' Desire for a Change in Teaching Assignment by Whether They Have a Major in Their Present Teaching Subject(s)	19
3:2	Teachers' Reasons for Desiring a Change in Teaching Assignment by Whether They Have a Major in Their Present Teaching Subject(s)	19
3:3	Comparison of Respondents' Perceptions Regarding Classroom Teachers' Training/Preparation for Dealing With Special Needs Students	21
3:4	Respondents' Most Frequently Given Reason For Feeling Teachers Are "Well Trained"	23
3:5	Respondents' Most Frequently Given Reason for Feeling Teachers Are "Not Well Trained"	23
3:6	Teacher Perceptions of Their Own Special Education Training By Number of Years of Teaching Experience	24
4:1	Estimated Numbers of French Teachers Required for the Next Two Years by Type of French Teacher Required	27

<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
5:1	Satisfaction with Teacher Retraining Opportunities by Respondent Group	31
5:2	Most Frequently Cited Response for Satisfaction With Retraining Opportunities by Respondent Group	32
5:3	Most Frequently Cited Response for Dissatisfaction With Retraining Opportunities by Respondent Group	33
5:4	Teacher Satisfaction with Retraining Opportunities by Division	35
5:5	Teacher Satisfaction with Retraining Opportunities by Number of Years of Teaching Experience	35
5:6	Teacher Satisfaction with Retraining Opportunities by Their Predisposition to Undertake Further Training	36
5:7	Teachers' Predisposition to Undertake Further Training by Whether They Have a Major in Their Present Teaching Subject(s)	36

SECTION I
DISCREPANCY BETWEEN TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS
AND TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

A. Objective

This section will focus on the first objective: "to determine the extent to which a mismatch occurs between teacher qualifications and subjects taught." The intent is to give an indication of the extent to which the phenomenon occurred of teachers teaching subjects for which they are not qualified.

B. Methodology

1. Limitations

The reader should keep in mind the following limitations when reading this section of the report:

- (i) Due to practical constraints it was not possible to include all Manitoba school divisions in the study. Some divisions included in the sample were identified as potential areas in which discrepancies might occur. Therefore, the study provides an indication of situations existing in Manitoba, but the data cannot be generalized to the province as a whole.
- (ii) Media file data does not list a major for every teacher. The sample only included teachers for whom a major was listed. Therefore, a greater number of teachers may be teaching subjects for which they are not formally trained, than was indicated by analysis of the Media File.
- (iii) Media File data does not always indicate a person's second post-secondary major. Therefore, analysis was further confounded by the fact some teachers' qualifications may be more closely matched to teaching assignments than Media File data indicates. This supposition appears to be supported by further analysis.
- (iv) Media File data does not indicate post-secondary training or education unless the program has been completed.
- (v) Although the same teachers supplied data for the Media File as answered the survey instrument, some discrepancies appeared between the post-secondary majors they reported on the two instruments.

2. Sample Selection

Seven divisions were selected for use in this study. These divisions were chosen utilizing a number of criteria. Divisions were selected from as many different geographic areas as possible, including urban, northern, eastern and south-western Manitoba. Directors within the Department of

Education were also consulted as to the divisions they felt might be included in a study of this nature. This included divisions which might require an increasing number of teachers of French. Information regarding the number of permit and letter of authority teachers was also considered. Therefore, the divisions chosen were not selected randomly. Selection was intended to highlight possible problem areas, while also representing various regions of the province.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

Two data sources were utilized for this section of the study: the 1981-82 Media File and a survey of teachers. Use of these data sources will be discussed separately.

(i) Media File Data:

In order to utilize Media File data, subject codes were matched to related major codes to provide the basis for determining whether teachers majors were related to teaching assignments. Subsequently, computer programs, developed by personnel in Management Information Systems (MIS), were used to access the data found in the 1981-82 Media File. These programs produced a list of teachers whose teaching qualifications did not appear to correspond with their teaching assignments. This list was then screened manually to exclude those teachers for whom a post-secondary major was not listed.

(ii) Teacher Survey Data:

(a) Instrument Design

A questionnaire was used to survey those teachers whose qualifications appeared to be at odds with their teaching assignments. The questionnaire was developed by members of the Research Branch. A number of questions in the instrument were designed to parallel questions asked of other groups participating in the study.

(b) Field Methods and Response Rate

Questionnaires were mailed to 283 teachers in seven divisions. Responses were received from 194 teachers, for an overall response rate of 69% (See Appendix A, Table A:1).

Four responses were not useable, giving a total of 190 useable responses.

C. Results and Discussion of Findings

The computer printout supplied by MIS listed the names of 929 teachers in the seven divisions. As previously mentioned, 283 of these were manually identified as having teaching assignments which did not match their post-secondary major(s), (ie., "mismatched").

A breakdown by division illustrates the total teacher population, as well as the number and percentage in each division who were classified as "mismatched"; and, therefore, surveyed. As indicated in the limitations, these figures could not be considered as precise reflections of the phenomenon (Table 1:1).

One purpose of the teacher survey instrument was to validate whether teachers appearing mismatched in the Media File data actually fell into this category. This was checked using two different methods.

First, teachers were allocated to two groups. If they reported having a major in any subject area taught "1/3 time or more" they were allocated to the first group (Appendix B, Question 1). If they did not report having a major in any subject area taught "1/3 time or more" they were allocated to the second group. Teachers in the first group were not considered "mismatched," while teachers in the second group were.

Table 1:2 provides the number of teachers by division who could be accurately labelled as teaching no subjects for which they had a related post-secondary major ("mismatched"), based on teacher survey responses. Overall, 15% of teachers in the ~~selected~~ sample, (thought to be composed entirely of mismatched teachers), indicated a discrepancy on the survey instrument between their post-secondary major and teaching assignment.

TABLE 1:1
DIVISIONS BY POPULATIONS OF TEACHERS BASED ON MEDIA FILE DATA

Division	Total Population (N)	Sample Selected as "Mismatched"	
		(N)	% of Total
St. Boniface #4	429	94	22%
Agassiz #13	173	44	25%
Seine River #14	263	48	18%
Lakeshore #23	113	20	18%
Pembina Valley #27	59	10	17%
Turtle River #32	105	17	16%
Frontier #48	332	50	15%
	TOTAL = 1474	283	OVERALL = 19%

TABLE 1:2
NUMBER OF TEACHERS WITHIN THE SELECTED SAMPLE,
BY DIVISION WHO ARE NOT TEACHING ANY SUBJECTS
FOR WHICH THEY WERE TRAINED, BASED ON SURVEY DATA

Division	Selected Sample (N)	"Mismatched" According to Survey Data	
		(N)	% of Sample
St. Boniface #4	94	12	13%
Agassiz #13	44	3	7%
Seine River #14	48	12	25%
Lakeshore #23	20	4	20%
Pembina Valley #27	10	1	10%
Turtle River #32	17	4	24%
Frontier #48	50	7	14%
	TOTALS = 283	43	OVERALL = 15%

The second method of analysis employed was designed to look at discrepancies between post-secondary major and teaching assignment on a subject basis, rather than on a respondent basis. This analysis indicated that of the 311 subjects reported, corresponding university majors were reported in 58% of the cases overall (Table 1:3). Table 1:3 also lists the teaching subjects listed 10 or more times. Mathematics was the subject most often taught without a post-secondary major. In comparison, specialty subjects, such as Music and Physical Education, were least likely to be taught without a post-secondary major.

These two types of analyses indicate that while fewer teachers than expected fell into the category where none of the subjects they taught one-third time or more were supported by a major, when viewed on a subject by subject basis, discrepancies were more likely to appear.*

The results of the teacher survey indicated that Media File data alone cannot be used to calculate accurately the extent to which teachers in Manitoba are teaching subjects for which they are not trained.

* For further analysis, see Table A:8, Appendix A.

TABLE 1:3
 WHETHER THE TEACHER HAS A MAJOR IN PRESENT TEACHING SUBJECT
 BY SUBJECT TAUGHT 1/3 TIME OR MORE

Major in Teaching Subject	Total Sample	Subject Taught 1/3 Time or More *							
		Science (%)	Language Arts (%)	Social Studies (%)	Business Education (%)	French (%)	Math (%)	Music (%)	Physical Education (%)
Yes	58%	56%	50%	79%	41%	72%	36%	82%	81%
No	42%	44%	50%	21%	59%	28%	64%	18%	19%
TOTAL N =	311**	34	52	33	17	29	39	11	37

* Subjects listed are those cited 10 or more times, as analysis based on smaller numbers may be misleading. Subjects are aggregated into general categories.

** The number exceeds the number of respondents because teachers may indicate more than one subject as being taught "1/3 time or more."

SECTION II
SPECIFIC AREAS OF DISCREPANCY BETWEEN
TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS AND TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

A. Objective

The second section of the study focuses on the objective: "to determine specifically in which of the following, if any, a mismatch of teaching assignments occurs: geographic areas, grade levels, subject areas." This section is intended to help broaden the scope of the study by utilizing some province-wide data in conjunction with survey data specific to the seven selected divisions.

B. Methodology

1. Limitations

The reader should note the following limitations inherent in this section of the study:

- (i) A part of this section is comprised of a secondary analysis of existing data. As such, some data applies to the 1980-81 school year, rather than the 1981-82 school year.
- (ii) Administrator responses were gathered using two different techniques. Superintendents were interviewed; principals were surveyed. While the instrument used was the same in both instances, the varying methods may have resulted in different responses.
- (iii) Data obtained from French consultants is limited, as only one division in the sample had a person designated as a French consultant. Another division had a Core contact teacher, but she did not feel qualified to participate in the study.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

A variety of data sources were utilized in this section of the report: information from existing Departmental data; superintendents; principals; and, co-ordinators/consultants. Use of these data sources will be discussed separately.

(i) Existing Department of Education Data:

Basically two sources were consulted for existing Department of Education data. Teacher Certification and Records supplied information on permits and letters of authority, as well as data

on teachers with outside credentials who were certified to teach in Manitoba public schools in 1980-81.

The second source was information published in the 1980 and 1981 Annual Reports of the Department of Education concerning Correspondence Branch courses. It was felt that courses most frequently taken by correspondence might indicate areas where a shortage of teachers exists.

Data from both sources was incorporated into tables used in this section of the report.

(ii) Administrator Interview and Survey Data:

(a) Instrument Design

The same instrument was used to survey principals as had been used to interview superintendents. The instrument was developed by members of the Research Branch. A number of questions were designed to parallel questions asked of other groups participating in the study.

(b) Field Methods and Response Rate

The superintendents of all seven divisions were interviewed, yielding a response rate of 100% (See Appendix A, Table A:1). Questionnaires were mailed to 111 principals. Responses were received from 89 principals, for an overall response rate of 80%. One response was not useable, giving a total number of useable responses of 88.

(iii) Consultant and Co-ordinators:

Questionnaires were sent to six Special Education co-ordinators and one French consultant. All returned the questionnaires for a response rate of 100% (Appendix A, Table A:1). Again, the instruments were developed by members of the Research Branch, and included questions comparable to those on other instruments.

C. Results and Discussion of Findings

Discussion of the results will be presented in two sections. The first contains existing Departmental data which presents a province-wide picture. The second contains data collected specifically for this study through survey and interview techniques.

1. Existing Department of Education Data

In some geographic areas and in some subjects, a shortage of teachers still exists. It is more likely that, in order to fill needs in these areas, teachers may be given teaching assignments which do not match their training. To give an indication of areas which may be affected, records of permits, letters of authority, teachers certified from outside Manitoba and total enrollment in Correspondence Branch courses have been examined.

(i) Teachers from Outside Manitoba:

In 1980-81, 143 teachers with teaching credentials from outside Manitoba were hired and certified to teach in the public school system. Eighty percent of those teachers went to teach in rural or Northern areas (Table 2:1). Teachers were most often hired in the general category of "primary/elementary/junior high" teachers (Table 2:2). However, in specific subject areas French teachers for rural areas were most often hired, followed by Music teachers. French teachers constituted 10% of the teachers certified with credentials from outside Manitoba (Table 2:3). This was followed by other specialists: Music teachers 9%; Physical Education teachers 5%. Special Education teachers constituted 3% of the total.

(ii) Permits and Letters of Authority:

Teachers teaching in Manitoba on permits or letters of authority issued in 1980-81 totaled 56; 14 letters of authority and 42 permits (Table 2:4). One letter of authority and 12 permits had been issued to teachers in the seven divisions selected for this study.

TABLE 2:1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS FROM OUTSIDE MANITOBA
CERTIFIED FOR TEACHING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM
IN 1980-81 BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Geographic Area*	Teachers with Outside Credentials Certified in 1981	
	(N)	(%)
Urban	29	20%
Rural	57	40%
North	57	40%
TOTAL =	143	100%

* Geographic areas are the categories used by Teacher Certification and Records in "Statistical Report on 1981 Manitoba Graduates and Teachers Certified With Credentials From Other Provinces/Countries" November 1981.

TABLE 2:2

TEACHERS CERTIFIED FROM OUTSIDE MANITOBA IN 1981
BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA AND SUBJECT AREA OF EMPLOYMENT
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Geographic Area*	Subject Area							
	Primary/ Elem/Jr. High (N)	FRENCH (N)	Music (N)	Physical Education (N)	English (N)	Art (N)	SPECIAL EDUCATION (N)	Other (N)
Urban	15	3	5	1	-	1	1	3
Rural	25	9	6	1	3	-	2	11
North	34	2	2	5	3	4	1	6
TOTAL	74	14	13	7	6	5	4	20

* Geographic areas and subject areas are the categories used by Teacher Certification and Records in "Statistical Report on 1981 Manitoba Graduates and Teachers Certified with Credentials From Other Provinces/Countries", November 1981.

TABLE 2:3

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS FROM OUTSIDE MANITOBA
CERTIFIED FOR TEACHING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM
IN 1981 BY SUBJECT AREA

Subject Area	Percentage of Teachers With Outside Credentials Certified in 1981
Primary/Elementary/ Junior High	52%
FRENCH	10%
Music	9%
Physical Education	5%
English	4%
Art	3%
SPECIAL EDUCATION	3%
Other	14%
TOTAL N =	143

TABLE 2:4
 DIVISIONS BY LETTERS OF AUTHORITY
 AND PERMITS ISSUED IN 1980-81

Divisions	Letters of Authority	Permits
Divisions in study	1*	12
Other divisions	13	30
TOTAL	14	42

* The Letter of Authority, issued to a division in the study, was for Industrial Arts.

TABLE 2:5
 LIST OF PERMITS ISSUED TO DIVISIONS
 IN THE STUDY IN 1980-81

Division	Permits (N)	Subject	Grade Level
St. Boniface #4	1	Music	Grade 7-9
	1	Music	Secondary
Agassiz #13	1	French Immersion	Elementary
Seine River #14	1	French	Grade 8
	1	French Immersion	Elementary
Lakeshore #23	1	General	Grade 7-9
	1	Horticulture	Secondary
Pembina Valley #27	1	Industrial Arts	Secondary
Frontier #48	1	Music	Elementary
	2	General	Grade K-4
	1	English	Secondary
TOTAL N =	12		

When the permits issued in the seven divisions were examined by subject area, a trend became apparent similar to that found for teachers with non-Manitoba credentials. Half the permits issued in these divisions were for French and Music (Table 2:5). Again specific specialty areas appeared to be in shortage. No such obvious trend appeared on the basis of grade level.

(iii) Correspondence Courses

Enrollment in Correspondence courses was also examined. If schools were offering courses by Correspondence, this might indicate subject area for which teachers were in shortage. Unfortunately, data was not available on either a school versus general public basis, or on a divisional basis.

Table 2:6 does indicate an increasing enrollment in Correspondence courses over the past three years, with the increase being slightly more pronounced in the senior high grades (Levels I to III). Analysis by subject areas showed that Mathematics and English were consistent over the past two years as the two most popular courses (Table 2:7). Agriculture courses jumped from sixth in enrollment in 1979-80 to third in 1980-81.

The same specialty areas observed in credentials and permit analysis did not appear in the list of the six most popular Correspondence courses. This may be the result of a number of factors. One factor may be that, due to the nature of the specialty subjects such as Music possibly teachers are hired to teach specialty subjects rather than utilizing Correspondence courses to teach students.

2. Perceptions of Administrators and Consultant/Co-ordinators

Perceptions of administrators will be reported separately from Special Education Co-ordinators and the French consultant, as the perceptions of the former group are more general in nature.

(i) Administrators:

Principals and superintendents were both asked whether they

TABLE 2:6
ENROLLMENT IN CORRESPONDENCE COURSES
BY GRADE LEVEL AND YEAR*

Grade Level	Year					
	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
Elementary	38	1%	56	1%	49	1%
Junior High	501	8%	429	6%	426	5%
Senior High	5,610	91%	6,304	93%	7,156	94%
TOTAL =	6,149	100%	6,789	100%	7,631	100%

*Source: 1980 and 1981 Annual Reports, Department of Education.

TABLE 2:7
RANKING OF ENROLLMENT IN CORRESPONDENCE COURSES (GRADES 9-12)
BY SUBJECT AND YEAR*

Courses	Year			
	1979-80		1980-81	
	Rank	(N)	Rank	(N)
Mathematics	1	1,277	1	1,544
English	2	747	2	860
Business Principles	3	671	5	685
History (incl. Social Studies)	4	654	4	724
Power Mechanics	5	544	6	530
Agriculture	6	543	3	728

* Only courses with enrollments of over 500 have been included. For each year this includes the six most popular courses.

felt there were any teachers in either their school or division teaching subjects for which they were not trained. Six out of seven superintendents felt there were, while 60% of principals answered "yes" (Appendices C and D, Question 1a). Although the majority of both groups answered in the affirmative, they had somewhat different perceptions of the subject areas and grade levels which were affected.

Superintendents most often cited the area of French instruction (including immersion and Francais specialty areas), (Appendix C, Question 1b). The other areas cited were: Business Education, Native Languages and ESL. Principals also ranked French highly; it was second with 16 responses (Appendix D, Question 1b). However, the subject they most frequently reported was Science. Music and Language Arts ranked third and fourth, respectively. Special Education was not an area frequently reported as being affected.

Another difference surfaced between principals' and superintendents' perceptions. It concerned the grade level most often reported as being affected by teachers teaching subjects for which they were not trained. Principals most often cited grades 7 to 9, while only one superintendent specifically mentioned the junior high grades (Appendices C and D, Question 1b).

As was found with the examination of existing Departmental data, overall patterns emerged more clearly by subject area than by grade level.

(ii) Special Education Co-ordinators and French Consultant:*

Of the six Special Education Co-ordinators surveyed, two thought there were teachers designated to Special Education in their divisions who were not trained in this area.

* All data for Co-ordinators and Consultants are reported in the text of the report as numbers are small and questionnaires brief. Copies of the instruments may be found in Appendix F.

The specific areas affected, as cited by the two co-ordinators, were: occupational entrance, life skills, Educable Mentally Handicapped (EMH), as well as remediation of specific learning disabilities and the behaviorally disturbed. One of the two co-ordinators felt that problems resulted from having Special Education teachers who were not trained in the area. The co-ordinator explained that the problem was most severe with teacher aides who were working with special needs students.

One division had a consultant specifically designated to the area of French language instruction. The consultant did not think that there were any teachers in the division teaching French who were not trained to do so. However, the consultant did emphasize the importance of language fluency in the teaching of French.

From examination of the various data sources it appears that, overall in Manitoba, French and certain other specialist areas, such as Music, require teachers. As well, both principals and superintendents cited French as a specific area of discrepancy between teacher qualifications and teaching assignments. Other subject areas, including Science, Music and various other types of language instruction, were also cited. Special Education did not seem to be singled out as an area in which specialist teachers lacked training.

SECTION III
ATTITUDES TOWARDS TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

A. Objective

This section addresses the objective: "to determine teacher, principal and superintendent attitudes towards: teaching assignments and teachers' confidence in dealing with special needs students." Also included in this section are some data from the survey of Special Education Co-ordinators.

B. Methodology

1. Limitations

In addition to limitations already considered in conjunction with the survey data, the reader should bear in mind that, as with any attitudinal measurement, responses are the perceptions of the respondents.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

The data sources used in this section are: teacher survey, principal survey, superintendent questionnaire, and Special Education co-ordinator questionnaire. Instrument design, data collection procedures and response rates have all been described in previous sections.

C. Results and Discussion of Findings

Results will be discussed in two parts. First, the general area of participant attitudes towards teaching assignments will be examined. Second, the area of Special Education will be discussed.

1. Teaching Assignments

Teachers were asked to indicate the training and/or preparation which related to the subjects they taught "one-third time or more." As indicated in Section I, the majority of teachers had a major in at least one of their teaching subjects. Responses, however, varied by whether it was the first, second or third subject they reported (Appendix B, Question 1a, b, c). "On the job experience" was most often cited for each subject reported, while "retraining" was least often cited.

For the subject teachers reported first, at least 70% indicated

training or preparation as a result of "university major/minor",

18

"training in preservice", "on the job experience", and "inservicing."

These percentages decreased for the second and third teaching subjects reported, with the categories of "on the job experience" and "inservicing"

being the only ones cited as preparation more than 50% of the time.

It appears that training/preparation was not evenly distributed among the subjects which composed teachers' full teaching assignment.

The survey instrument also asked teachers if they would prefer to teach subjects or grade levels other than those they were presently teaching. Analysis was done on the basis of whether the teacher had a major in one of their teaching subjects. Thirty-one percent of those having a relevant major desired a change, as compared to 34% of those without a relevant major (Table 3:1). Therefore, regardless of training, approximately one-third of teachers wished to change their teaching assignment. However, the reason given for wanting a change varied by group (Table 3:2). The reason most often cited by those holding a relevant major was "interest or enjoyment/more rewarding," (52%). Those without a relevant major most often wished a change because of "my major or area of training" (57%). However, it should be noted 66% of those without a relevant major did not indicate a desire to change their teaching assignment.

The three subject areas teachers most often preferred to teach were: History, Mathematics and Computer Science (Appendix B, Question 3(b)). The grade level teachers most often preferred to teach was the senior high school level (Grades 10-12), (Appendix B, Question 3(c)).

It appeared that teachers who would prefer to change their teaching assignment would like to teach specific subjects at the senior high school level. However, the reasons for desiring the changes differed by whether a teacher had a major related to their teaching assignment. Those who did not most often wanted a change in order to utilize their major training. This indicates that, where a discrepancy exists between teacher qualifications and teaching assignments, there is a desire on the part of some teachers to alter the situation.

TABLE 3:1

TEACHERS' DESIRE FOR A CHANGE IN TEACHING ASSIGNMENT
BY WHETHER THEY HAVE A MAJOR IN THEIR PRESENT TEACHING SUBJECT(S)

Desire a Change in Teaching Assignment	Major in Teaching Subject(s) *	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Yes	31%	34%
No	69%	66%
TOTAL N =	139	41

* This refers to a major in one of the subjects the teacher presently teaches "1/3 time or more."

TABLE 3:2

TEACHERS' REASONS FOR DESIRING A CHANGE IN TEACHING ASSIGNMENT
BY WHETHER THEY HAVE A MAJOR IN THEIR PRESENT TEACHING SUBJECT(S)

Reasons	Major in Teaching Subject(s) *			
	Yes		No	
	(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
My major or area of training	11	20%	8	57%
Interest/enjoyment/rewarding	28	52%	4	29%
Diversify teaching subjects	5	9%	1	7%
More applicable for students	3	6%	-	-
Previous related experience	6	11%	-	-
Refreshing to do new things	1	2%	1	7%
TOTAL	54	100%	14	100%

* This refers to a major in one of the subjects the teacher presently teaches "1/3 time or more."

As previously discussed in Section II, superintendents and principals were asked if they thought there were teachers in their division or school teaching subjects for which they were not trained. If they answered affirmatively, they were also asked whether they felt any problems resulted (Appendices C and D, Question 1c). Half the superintendents felt problems resulted as compared to approximately two-thirds (68%) of the principals. Reasons given by superintendents were varied, while principals most often felt that, with unqualified teachers, students did not master the subject; and therefore, had difficulty at the next level or grade (Appendices C and D, Question 1d). As their second most frequent response, principals stated "the specific program suffers."

Three (of seven) superintendents felt others in the division felt problems resulted from teachers teaching subjects for which they were not trained. They most often indicated that "teachers" saw problems as resulting (Appendix C, Question 2a and b). Eighty-three percent of principals felt others saw problems resulting. They most often cited "teachers", followed by "parents" (Appendix D, Questions 2a and b).

2. Special Education

The area of Special Education was one identified as being of specific concern to the study. Therefore, superintendents, principals, teachers and Special Education co-ordinators were all asked for their perceptions.

Teachers were asked how well prepared they felt to deal with special needs students in their classroom.¹ Principals, superintendents and co-ordinators were asked a comparable question dealing with classroom teachers' training in this area. Fifty percent of teachers felt they were "well trained" (Table 3:3). The group most likely to feel teachers were "not well trained" (67%) were Special Education co-ordinators, although the small total number of co-ordinators must be kept in mind while reading the analysis.

¹Teachers who said the question was "not applicable" were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, those responding felt the question was applicable to their teaching situation.

TABLE 3:3
 COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
 REGARDING CLASSROOM TEACHERS' TRAINING/PREPARATION
 FOR DEALING WITH SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS

Perceptions of Training to Deal with Special Needs Students*	Respondent Group			
	Teachers (%)	Principals (%)	Super- intendents (%)	Special Education Co-ordinators (%)
Well trained	50%	38%	43%	33%
Not well trained	50%	62%	57%	67%
TOTAL N =	173	85	7	6

*The "well trained" category represents a combination of "very well trained" and "moderately well trained" responses. The "not well trained" category represents a combination of "not well trained" and "not trained at all" responses.

Tables 3:4 and 3:5 provide a comparison of respondent group reasons for stating "well trained" or "not well trained" regarding teachers' training to deal with special needs students (also see Appendix B, Question 5b and Appendices C and D, Question 4b). Responses of Special Education co-ordinators were not included due to the variety of their responses.² Most frequent responses of principals, teachers and superintendents were similar, with the exception of superintendents' feeling that resource teachers specifically helped teachers to become "well trained."

Analysis was also conducted on teachers' responses by their number of years of teaching experience (Table 3:6). Teachers with one year or less of teaching experience were more likely to feel "well trained" than were teachers with more years of teaching experience, especially the "more than 25" year group. This may support the comment of one Special Education co-ordinator (see Footnote 2) regarding the better preparation of beginning teachers.

Although better preparation of beginning teachers may indicate more and better training opportunities in this area, it should be noted that half the teachers responding to the question did not feel prepared to deal with special needs students in their classrooms.

Although many teachers exhibited a range of preparation or training for their teaching assignments this preparation did not apply equally to each of their teaching subjects. Teachers who wished to change assignments often wished to do so because of their "major or area of training." There was also

²Comments by Special Education Co-ordinators included: "beginning teachers are generally better prepared than teachers who have been in the field for 15 or more years"; "they do not feel qualified and are uneasy with such students"; "they ought to be more aware of the problem; more sensitive to kids' needs"; "teachers are not generally trained on how to deal with all areas" (ie., of Special Education); and, "current courses in Special Ed. have not been taken, but this is being remedied with consultant help."

TABLE 3:4
 RESPONDENTS' MOST FREQUENTLY GIVEN REASON
 FOR FEELING TEACHERS ARE "WELL TRAINED"

Respondent Group	First Ranked Response
Teachers	"Experience helps teachers cope"
Principals	"Experience helps teachers cope" and "Mixture of training and experience"
Superintendents	"Classroom teachers have learned from resource teachers"

TABLE 3:5
 RESPONDENTS' MOST FREQUENTLY GIVEN REASON
 FOR FEELING TEACHERS ARE "NOT WELL TRAINED"

Respondent Group	First Ranked Response
Teachers	"Teachers are not given/do not have specific training"
Principals	"Teachers do not have appropriate training"
Superintendents	"Need for more emphasis in this area in preservice"

concern expressed by principals regarding problems resulting from teachers teaching subjects for which they are not trained. Half the teachers felt they were "not well trained" to deal with special needs students. It appeared that all groups feel more comfortable when teachers were functioning in a subject area in which they had some specific training or preparation.

TABLE 3:6
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN SPECIAL EDUCATION TRAINING
BY NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Perceptions of Training to Deal With Special Needs Students *	Years of Teaching Experience **				
	1 or Less (%)	2-9 (%)	10-17 (%)	18-25 (%)	More than 25 (%)
Well trained	60%	49%	41%	53%	33%
Not well trained	40%	51%	59%	47%	67%
TOTAL N =	20	77	41	15	6

*The "well trained" category represents a combination of "very well trained" and "moderately well trained" responses. The "not well trained" category represents a combination of "not well trained" and not trained at all" responses.

**"Years of teaching experience" refers to the number of years of teaching the subject listed first as a "subject taught 1/3 time or more."

SECTION IV
NUMBERS OF TEACHERS REQUIRED IN THE AREA OF
FRENCH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

A. Objective

This section focuses on demand for teachers in the area of French language instruction. Specifically the objective is: "to estimate, where possible, the approximate numbers of French teachers required in 1982-83 by geographic area, grade level and program."

B. Methodology

1. Limitations

The readers should bear in mind that figures supplied are estimates; numbers supplied by principals, superintendents and the French consultant may vary.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

Data used in this section includes information supplied by the Teacher Certification and Records Branch and survey/interview data from administrators and the French consultant. Instrument design, data collection procedures and response rates have been discussed previously.

C. Results and Discussion of Findings

As discussed in Section II, of the teachers certified from outside Manitoba in 1980-81, 10% were certified and hired to teach French (Table 2:3, Section II). French was also an area in which there were a number of permit teachers in the divisions included in the study (Table 2:5, Section II). It appeared from these statistics that French teachers have been in demand in Manitoba for the past few years. The trend is expected to continue.

Although the divisions selected in the study were not intended to be representative of all Manitoba school divisions, they definitely did follow the general trend of requiring increasing numbers of French teachers. Five of the seven superintendents interviewed, anticipated an increased number of French teachers in the next two years. Approximately 30% of the principals surveyed anticipated an increase (Appendices C and D, Question 6).

When numbers estimated by principals were totalled, they usually exceeded the estimates given by superintendents (Table 4:1). This may be because superintendents, for a variety of reasons, cannot justify staff increases of the magnitude principals find desirable.

It appeared from administrators' estimates that the greatest demand will be for immersion teachers (Table 4:1). Also, it should be noted that, even considering the lower estimates given by superintendents, in five divisions surveyed a total of approximately 30 French teachers will be required in each of the next two years. It is difficult to determine the numbers which would move from division to division but, even with this in mind, an increasing demand for French teachers seems certain.

Tables A:2 and A:7 in Appendix A provide a breakdown of numbers by division. Estimates by the French consultant are included in the appropriate table. As might be expected, divisions with Français schools require the greatest number of French teachers, especially in specialist areas at the senior high school level (Appendix B, Question 1b). Also, school divisions with close proximity to Winnipeg estimated a greater need for French teachers than did divisions farther away (Appendix A, Tables A:2 to A:7).

In order to obtain a province-wide picture, it would be necessary to contact administrators in all Manitoba school divisions. However, this sample did indicate that there is a need to supply an increasing number of teachers of French. This is supported by examination of the subjects taught by teachers from outside Manitoba. At present, these teachers are being used to fill a portion of the increasing number of positions available to teachers of French.

TABLE 4:1
 ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF FRENCH TEACHERS REQUIRED
 FOR THE NEXT TWO YEARS
 BY TYPE OF FRENCH TEACHER REQUIRED

Type of French Teacher Required	Number of Teachers Required			
	1982-83		1983-84	
	Principals' Estimate	Superintendents' Estimate	Principals' Estimate	Superintendents' Estimate
Conversational French	9	1	9	5
Core French	9	7	8	-
Immersion	18	18	22	18
Français	14	6	23	6
TOTAL N =	50	32	62	29

SECTION V
TEACHER TRAINING AND RETRAINING

A. Objective

The objective of this section is "to describe potential options in the area of teacher training and retraining." It was felt that, in any discussion of teacher shortage areas or of discrepancies between teacher qualifications and teaching assignments, teacher training and retraining were important issues. If shortages are to be overcome and discrepancies eliminated, teacher training and retraining options should be of primary concern to educators.

B. Methodology

1. Limitations

The reader should note the following limitations which are pertinent to this section of the study:

- (i) Limitations previously discussed regarding survey and interview data also apply to this section.
- (ii) In some cases, responses from teacher training institutions and the MTS were given by more than one person in a group interview situation. However, for purposes of analysis, responses were aggregated so that one set of responses was allocated to each institution. No problem of conflicting answers was encountered in the process.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection and analysis procedures have already been discussed for superintendents, principals, teachers and co-ordinator/consultant(s). Therefore, data collection and analysis techniques will be discussed for the teacher training/MTS respondents and the professional development chairperson sample. For both groups, instruments were designed by members of the Research Branch and some questions were designed to parallel those on other instruments.

- (i) Representatives from each of the teacher training institutions * as well

* Teacher training institutions: University of Manitoba, University of Winnipeg, Brandon University, and St. Boniface College. Frequencies of response may be found in Appendix E. Although numbers are small, the length of the interview warrants some detailed description.

as representatives of the Manitoba Teachers' Society were interviewed, for a response rate of 100% (Appendix A, Table A:1).

Interviews took place in December 1981. This was the first data collected as it was felt this might give an overall perspective which could be used as a starting point for the study.

(ii) Survey of Professional Development Chairpersons

The Manitoba Teachers' Society supplied the names of professional development chairpersons for the divisions included in the study. Each division had one representative, with the exception of Frontier which had three area representatives. Therefore, the questionnaire was mailed to nine professional development chairpersons.

Of the nine, 5 responded for a response rate of 56% (Appendix A, Table A:1). One person felt unable to answer the questionnaire adequately. This constituted a non-useable return and, as a result, analysis was based on four responses.

A lower response rate for this group, than for others in the study, may be a result of the timing of the questionnaire. It was distributed shortly before Spring Break; a time when teachers tend to be busier than usual.

C. Results and Discussion of Findings

For purposes of clarity, results will be presented in the following sequence: administrator suggestions for dealing with discrepancies between teaching assignments and qualifications; retraining/inservicing opportunities; special areas; as well as, optional delivery methods and general comments.

1. Administrator Suggestions for Dealing With Discrepancies Between Teaching Assignment and Qualifications

Both principals and superintendents were asked: "do you have any suggestions for dealing with the phenomenon of teachers teaching subjects for which they were not trained?" All superintendents and 63% of principals indicated they had suggestions.

Both groups had a variety of suggestions, encompassing everything from inservicing to preservice changes to the need for incentives to encourage teacher upgrading and retraining (Appendices C and D, Questions 3a and b).

The most frequently given suggestions differed between principals and superintendents. Superintendents most often stated "teachers must be more flexible/they need to be generalists." Other comments focused on the need for preservice changes. On the other hand, principals saw a need for "more inservicing/retraining" and for the provision of "support and incentives (eg., funding and credit courses) to encourage retraining of teachers." Although they also mentioned the need for preservice changes, this was less pronounced.

2. Retraining/Inservicing Opportunities

A number of groups in the study were asked to respond to questions specifically concerning opportunities for teacher retraining and inservicing. They were asked how satisfactory they felt opportunities were for teachers to retrain. The majority of all groups indicated a degree of satisfaction. Teachers and professional development chairpersons were the group most likely to indicate opportunities were unsatisfactory (Table 5:1).

A variety of reasons were given to support both "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" responses (Appendix B, Question 4b; Appendices C and D, Question 8). The reasons most often given for satisfaction were fairly consistent among groups (Table 5:2). "Support and encouragement by the administration" appeared to be a major factor contributing to satisfaction. This was cited second most frequently by teachers. The reason most frequently given for dissatisfaction was the same for principals, teachers and superintendents (Table 5:3). Geographic location was perceived to be an important factor in availability of retraining opportunities.

Respondent groups were also questioned as to whether there were certain subject areas they felt required more emphasis in retraining or inservicing.

TABLE 5:1
 SATISFACTION WITH TEACHER RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES
 BY RESPONDENT GROUP

Satisfaction with Retraining Opportunities*	Respondent Group				
	Teachers	Principals	Super- intendents	Professional Development Chairpersons	Personnel from other Institutions **
Satisfactory	55%	58%	71%	50%	60%
Unsatisfactory	45%	32%	29%	50%	40%
TOTAL N =	178	86	7	4	5

* Categories were created by combining "satisfactory" and "very satisfactory" responses and "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory" responses.

** Personnel from other institutions include those from MTS and the teacher training institutions.

TABLE 5:2

MOST FREQUENTLY CITED RESPONSE FOR SATISFACTION
WITH RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES BY RESPONDENT GROUP

Respondent Group	First Ranked Response
Teachers	"Opportunities are available"
Principals	"Division/administration provides time, opportunities and/or funding"
Superintendents	"Division/administration provides time, opportunities and/or funding"
Personnel from other institutions	"Many opportunities are available, but are not always used"

TABLE 5:3

MOST FREQUENTLY CITED RESPONSE FOR DISSATISFACTION
WITH RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES BY RESPONDENT GROUP

Respondent Group	First Ranked Response
Teachers	"Distances too great for rural teachers to travel to courses"
Principals	"Distances too great for rural teachers to travel to courses"
Superintendents	"Distances too great for rural teachers to travel to courses" and, "Division does not encourage leaves/sabbaticals"
Personnel from other institutions	"Not enough incentives (ie. credit courses) for French language" and "Need for more systematic and long-term retraining"

Six of seven superintendents felt there were specific areas requiring greater emphasis, as compared with 71% of principals, and 100% of representatives from other institutions (Appendices C and D, Question 9a). Correspondingly, teachers were asked if there were subject areas in which they would like further training or preparation. Fifty-four percent indicated they would like further training (Appendix B, Question 2a).

A number of subject areas were listed. Those listed by personnel from other institutions were varied. They included: "social psychology" and "communication skills"; "specialized areas (eg. music)"; "special education"; "curriculum development areas"; "immersion and Francais" (including Francais specialist areas and Science); as well as, "reading and Language Arts", especially for teachers moving from teaching secondary to primary grades.

The top two choices selected by teachers were Science, followed by Physical Education, Math and Language Arts. Principals cited Language Arts, Science and French (including Francais) as their top three choices. Superintendents most often cited Francais and Immersion specialist areas, followed by computer-related subjects. The area of computers was also cited frequently by teachers and principals (Appendix B, Question 2b and Appendix C, Question 9b).

Teachers most often felt "inservicing" was the vehicle they would prefer to offer them further training (Appendix B, Question 2c). Principals also favored a "wide range of workshops or inservices" to provide greater emphasis in certain subject areas (Appendix C, Question 9c). Superintendents, however, most often felt "more help from the Department of Education" and "better original preparation of teachers" were suitable ways to provide the necessary emphasis (Appendix D, Question 9c). Personnel from other institutions favoured use of the ACE program (Appendix E, Question 3b).

Teacher attitudes towards retraining opportunities were also considered in more detail. Analysis by division revealed the fact that 68% of teachers

in the most Northern division included in the study felt retraining opportunities were satisfactory (Table 5:4). According to the superintendent of this division, the division funds and supplies such opportunities for teachers. This may help to overcome the problems of distance.

Teacher satisfaction was also analyzed by number of years of teaching experience (Table 5:5). Teachers with "one year or less" teaching experience were most likely to be satisfied (71%) with retraining opportunities. Those with "more than 25 years" were least likely to be satisfied, while other teachers indicated an even split between satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Whether teachers would like to undertake further training was also considered in conjunction with two factors. A predisposition to undertake further training did not seem to be affected by whether or not teachers were satisfied with retraining opportunities (Table 5:6). However, when analyzed by whether teachers had a major in one of their teaching subjects, differences appeared. Three-quarters of teachers who did not have a major were interested in further training, as compared to approximately 50% of those who had a relevant major. This reinforced some findings in Section II concerning a need for opportunities for teachers who may lack some academic training or preparation.

3. Special Areas

The two special areas of interest to this study, French and Special Education, are the focus of this section. They will be discussed separately.

(1) Special Education

A number of the respondent group were asked whether they would like to see changes in the way teachers are trained or prepared to deal with special needs students. All special education co-ordinators and personnel from other institutions answered "yes", as did six of seven superintendents, 80% of principals, and 75% of teachers. Inservicing or retraining were most often seen as the

TABLE 5:4

TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES
BY DIVISION

Satisfaction with Opportunities to Retrain*	Division						
	#4 (%)	#13 (%)	#14 (%)	#23 (%)	#27 (%)	#32 (%)	#48 (%)
Satisfactory	51%	50%	56%	33%	86%	46%	68%
Unsatisfactory	49%	50%	44%	67%	14%	54%	32%
TOTAL N =	63	22	32	12	7	13	28

* The "satisfactory" category represents a combination of "very satisfactory" and "satisfactory" responses.

The "unsatisfactory" category represents a combination of the "very unsatisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" responses.

TABLE 5:5

TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES
BY NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Satisfaction with Opportunities to Retrain*	Years of Teaching Experience**				
	1 or less (%)	2-9 (%)	10-17 (%)	18-25 (%)	More than 25 (%)
Satisfactory	71%	52%	49%	50%	33%
Unsatisfactory	29%	48%	51%	50%	67%
TOTAL N =	21	75	45	16	6

* The "satisfactory" category represents a combination of "very satisfactory" and "satisfactory" responses.

The "unsatisfactory" category represents a combination of the "very unsatisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" responses.

** "Years of teaching experience" refers to the number of years of teaching the subject listed first as a "subject taught 1/3 time or more."

TABLE 5:6
 TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH RETRAINING OPPORTUNITIES
 BY THEIR PREDISPOSITION TO UNDERTAKE
 FURTHER TRAINING

Satisfaction with Retraining Opportunities*	Predisposition to Further Training	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Satisfactory	56%	53%
Unsatisfactory	44%	47%
TOTAL N =	90	77

* The "satisfactory" category represents a combination of "very satisfactory" and "satisfactory" responses.

The "unsatisfactory" category represents a combination of the "very unsatisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" responses.

TABLE 5:7
 TEACHERS' PREDISPOSITION TO UNDERTAKE FURTHER TRAINING
 BY WHETHER THEY HAVE A MAJOR
 IN THEIR PRESENT TEACHING SUBJECT(S)

Predisposition to Further Training	Major in Teaching Subject(s)*	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Yes	49%	76%
No	51%	24%
TOTAL N =	140	38

* This refers to a major or minor in one of the subjects which the teacher presently teaches "1/3 time or more."

appropriate options for such training, by all groups except Special Education co-ordinators, (Appendix B, Question 6b; Appendices C and D, Question 5b; Appendix E, Section III, Question 2). However, a variety of suggestions were given for changes at both the preservice and inservice/retraining levels.

The general feeling was that, at the preservice level, there was a need for more exposure. Special Education co-ordinators felt there was a need for compulsory courses, or at least some exposure for all preservice students. This paralleled the suggestion most frequently given by teachers, principals and superintendents: "all teachers should have some courses in Special Education."

Personnel from other institutions tended to favour the use of inservicing and retraining. They felt that teachers already in the field needed to have resources, (including specialists, resource teachers and practical inservicing), to help them cope with special needs students (Appendix E, Section III, Question 2). Special Education co-ordinators saw a need for inservicing, but felt that any inservicing had to be ongoing in nature and geared to specifics. The problem that teachers already attend many inservices was noted. One co-ordinator suggested that short summer sessions, paid jointly by the Department of Education, the school division and the teacher, might be an answer.

Teachers, principals and superintendents most often cited different suggestions. Teachers suggested inservices and workshops should be more available. Principals most frequently stated that teachers could be required to take periodic (mandatory) courses in the area. Superintendents, on the other hand, felt there was a need to provide incentives in the form of credit courses and to provide co-operatively run courses.

It was also of interest to note additional comments supplied by Special Education co-ordinators. Two felt that teachers assigned to various special needs classes needed further training in some specific skills. One co-ordinator was concerned with the lower level of service in rural areas; that is, the lack of psychologists, psychiatrists and clinicians. One co-ordinator felt that mainstreaming was not allowing special needs students access to the best possible education, while another was optimistic that, "in the area of Special Education, the situation is generally on the upswing." The variety of comments may point to a diversity with respect to Special Education found among school divisions across Manitoba.

(ii) French Language Instruction

With regard to French language instruction, the divisional French consultant surveyed has suggestions for both the preservice and inservice/retraining areas.

In the area of preservice, the consultant felt conversational French should be emphasized, and that those who wished to teach French as a second language should be required to hold a proficiency certificate. The consultant also indicated that inservicing for those teaching French should encompass four inservice days, during which problems could be discussed and program adjustments could be made.

4. Optional Delivery Methods

Responses were elicited from various groups in the study concerning suggestions for delivering preservice training, inservicing and other retraining.

(1) Suggestions for Preservice Training

Personnel from teacher training institutions and the Manitoba Teachers' Society all felt that there was a need for changes at the preservice level. An explanation of their responses can be found in Appendix E (Section I, Question 1). All agreed that certain subject areas required more emphasis at this level. Subjects cited included: Special Education, reading, French immersion and Francais, as well as some other specialist areas, such as Home Economics and Business Education. It was also stated that there was a need to combine theory and practice more effectively; with two respondents indicating a need for improvement in seminar in-school experience.

Suggestions for optional ways of offering preservice training were elicited from representatives of other institutions, principals, superintendents and professional development chairpersons. The suggestion made most often from personnel of teacher training institutions was to expand the practical component of preservice (Appendix E, Section IV, Question 1). This was also mentioned by a professional development chairperson. Other comments from professional development chairpersons concerned the need to give more support to co-operating teachers and the possible use of experienced "master" teachers.

Principals also focused on the practical, most often suggesting the need for more practical experience or "on the job training" (eg. using internship programs), (Appendix C, Question 10a). Superintendents had a different perspective. Their two most frequent suggestions were to "expand specialist programs" (eg. Francais, computers) and to "encourage students to enter shortage areas in preservice." Both may reflect their need to recruit qualified teachers in shortage areas.

It is interesting to note that in the general comments made by teachers at the end of their survey instrument, preservice was a major area of concern. Their first and third most often given comments were "need for a practical emphasis in preservice, inservicing and retraining," (1st) and "preservice training did not provide adequate or relevant preparation for teaching" (3rd), (Appendix B, Question 7).

(ii) Suggestions for Inservicing and Other Retraining

Persons from teacher training institutions and the MTS as well as professional development chairpersons were asked whether they felt methods of delivering inservicing or retraining to teachers should vary by geographic area and/or teaching assignment. There was general agreement that flexibility was required in both areas (Appendix E, Section II, Question 2).*

Two professional development chairpersons suggested inservicing be given to specific schools or areas within a division. This would serve to combat problems of distance. Concerning geographic area, two persons from teacher training institutions indicated that off-campus courses were available, providing numbers warranted. Other suggested alternate methods included: co-operative workshops among divisions using local expertise; use of the computer to extend retraining away from the campus; and, more individualized programs utilizing telephones and new modes of interactive technology.

There seemed to be general agreement that more individualization, on the basis of both subject area and grade level taught, would be beneficial (Appendix E, Section II, Question 2).

*Of professional development chairpersons one stated: "don't know" or "no" regarding the need for varying delivery methods; all others indicated "yes".

(a) Inservicing

Regarding alternate ways of offering inservicing itself, perceptions differed among respondent groups. Professional development chairpersons appeared to feel that more initiative could be taken by divisions. Principals most often responded that inservices needed to be longer and include follow-up activities (Appendix C, Question 10b). This was followed by the comment that "more co-operation should take place between division, the Department of Education and Faculties of Education." Superintendents saw the need for inservicing to be "geared to individual/local needs" (Appendix D, Question 10b).

In the section of general comments made by teachers, the second most frequent concerned the "need for more and varied opportunities in order to keep up to date", in areas such as computers and French immersion. As previously noted in Section III, teachers most often cited inservicing as the method they would like to use for further training (Appendix B, Question 2c). With this in mind, comments regarding preferred ways of delivering inservicing may take on added importance.

(b) Other Retraining

It was hoped that other options in the area of teacher retraining would surface as a result of this study.

Principals stressed two main areas. First, that "sabbaticals or leaves should be readily available"; second, that mandatory retraining (with certain options) should be required of teachers. Superintendents, on the

other hand, cited the need for courses to be accessible to rural teachers and the need for more opportunities in the area of French (Appendices C and D, Question 10c).

However, it was from teachers and persons from teacher training institutions that some less traditional ideas were expressed. The ACE program was one option mentioned; but, it was not something which teachers commented upon. Perhaps there is a need for further publicity of the program.

One respondent suggested that learning packets or modules could be distributed to teachers using video disc, videotape or computer. These interactive modes could be used for self-study following six-week seminar retraining or upgrading programs. This would utilize the summer session, but would also provide individualized, systematic follow-up for teachers outside Winnipeg.

One teacher suggested a rotation between Faculty of Education personnel and "master teachers" chosen because of their teaching expertise. This would put Faculty personnel into schools for a year (or a semester) where they could provide in-school inservices or retraining opportunities. "Master teachers" would spend time at a Faculty of Education where they would help preservice students. These teachers would also have the opportunity to become acquainted with the more academic side of the profession. The teacher felt that this arrangement "would broaden the horizons of both parties."

Other comments grouped into general categories may be found at the end of the frequencies for teachers, principals, superintendents and teacher training/MTS personnel, (Appendices B through E).