A STUDY OF SMALL CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOLS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

LOUIS JAMES MEANEY


CENTRE FOR NFLD. STUDIES
JUN 2 1978
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
OF NEWFOUNDLAND

A STUDY OF SMALL CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOLS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

by

Louis James Meaney, B.A. (Ed.)

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Educational Administration
Memorial University of Newfoundland

September 1976

St. John's Newfoundland

AN ABSTRACT

The small high school has been criticized and often condemned because of its size. Found in the related literature are claims that the small high school has limited facilities, has difficulty in attracting and holding qualified staff, offers narrow curricular programs, and has few pupil services. The result of these weaknesses is school ineffectiveness.

In the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador there are many areas where, due to various factors, consolidation and centralization have not eliminated small schools. In 1973-74 there were fifty-three small central high schools with an enrolment of fewer than 200 pupils.

This study has attempted to determine the current status and future prospects of six "remote and necessary" small central high schools in the Province with respect to facilities, staff, program, consultative services, and pupil services. The effectiveness of these schools was presented in terms of pupil retention, promotion, retardation, and graduation. A profile of the small central high school in the Province was then developed using these components. Problem areas related to the schools' effectiveness included: facilities, employment and retention of qualified teachers, consultative services, program, pupil services, and socio-economic conditions of the school areas.

Structured interviews using questionnaires and data guides were conducted with school board office personnel, school principals, teachers, and Grade XI students. Previously recorded data were collected from the

school board offices, schools, and various departments of governments.

Some of the major findings and conclusions include the following: (1) generally, small central high schools in Newfoundland and Labrador lack the basic instructional facilities considered essential to the provision of a comprehensive high school program, (2) most teachers in small central high schools in the Province have been associated with such small schools in terms of their own high school education and teaching experience, (3) the majority of the teachers are sufficiently qualified to teach the program being offered, (4) the curriculum of these schools is generally considered narrow, rigid, and irrelevant in terms of meeting the needs of all students, (5) consultative services are grossly inadequate for these schools, (6) there are few services for pupils, and (7) results in the Public Examinations for these schools are better than those of the Province as a whole.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was given the support and co-operation of many groups and individuals. High school students, teachers, principals, school board office personnel from the sample school areas were truly co-operative. Personnel in the various departments of governments were generous. I am grateful to Dr. P. J. Warren and Dr. D. Kirby, my supervisors, who provided the necessary criticism and encouragement. I also express gratitude to Dr. V. Snelgrove and Dr. F. Riggs for their co-operation and help. Finally, I express appreciation to my wife, Marie, for her encouragement and patience during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The small high school has been the subject of much consideration, especially since the 1950's when the effectiveness of secondary education in accomplishing its aims began to be questioned as perhaps never before. There have been claims that the small high school has limited facilities, has difficulty in attracting and holding qualified staff, offers narrow curriculum programs, and has few pupil services. The result of these weaknesses is school ineffectiveness. Such claims led to demands that these high schools be consolidated into larger administrative units.

Although this solution to the problems of the small high school continues to be recommended, consolidation and centralization have not eliminated many small high schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. In 1963-64, there were fifty-six central high schools and nineteen regional high schools with fewer than ten classrooms; in 1973-74, the numbers were fifty-three and eight respectiyely. Forces preventing consolidation include economic, civic, denominational, and personal ones. In addition to these forces, there are the barriers of distance and isolation preventing the consolidation of some small high schools in the Province.

There are a number of small high schools in the Province that, because of their location, may be labelled "remote and necessary." These

are likely to continue to exist as people in small communities in Newfoundland and Labrador resist consolidation and centralization. Consequently, the status and future of these schools in terms of goal achievement should be seriously considered.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to examine the present status and future prospects of small central high schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What is the current status of a selection of small central high schools with respect to facilities, staff, program, pupil services, and consultative services?
2. What has been the effectiveness of such schools over a five-year period in terms of pupil retention, pupil promotion and retardation, and public examinations results?
3. What are the problems being faced by such schools as seen by principals, teachers, pupils, and school board consultants?
4. What are the views of principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants concerning what might be done to alleviate the problems identified in (3) above?

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

No study has been conducted in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador on the status and prospects of such small central high schools. It is believed that this study will be significant since many such high schools now exist and are likely to continue to exist for some time.

The widespread assumption that small central high schools are being eliminated quickly is contradicted by the fact that there has been no significant decrease in the number of such schools in the past ten years.

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Central High School. A central high school is one which accommodates grades seven to eleven inclusive.

Small High School. For the purpose of the present study, a small high school is defined as one with an enrolment of fewer than 200 pupils. While this definition of small may seem somewhat arbitrary, a number of related studies also chose 200 pupils as a maximum enrolment.

Remote High School. A remote high school, for the purpose of this study, is defined as one with no road connection to another high school, or a school that is twenty miles or more by road from another high school. The delimitations of this definition are based on recommendations that transported pupils not be bussed twenty miles or more one way.

Program. Program refers to a combination of courses approved by the Department of Education which are offered in the school.

Instructional Facilities. Instructional facilities, for the purpose of the present study, refer to spaces where instruction is planned and/or carried out. Such spaces include classrooms, libraries, laboratories, gymnasia, sports fields, and teachers' rooms.

Consultant. A consultant refers to a high school generalist supervisor, or a subject specialist employed by the school board to function in a consultative capacity.

Socio-Economic Characteristics. Socio-economic characteristics,

for the purpose of the present study, are used to describe the area in which the selected schools are located. The characteristics include population, number and size of families, income, employment, and occupations.

Retention. For the purpose of this study, retention is defined in terms of the number of students who remain in school to complete their year. The retention rate, therefore, is an annual retention rate rather than one that measures the proportion of students entering school who complete their high school program eleven or twelve years later.

School Effectiveness. For the purpose of the present study, school effectiveness is defined in terms of pupil retention, pupil promotion and retardation, and public examinations results.

V. LIMITATIONS

The present study was limited by the lack of data available concerning the schools studied. Relatively few comprehensive record systems were found in these schools. The study was also limited by the difficulties associated with the interview method of collecting data. Although every effort was made to develop and refine this technique, some of the replies may have been influenced by the researcher's handling of the interview or his interpretation of the answers provided.

VI. DELIMITATIONS

This study is delimited to small central high schools which have been defined as being "remote." While findings and conclusions may be applied to all small central high schools in the Province, the recommendations are specifically directed to those which are considered "remote."

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

This chapter has introduced the research problem, presented the significance of the study, the definition of important terms, and stated the limitations and delimitations of the study. In Chapter II, a review of the related literature is provided. Chapter III presents the methodology of the study including a description of the instrument used as a structured interview, the sample, and data collection and analysis. In Chapter IV, the analysis of the data under the headings of setting, status, effectiveness, profile, and problems of the small central high school is provided. Chapter V contains a summary of the purposes and procedures, a summary of the findings, a statement of the main conclusions, recommendations for improvement, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. SECONDARY EDUCATION

Secondary education has been defined in many ways. It has been defined in terms of the age range of the pupils taught and in terms of the grade levels of secondary schools. These definitions are inadequate, however, since they say nothing of the objectives and functions of secondary education.[1]

The Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education, National Education Association of Secondary School Principals defines secondary education as follows:

> Secondary education denotes the education by schools for the purpose of guiding and promoting the development of normal individuals for whom on the one hand the elementary school no longer constitutes a satisfactory environment, and who on the other hand are either not yet prepared to participate effectively in society unguided by the school, or are not ready for the specialized work of the professional schools or the upper division of the liberal arts college.[2]

Identifying the goals and purposes of secondary education is likewise a difficulty. Perhaps the most comprehensive, functional, and influential listed aims of secondary education were the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, formulated by the United States Commission

---

[1] E. Dale Davis, Focus on Secondary Education (Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966), pp. 2-3.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The Commission determined the seven main objectives of secondary education as: health, command of fundamental processes, vocation, worthy home membership, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.[3] In relation to these principles, Davis lists the generally accepted objectives as follows:

1. provide for the development of each personality to the fullest realization of inborn capacities;
2. provide for the maximum development of each student's intellect;
3. provide for the development of good citizenship on the part of the students;
4. provide for the development of understanding and knowledge about life that will lead to good physical and mental health;
5. provide for the desirable moral development of its students;
6. provide education in family living;
7. provide educational experiences that will help students equip themselves with the skills, knowledge, understanding, and attitudes necessary for earning their own living;
8. help students live a better, more enriched, enjoyable life.[4]

Although these general objectives may be appropriate for all secondary schools, specific objectives may differ among and within regions. That the purposes of secondary education are diverse is indicated by the different types of secondary schools which exist today. These types are:

1. Regular high schools (comprehensive, vocational, specialized, and restricted general).
2. Senior high schools (comprehensive and vocational).
3. Junior high schools (general and comprehensive).

[3]Rudyard K. Bent and Henry H. Kronenberg, Principles of Secondary Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), p. 38.

[4]Davis, op. cit., pp. 55-57.

4. Junior-senior high schools (comprehensive and restricted general).
5. Evening or part-time schools (general and vocational).
6. Extended secondary schools (general and technical).
7. High school-community college (comprehensive).[5]

In spite of efforts to clarify and reach objectives, and satisfy the needs of youth, secondary education has been subjected to much criticism. Both educators and lay citizens have levelled the following criticisms at secondary schools, especially since the 1950's:

1. Secondary schools have not properly defined their basic functions and purposes.
2. The secondary school has accepted roles and responsibilities and is performing services which are not consistent with its proper function, and which militate against its efforts to fulfill its essential purpose.
3. The curriculum of the high school does not give proper emphasis to essential subjects, and pupils are not required to study subjects necessary for their intellectual development and for the promotion of national welfare.
4. The programs of the school do not provide adequately for the education of intellectually gifted children in terms of their abilities and capacities.
5. The schools have insufficient finances to provide an adequate program of education.

---

[5] William M. Alexander and J. Galen Saylor, Modern Secondary Education: Basic Principles and Practices (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 87.

6. The rate of attrition in secondary schools is much too high.
7. Many pupils fail to attain a desirable level of achievement and do not possess a high level of skill in fundamentals or an adequate knowledge of our cultural heritage.
8. Methods of teaching and of organizing instruction do not conform adequately to what is known about the psychology of learning or human motivation.
9. The school fails to develop proper patterns of behavior, adherent to value patterns accepted as good, or high standards of conduct.
10. The high schools have been charged on occasion with teaching beliefs and principles that are not consistent with our tradition.[6]

Such criticisms have not been ignored. In realizing that education is directly related to society in general, many educators, such as Douglass, state that the program of the high school must be flexible enough to prepare young people for changing living conditions. Changes and trends in secondary education must keep pace with changes and trends which are found in every area of living. Douglass states that such changes and trends include changes in homes and leisure activities; trends towards materialism and softer living; and increases in population, the amount of knowledge, technical developments, the amount of juvenile delinquency, the influence of mass media, the complexity of economics and government, and the importance of various aspects of international

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 103-115.

relations.[7]

With so much self-appraisal and re-evaluation in secondary education in the past two decades, the small high school in particular has come under close scrutiny. Generally, it has been found that the small high school cannot provide the learning situation that is needed to prepare youth for a society such as ours. The small high school has been condemned because of its size.

II. HIGH SCHOOL SIZE

Although many recommendations have been made regarding high school size, the optimum size for a high school is still a debatable issue. The ideal size as advocated by educators and researchers would seem to be one that maximizes the advantages of small and large high schools, and minimizes the disadvantages of each size of school.

James B. Conant concluded that the enrolment in many high schools was too small to allow a diversified curriculum except at exorbitant expense. He further stated that schools with a graduating class of less than 100 have serious problems in providing a good secondary education. Not only do finances restrict the course offerings, but the small number of students prohibits the use of counselors and specialists.[8]

After summarizing four research studies on high school size in relation to the provision of a comprehensive, quality program, Evans

---

[7] Karl R. Douglass, Trends and Issues in Secondary Education (New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education, 1962), pp. 3-9.

[8] James B. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 38.

concluded that the studies recommended a need for a graduating class of 400.[9] This number is taken as a maximum for a graduating class; Conant's 100 is a minimum.

In an opinion poll in the early 1950's, school superintendents were asked the question: "What size secondary school is best, keeping in mind the scope of experiences and attention to individual needs?" The results of this survey were: 37% favoured a size of 150-400, 31% favoured 400-750, 3% favoured less than 150. No one favoured a school with an enrolment over 2,000, and only 5% favoured an enrolment over 1,200.[10] After completing his study of small high schools in the late 1950's, Woods recommends the minimum size, on the bases of cost and breadth of offerings, to be 300-350.[11]

Relatively little research has been conducted concerning high school size in Canada. Downey's investigation of small high schools in the mid 1960's led him to conclude that Alberta's small high schools lacked the essentials that provide quality high school education. He recommended that schools enrolling fewer than 200 students not be accorded "full high school status."[12] The Report of the Royal Commission

---

[9] N. Dean Evans, "How Large Should a High School Be?" Delaware School Journal, XXX, No. 4 (1965), p. 9.

[10] William B. Forrest, "What Size School is Best?" The Nation's Schools, Vol. 54, No. 4 (October, 1954), p. 59.

[11] Thomas E. Woods, "Relationship of High School Size to Curriculum Offerings" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, July, 1957), p. 2.

[12] Lawrence W. Downey, The Small High School in Alberta: A Report of an Investigation (Edmonton: The Alberta School Trustees' Association, 1965), p. 59.

on Education and Youth, Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, recommended that three-year high schools should have a minimum enrolment of 300 pupils, and that central high schools have a minimum enrolment of 500 pupils.[13] Warren recommends that, where possible, regional high schools should have an enrolment of 600 pupils and central high schools 1,000 pupils. The maximum enrolment, he contends, should be 2,000 pupils.[14]

A review of the related literature indicates that among other factors, cost and an effective program are the main problems universally facing school supporters in relation to school size. As a report of the American Association of School Administrators states:

> Except for cost of transportation and often even including it, small schools are more expensive to maintain than reasonably large ones if comparable programs are provided for the pupils. High schools having fewer than 300 to 400 pupils are more expensive to maintain than the larger school if a diversified program is offered. Those having fewer than 100 pupils are especially expensive or inadequate, or both.[15]

III. THE LARGE HIGH SCHOOL

The enrolment that classifies a school as large is sometimes set arbitrarily. However, research does show that school size makes a difference on some school factors. The lower enrolment range generally

---

[13] Gov. of Nfld. and Labrador, Report of the Royal Commission on Education and Youth, Vol. 1, Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1967, p. 106.

[14] P. J. Warren, Quality and Equality in Secondary Education in Newfoundland (St. John's: Committee on Publications, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1973), p. 140.

[15] "School District Organization," American Association of School Administrators (Washington: A.A.S.A., 1958), p. 210.

accepted to classify a high school as large is 500 to 750 pupils.

Advantages of Large High Schools

When large high schools are studied in relation to programs, staff, facilities, and services, the following arguments in favour of the large high school may be found:

1. The teachers in the large high school are more experienced.
2. There is less turnover of teachers.
3. The larger school offers a more comprehensive program.
4. Specialization in the guidance function is made possible.
5. The number and variety of extra-curricular activities are greater in the larger high school.
6. Indirectly the size of the high school affects the acuteness of the need for supervision. The large school provides more supervision.
7. Some special fields tend to be offered as the size of the school increases.
8. The operation of the large high school is not as costly as the operation of the small high school.[16]

Herrick's study conducted in the mid 1950's supports these arguments. He concluded that large high schools offered a greater variety of courses with more frequency and regularity and with greater adaption of content and method to the varying abilities of different groups of pupils; more extensive and balanced programs of pupil activity, or extra-curricular activities; more adequate provision for lunchrooms,

---

[16] Woods, op. cit., pp. 75-77.

health examinations, counseling, psychological assistance, and other special services; greater success, with some exceptions, in recruiting and holding teachers, and in providing the educational leadership necessary to keep them growing professionally; and, more adequate provision at reasonable costs of necessary building facilities and equipment of certain types.[17]

Defining size by enrolment, Shelly found that there was an inverse relationship between size and quality of secondary education. His study further showed that 69% of the variance of school quality was accounted for by the variance in school size, scope of educational program, plant facilities, and certification of teachers.[18]

Using number of staff as a criterion for size of school, Knowles' study of school size on freshman success in Alberta showed that marks of students from larger schools were consistently better predictors of university success than marks from smaller school students.[19] Downey concluded that only the larger school offered completely adequate programs.[20]

---

[17]John H. Herrick, From School Program to School Plant (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956), pp. 91-92.

[18]Herman W. Shelly, "An Analysis of Relationships Between Eight Factors and Three Measures of Quality in Thirty-nine South Carolina Secondary Schools" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1957), pp. 108, 207.

[19]Donald W. Knowles, "The Influence of Faculty, High School Size, and Sex in Predictions of Freshman's Success Using Departmental and Principals Rating Grade XII Scores" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1964), p. 60.

[20]Downey, op. cit., p. 19.

Disadvantages of Large High Schools

Recently, the failure of very large high schools to achieve a high quality of education has become the subject of a great deal of discussion. Among the reasons often cited for this failure are the following:

1. The increased difficulty of administration, with the accompanying tendency of the principal to neglect his function as a leader because of preoccupation with operating the machinery;
2. The increased difficulty of unified staff planning and attack upon problems that should be of school-wide concern, i.e. the greater tendency for each teacher or department to operate independently rather than as part of a school-wide team;
3. The increased tensions and fatigue of teachers in a large school with more activity and noise, more formalization of operating procedures, and more conflicting demands upon their time and energy;
4. The increased difficulty of focusing effective attention upon the problems and needs of the individual pupil, especially in schools where the instruction of a given child is the responsibility of a number of different teachers during the same semester or year;
5. The less favourable psychological reaction of the students to the school situation, including the awe and even fright, and the tension of a young child in a very large school, and the misbehavior of the older child whose identity is lost in the mob.[21]

---

[21] Herrick, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

Barker and Gump claimed that increased number of students, high staff to pupil ratio, crowded facilities, and inflexible narrow curriculum offerings have combined to restrict individual growth of students in the large "comprehensive" high school. They state:

> One problem of the large comprehensive high school is related closely with the phenomenon of people having less direct contact when placed in a crowded society. As schools increase in size students within the school tend to withdraw both from participation in school activities and involvement with other students.[22]

In the late 1960's, Hussein investigated whether school size, measured by enrolment, had any effect on teachers' level of satisfaction with their work and their degree of participation in the school program. He found that school size caused certain unfavourable organizational changes which in turn tended to affect another group of psychologically based variables, and both caused the ultimate impact that school size had on teachers' satisfaction and participation. The study showed that school size and teacher satisfaction and participation were negatively related.[23] In 1969, Kleinert stated:

> My findings indicate decreased student involvement in activities as high schools grow larger. This is usually viewed as undesirable by students, parents, teachers, and administrators who believe that participation in student activities is basic to learning cooperation and leadership,

---

[22] Roger F. Barker and Paul V. Gump, Big School, Small School, High School Size and Student Behavior (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964), p. 8.

[23] Ibrahim M. J. Hussein, "The Effects of School Size Upon Teacher Satisfaction and Participation" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968), pp. 105, 115.

as well as to having a rich and enjoyable high school experience.[24]

And recently, to add to the evidence that large high schools are detrimental to their members' satisfaction and participation, Larre stated that the large high school, while satisfying the academic needs by specialization and teachers who are better prepared, neglected a variety of psychological and social needs: the larger high school could not satisfy these needs, which ranged from safety needs to self-actualization and love needs, due to little real personal contact.[25]

IV. THE SMALL HIGH SCHOOL

As stated in Chapter I of this study, the small high school is defined as one with an enrolment of fewer than 200 pupils. This definition is by necessity arbitrary, but the related literature shows that an upper enrolment range of 200 to 600 generally classifies a high school as small.

Advantages of Small High Schools

Supporters of the small high school decry the disestablishment of such a school and have put forth these arguments for maintaining small high schools:

1. Small high schools tend to centre the guidance program in the classroom teacher.

---

[24] E. John Kleinert, "Effects of High School Size on Student Activity Participation," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, No. 335 (March, 1969), p. 35.

[25] Lucien Larre, "Small Schools, Big Schools, and Needs of Students," The School Trustee (October, 1972), pp. 23-27.

2. In the area of articulation, small high schools tend to work more intimately with elementary schools than do larger schools.
3. There is with the small high school a closeness between home and school, and the process of making schools truly life and community centered is enhanced.
4. The small high school is not likely to resort to mass production methods and lose sight of individual needs of youth as happens in larger schools.
5. The smaller high school has greater integration between subject matter areas.
6. There is no excess of specialization and departmentalization in the small high school as there is in the larger school.
7. The small high school does not have an impersonal character as does the large high school.
8. The smaller high school is closer to the needs and interests of its respective communities, while most large schools are not so because so many of them draw their students from several communities in order to become large.
9. Small high schools do not deny to many students, as many large ones do, the opportunity to participate in student government and other student activities.[26]

In relation to teacher benefit, Shapiro found in the late 1950's that small high schools have more effective communication among staff, more democratic group activity, and more effective performance by indi-

---

[26] Woods, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

vidual staff members.[27] In the early 1960's, Barker and Gump found that the small high school was better for the student in that (a) students participated in more and a wider variety of inter-school and extra-curricular activities, and (b) there was greater opportunity for satisfaction of needs relating to competence, challenge, activity, and group affiliation.[28]

Disadvantages of Small High Schools

Studies of the small high school have identified generally four characteristic weaknesses of such schools:

1. Small schools often have only a narrow, limited academic or college preparatory curricular program.
2. Small high schools often have a limited extra-curricular program, which may over-emphasize athletics.
3. Small high schools often have a limited program of educational and vocational guidance.
4. Small high schools often must ask their teachers to fill assignments requiring many different preparations; sometimes in areas for which they have no formal training.[29]

As early as the mid 1950's, Woods' study showed that small high schools did a less adequate job of providing materials of instruction,

---

[27] David F. Shapiro, "Relationship of School Size to Staff Relations" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1957), pp. 115-116.

[28] Barker and Gump, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

[29] Franklin D. Carlson, "Instructional Problems of Small Washington High Schools" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1968), p. 20.

communicating with parents, and providing for student participation in class planning than did larger high schools.[30] Grey's study in the early 1960's provided evidence that (a) small high schools were more willing to accept as teachers persons who had no prior experience, and that (b) these schools were passed over in the allocation of facilities and equipment.[31] This omission worsens the situation, especially since Sorenson states that lack of personnel and facilities and equipment were cited by many teachers as significantly hindering their effectiveness as teachers.[32] As Oviatt stated, high schools with an enrolment of less than 400 students tend to pay a premium per pupil cost for an inferior educational program.[33]

The 1965 Annual Report of the Department of Education, Province of Alberta, stated similar complaints about small high schools. Superintendents reported that the small high school was increasingly ineffective in meeting the educational needs of students and was economically unsound. Problems attendant on its operation were similar to those in the past. It was difficult to secure staff and retain their services.

---

[30] Woods, op. cit., p. 75.

[31] Stuart C. Grey, "A Study of the Relationship Between Size and a Number of Qualitative and Quantitative Factors of Education in Four Sizes of Secondary Schools in Iowa" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1961), pp. 2, 27.

[32] Frank D. Sorenson, "Teacher Load in Nebraska High Schools in Communities of Less than 1,000 Population" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1962), p. 223.

[33] Stanley W. Oviatt, "A Study of the Optimum Size of the High School" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965), pp. 131, 132.

The teachers were required to instruct in a range of subjects with perhaps little training in some.[34]

Many proposals have been made to overcome some of the disadvantages of the small high school, particularly where consolidation is not feasible. Canadian proposals include provision of special facilities, services, and projects as recommended by Downey,[35] The Report of the Royal Commission on Education and Youth,[36] Warren,[37] and a Report to the Minister of Education.[38]

V. SUMMARY

Over the past two decades, secondary education has been a matter of continuing concern. Educators and researchers have attempted to define the purposes of high schools and to propose programs and organizational changes to help them to achieve these purposes. One organizational change was the consolidation of small high schools into larger ones.

In recent years, large consolidated schools have received considerable criticism. There have been claims that they have not been

---

[34]Gov. of Alberta, "Annual Report of the Department of Education, Province of Alberta, 1965, The Alberta Teachers' Association Magazine, Vol. 45, No. 8 (March, 1965), pp. 51-52.

[35]Downey, op. cit., pp. 59-76.

[36]Report, op. cit., pp. 106-107.

[37]Warren, op. cit., pp. 153-157.

[38]Gov. of British Columbia, An Interim Report to The Honorable The Minister of Education, Mrs. Eileen E. Dailly, From the Small Senior Secondary School Study Committee, 1974, pp. 2-6.

meeting the non-academic needs of young people. The small high school is seen now as having great potential for meeting these needs. But at the same time the small high school must solve the characteristic weaknesses related to its size.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a description of the instrument and the sample, an outline of the procedure used for data collection, and the methodology applied in the study to analyze the data.

I. INSTRUMENTATION

Data guide sheets listing the various selected components of the school and characteristics of the school area were used while collecting previously recorded data from schools, school boards, and departments of governments. The components of the school included facilities, staff, and various pupil-related components such as retention, retardation, and matriculation. The characteristics of the area included population, number and size of families, income and employment, and occupations of adults in the area.

Written questionnaires were developed and used as data guides for the structured interviews. These questionnaires were developed from questionnaires used in similar studies conducted in North America, including Newfoundland and Labrador. A different questionnaire was used for the principal, the teacher, the pupil, and the consultant. Although these questionnaires were similar in that they dealt with the components of facilities, staff, program, consultative services, pupil services, school effectiveness, and socio-economic characteristics of the area,

there was a different one for each classification of person or group interviewed to allow for views according to the position held by these people. Copies of these guides and questionnaires are included in the Appendix.

II. THE SAMPLE

As stated in the Definition of Terms, Chapter I, the conditions that determined a central high school as being "small" and "remote" were arbitrarily set. From a list of all one hundred forty-six high schools in the Province, all central high schools that could be labelled small and remote were selected. It was agreed that a selection of six schools for intensive study would be representative of all small central high schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Table 1

Size by Enrolment of Central High Schools in Newfoundland and Labrador 1973-74

Enrolment	No. of Schools
0 - 99	11
100-199	42
200-299	26
300-399	15
400-499	6
500 plus	7
Total	107

Table 1 shows that there were fifty-three central high schools in the Province in 1973-74 with fewer than 200 pupils. Of these, fifteen

were classified as remote for the purposes of this study. These remote, small central high schools are located in communities situated along the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, some of them on small islands. Six of these schools were selected randomly for intensive study. Of the six, two are situated on the North-West Coast, two on the North-East Coast, and two on the South Coast. For tabulation and identification purposes, School 1 is in Community A of Area I, School 2 is in Community B of Area II, School 3 is in Community C of Area III, School 4 is in Community D of Area IV, School 5 is in Community E of Area V, and School 6 is in Community F of Area VI.

III. DATA COLLECTION

Data for this study were collected from a variety of sources which include Statistics Canada, the Department of Social Services, the Department of Education, school boards, schools, and structured interviews with principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants. Permission and co-operation were received from the different government departments and divisions, as well as from the schools and school boards.

The researcher visited the schools and communities selected to talk with individuals and groups to gather first-hand information concerning the schools. Interviews and discussions were held with six principals, forty teachers, seventy-three Grade XI students, and ten consultants. Each person or group was asked to complete the questionnaires between the researcher's first and second visits to the school and school board office. No more than two days was spent in each school or community. The data were collected over a five-week period during May and June, 1974.

IV. DATA TREATMENT

The data of the study are analyzed in five stages: the setting of the schools, the present status of the schools, the effectiveness of the schools, a profile of the small central high school, and problems of the small central high school.

The first stage of the analysis presents the setting of the sample schools in terms of population, occupations, and employment and income of the areas in which the schools are situated.

The present status of the sample schools is established in the second stage of the analysis by providing a detailed analysis of the components which are used to determine the status of the schools. These five components are: facilities, staff, program, consultative services, and pupil services.

In the third stage of the analysis, the effectiveness of the six sample schools is shown by a presentation and analysis of pupil retention, promotion, retardation, and graduation.

The fourth stage of the analysis presents a profile of the small central high school in the Province in terms of instructional facilities, teaching staff, curricular program, consultative services, pupil services, and school effectiveness.

The fifth stage of the analysis examines six problem areas in relation to school effectiveness. These problem areas as seen by teachers, pupils, and consultants include: facilities, employment and retention of qualified teachers, program, consultative services, pupil services, and socio-economic conditions of the school area.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter has related the research methodology used in this study. A description of the instrument used in the structured interviews and collection of data was presented. Then a description of the sample was provided to show how the sample was selected, and why the sample is valid. Next a description of the collection of data was given in terms of sources, time, and locations. Finally a description was given of the five stages in the analysis of data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. THE SETTING OF THE SCHOOLS

The schools selected for study are situated in coastal communities on the island portion of the Province. Two of the six communities are located on the North-West Coast, two on the North-East Coast, and two on the South Coast. The communities in which the sample schools are situated are accessible by road and sea. Each community may be considered the nucleus of an area comprised of several small communities. The smaller feeder communities, none of which are more than sixteen miles distant, are linked to the central community by gravel roads. The central community of each of the areas in question has been designated as the receiving centre under the centralization and consolidation programs established by the Provincial Government. In relation to the present stage of centralization and consolidation, these central communities and their high schools have increased in population to a level that is apparently acceptable to the people of these areas. It is in these central communities that the main industries and services of the areas are found.

Population

The communities are relatively small in terms of population and, except for two communities, the population has remained stable over a

ten-year period. Table 2 shows that in 1971 the largest of the communities was comprised of 300 families with a population of 1,232, while the smallest was comprised of 90 families with 393 people. Table 3 provides a comparison of populations and population changes over a ten-year period for the six communities. There was a low, steady increase in population from 1961 to 1971 in four communities. Community D and Community F had population increases of 53 percent and 133 percent respectively. These increases were due to resettlement from smaller communities in the areas into these receiving communities.

Occupations

Traditionally, the communities in the six areas have been fishing/farming or fishing/logging communities. Due, in part, to the improvement of transportation and communication since the early 1960's, the means of earning a living have changed. There has been a marked decrease in the number of people engaged in the traditional occupations. Table 4 shows the chief occupations of the areas for 1971. The 4 percent of the labour force that are classified as professional were comprised mostly of teachers and clergy. Only 13 percent of the labour force were fishermen or woodsmen, and 12 percent labourers. Most of the women, 35 percent of the labour force, classified themselves as housewives; the remainder were in the trades and professions. Over 1,100 persons, 28 percent of the labour force, were classified as being unskilled with no job, retired, or gentlemen. These are tabulated as "Other."

Employment and Income

As Table 5 illustrates, on an average 10.8 percent of the labour force in these communities were unemployed in 1974. The highest unem-

Table 2

Population, Number and Size of Families of Communities in Which Sample Schools are Located, 1971

Community	Population	Number of Families	Average Family Size
A	739	120	6.2
B	1,232	300	4.1
C	393	90	4.5
D	637	145	4.4
E	575	120	4.8
F	861	145	5.9
Total	4,437	920	4.8

Source: Statistics Canada

Table 3

A Comparison of Populations and Population Changes for the Communities in Which Sample Schools are Located

Community	Population			10 Year Pop. Change	
	1961	1966	1971	n	%
A	682	733	739	57	8
B	1,062	1,183	1,232	170	16
C	371	388	393	22	6
D	417	398	637	220	53
E	544	549	575	31	6
F	369	490	861	492	133
Total	3,445	3,741	4,437	992	29

Source: Statistics Canada

Table 4

Chief Occupations of Areas in Which Sample Schools are Located, 1971

Occupation	Area I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total	
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Professional	16	26	41	23	26	51	183	4
Tradesman	38	63	61	32	53	60	307	7
Fisherman/ Woodsman	40	102	145	82	65	110	544	13
Labourer	62	81	36	32	122	175	508	12
Housewife	146	293	276	161	265	307	1,448	35
Other	113	217	273	125	196	228	1,152	28
Total	415	782	832	455	727	931	4,142	100

Source: Official List of Electors, Gov. of Nfld. and Labrador

Table 5

Labour Force and Employment Rate for Five Communities in Which Sample Schools are Located, 1974

Community	Labour Force			
	Employed n	Unemployed n	Total n	Unemployment Rate
A	90	40	130	30.8
B	195	30	225	13.6
D	150	5	155	3.2
E	135	10	145	6.9
F	295	20	315	6.3
Total	865	105	970	10.8
Average	173	21	194	10.8

Source: Statistics Canada

ployment rate was 30.8 percent for Community A, while the lowest rate was 3.2 percent for Community D. Most of the unemployed segment of the labour force received government assistance. Table 6 presents a comparative view of the long-term and short-term social assistance provided to the communities over a two-year period. During 1972-73 there was a total of 412 persons receiving long-term assistance, and 319 receiving short-term assistance. During 1973-74 there was a total of 366 persons receiving long-term assistance, and 221 receiving short-term assistance. Short-term assistance recipients were members of families whose wage earners were gainfully employed for a part of the year.

Table 7 presents the income figures for the portion of the communities' labour force that was gainfully employed in 1970. The average annual income for the communities in which the sample schools are located ranged from $3,628 to $5,884. Most of the families in the communities earned less than $6,000 annually; no more than fifteen families in any community earned $10,000 or over annually. Only Community B had an aggregate income of over one million dollars.

With the relatively small populations and incomes, these communities apparently have limited available local resources on which the schools can draw to improve their status. Within the socio-economic setting outlined above, the present status of the sample schools is presented in the following stage of the analysis.

II. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE SCHOOLS

The present status of the schools selected for study is presented in terms of five components. These components are: facilities, staff, program, consultative services, and pupil services. The data relating

Table 6

Long-Term and Short-Term Social Assistance Over a Two-Year Period for Communities in which Sample Schools are Located

Community	Long Term Assistance				Short Term Assistance			
	1972-73		1973-74		1972-73		1973-74	
	Cases	Persons	Cases	Persons	Cases	Persons	Cases	Persons
A	21	54	27	96	26	132	14	64
B	23	60	24	60	9	39	6	33
C	25	62	25	69	4	20	6	23
D	28	98	18	47	6	22	7	19
E	28	82	25	60	16	49	12	36
F	16	56	14	34	15	57	10	46
Total	141	412	133	366	76	319	55	22
Average	24	69	22	61	13	53	9	37

Source: Annual Reports, Department of Social Services, Gov. of Nfld. and Labrador

Table 7

Income of Families of Five Sample Communities in which Sample Schools are Located, 1970

Community	Income	Families n	Families %	Aggregate Income	Average Income
A	3,000 and less	25	21	51,800	2,072
	3,000 - 5,999	65	54	318,996	4,907
	6,000 - 9,999	25	21	189,690	7,584
	10,000 and over	5	4	77,690	15,538
	Total	120	100	634,535	5,288
B	3,000 and less	135	45	283,621	2,101
	3,000 - 5,999	95	32	405,438	4,268
	6,000 - 9,999	55	18	415,870	7,561
	10,000 and over	10	3	111,966	11,197
	Total	300	100	1,248,609	4,162
C	3,000 and less	60	41	126,659	2,111
	3,000 - 5,999	60	41	265,901	4,432
	6,000 - 9,999	20	14	150,552	7,528
	10,000 and over	--	--	--	--
	Total	145	100	583,946	4,027
D	3,000 and less	60	50	114,031	1,901
	3,000 - 5,999	40	33	168,580	4,214
	6,000 - 9,999	15	13	106,493	7,100
	10,000 and over	5	4	57,560	11,512
	Total	120	100	435,339	3,628
E	3,000 and less	35	24	83,671	2,319
	3,000 - 5,999	55	38	246,205	4,476
	6,000 - 9,999	35	24	263,020	7,515
	10,000 and over	15	10	201,113	13,408
	Total	140	100	853,210	5,884

Source: Statistics Canada

to these five components are presented for each component as they have been previously listed.

Instructional Facilities

Instructional facilities refer to instructional areas either within or outside the school plant, including facilities owned by the community but to which the school had access. Table 8 presents the facilities to which at least one of the six schools had access. School 4 had the least number of classrooms, 3; while Schools 3, 5, and 6 had 6 classrooms. Five of the six schools had rooms designated as libraries. Of these five, the number of contained titles ranged from 1,000 for School 2 to 3,500 for School 6. These titles included books, film strips, slides, transparencies, tapes, and records. Two of the schools had science laboratories. School 4 had a room designed and built as a science laboratory, School 5 had a regular classroom designated as a laboratory. Each of the other four schools possessed at least one science kit.

The physical education facilities for the schools were relatively limited. School 4 and School 5 had regulation-sized gymnasiums. School 2 and School 3 had an auditorium and a basement lunch room, respectively, designated as gymnasia. An outdoor playground existed for School 2. Three schools had access to outdoor ice rinks in winter. One rink was located on school property. School 2 had a softball field contained within the playground.

Offices and rooms for the teaching staff were often multi-purpose spaces. Each school had one teachers' preparation room. In five of the six schools these preparation rooms also served as staff lounges and/or

Table 8

Instructional Facilities
1973–1974

Type of Facility	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Aver.
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n̄
Regular Classroom	5	5	6	3	6	6	31	5.2
Library	–	1	1	1	1	1	5	0.8
Science Laboratory	–	–	–	1	1	–	2	0.3
Gymnasium	–	–	–	1	1	–	2	0.3
Outdoor Playground	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	0.2
Outdoor Ice Rink	1	1	1	–	–	–	3	0.5
Ball Field	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	0.2
Teachers' Prep. Room	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1.0
Administration Room	1	2	3	1	2	1	10	1.7
Other	–	2	–	1	–	–	3	0.5
Total	8	14	12	9	12	9	64	10.7

staff kitchens. All six schools had either a principal's office or a vice-principal's office, or one office shared by both administrators. There was a total of 10 administration rooms averaging 1.7 such rooms for each school.

Teaching Staff

The present staff of the sample schools are presented in terms of their education, professional development, experience, and mobility. Each of these characteristics, for the purpose of this study, is determined by factors which are listed and described as each characteristic is presented.

Education. The staff characteristic of education is determined by the type of hometown in which teachers were raised, the type of school from which they graduated, their university degree standing, and their teaching certificate.

Table 9 shows the various types of hometowns in which the present staff were raised. The majority, 72.5 percent, were raised in small fishing/farming communities. None were raised in St. John's, Newfoundland. Many, therefore, graduated from small schools. Table 10 shows that the largest number of teachers, 40 percent, graduated from small all-grade schools.

Of the forty teachers, twenty-two or 55 percent held at least one university degree (Table 11). Table 12 illustrates that the staff's teaching certificates ranged from a Grade I to a Grade VII Certificate, with the greatest number of teachers, 35 percent, holding a Grade IV Certificate.

Table 9

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74:
Type of Hometown

Type of Hometown	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Small Fishing/ Farming Community	4	5	6	4	7	3	29	72.5
Small Town 5,000	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	5.0
Town 5,000 10,000	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	7.5
Town 10,000 20,000	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	5.0
Town 20,000 50,000	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.5
Other	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	7.5
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 10

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Type of School Graduated From

Type of School	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Small All-Grade 200	1	3	4	2	6	0	16	40.0
Large All-Grade 200	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	7.5
Small Central High 200	2	1	0	0	0	2	5	12.5
Large Central High 200	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.0
Small Regional High 200	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
Large Regional High 200	1	0	4	1	2	3	11	27.5
Other	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	5.0
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 11

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74:
University Degrees

Degree Standing	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
No Degree	3	2	6	3	2	2	18	45.0
One Bachelor's	1	3	0	2	3	2	11	27.5
Two Bachelor's	2	2	2	0	3	1	10	25.0
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.5
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 12

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74:
Teaching Certificates

Teaching Certificate	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Grade I	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.0
Grade II	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	5.0
Grade III	0	1	3	0	1	0	5	12.5
Grade IV	1	3	3	3	3	2	14	35.0
Grade V	3	2	1	1	2	2	11	27.5
Grade VI	0	0	1	0	3	1	5	12.5
Grade VII	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Professional Development. For the purposes of this study, the staff's professional development is determined by the teacher's involvement in activities which include studying of university courses, reading of professional literature, active membership in educational committees, attending teacher inservice activities, and attending school staff meetings.

Table 13 shows the extent to which teachers were involved in those activities. For any one school, no more than three teachers were upgrading professionally by taking university off-campus courses. In June, 1973, 32.5 percent of the 40 teachers were taking university off-campus courses. No more than two teachers from any one school read professional literature regularly. Of the 40 teachers, 25 percent read at least two professional magazines regularly. Only one teacher of the 40 was an active member of an educational committee. Three of the six schools had teachers who attended workshops during the school year. Of the total staff for the six schools, 72.5 percent indicated that they attended staff meetings regularly.

Experience. Staff experience is considered in relation to the number of years of teaching experience and the different types of schools in which teachers taught. The year in which this study was conducted is included in these two determinants of staff experience.

As illustrated in Table 14, none of the 40 teachers had more than 29 years of teaching experience. The table also shows that 12 teachers, 30 percent, were teaching for their first time. A study of Table 15 reveals that most teaching experience was gained in the small all-grade and small central high school.

Table 13

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Professional Development by Various Activities

Type of Activity	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Studying University Courses by June 1973	2	3	2	2	2	2	13	32.5
Reading at Least Two Professional Magazines Regularly	2	1	2	2	2	2	10	25.0
Active Member of Educational Committee	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
Attending at Least Two Workshops in 1973-74	3	0	4	0	0	3	10	25.0
Attending Staff Meetings Regularly	6	4	5	4	7	3	29	72.5
Total Staff	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.5

Table 14

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Experience by Number of Years Teaching

Number of Years Teaching	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
1	2	1	3	0	5	1	12	30.0
2	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	10.0
3 - 4	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	7.5
5 - 9	1	1	3	3	1	0	9	22.5
10 - 14	1	1	0	1	2	1	6	15.0
15 - 19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
20 - 24	0	2	1	0	0	1	4	10.0
25 - 29	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.5
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 15

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Experience by Type of School Taught In

Type of School	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
All-Grade	2	3	3	5	4	1	18	45.0
Primary	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
Elementary	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	10.0
Central High	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0
Regional High	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	7.5
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.5
Total Staff	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Mobility. The number of different schools in which teachers taught and teachers' plans for the upcoming year are used to indicate staff mobility.

As illustrated in Table 16, 15 teachers, 37.5 percent, had taught in only one school, while 10 percent had taught in more than five different schools. Table 17 shows that 31 of the 40 teachers, 77.5 percent, planned to teach the following year in the school system in which they were then teaching. Seven teachers intended to teach elsewhere in the Province, while two teachers planned to return to Memorial University of Newfoundland to further their training.

Program

The existing school program is analyzed by listing the different types of curricular programs offered in the schools and the extra-curricular activities that were under the direction of the schools. There is also an analysis of pupil enrolment by subject and grade to reveal the number and kind of subjects offered in each grade of each school.

Type of Program. Table 18 shows that 5 of the 6 schools had at least two types of programs. All of the schools offered the academic or university preparatory program, two schools offered to some degree the general program for pupils who were not university-bound, and four schools provided a special program for pupils who could not cope with the academic or general program.

Extra-Curricular Activities. Table 19 related the seven different kinds of extra-curricular activities ongoing in the schools. All the

Table 16

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Mobility by Number of Different Schools Taught In

Number of Different Schools	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
1	4	1	4	0	4	2	15	37.5
2	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	20.0
3	0	1	1	1	1	1	5	12.5
4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	7.5
5	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	10.0
6	0	1	1	0	2	0	4	10.0
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 17

Staff Characteristics, 1973-74: Mobility by Occupational Plans for 1974-75

Mobility Plans for 1974-75	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	Teachers							
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Teach in this School System	4	5	6	5	7	4	31	77.5
Teach in Another Nfld. School System	0	2	2	0	2	1	7	17.5
Attend University for Teachers	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.0
Total	6	7	8	5	9	5	40	100.0

Table 18

School Program, 1973-74: Types of Curricular Programs Offered[1]

Type of Program Offered	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total n	%
Academic	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	100.0
General	-	*	-	-	*	-	2	33.3
Special Education	*	-	*	*	*	-	4	66.7
Total	2	2	2	2	3	1	6	100.0

[1](*) indicates presence of program

Table 19

School Program, 1973-74: Extra-Curricular Activities Existing in School[1]

Kind of Activity	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total n	%
Athletics	*	*	*	*	*	*	6	100.0
Student Government	–	*	*	–	*	–	3	50.0
School Newspaper	*	*	*	*	*	–	5	83.3
School Year Book	–	–	–	–	*	–	1	16.7
Subject Matter Club	–	–	–	–	*	*	2	33.3
Drama Club	–	–	–	–	*	–	1	16.7
Community Service Club	–	–	*	–	–	–	1	16.7
Total	2	3	4	2	6	2	19	100.0

[1] (*) indicates presence of activity

schools had some form of athletics, and at least one other pupil activity. School 5 was active in six extra-curricular activities; all six schools provided a total of 19 activities.

Enrolment by Subject and Grade. As Table 20 shows, the greatest number of subjects being studied was 17, in School 5; the least number was 7, in School 6. All the pupils were enrolled in the core subjects of English and mathematics. The smallest enrolments were in the sciences, of which biology and earth science had the greatest, 11 percent. Only two schools offered physics, for a total of 28 students, while none offered chemistry. French was offered in School 3 and School 5.

Consultative Services

Consultative services for the schools are determined by the number and kind of supervisors and subject-area specialists that were employed by the school board and were stationed at the central office or at one of the schools in the district.

The availability of consultants to the schools is shown in Table 21. There were six different types of consultants, five of which were available to School 6. School 3 and School 4 had only one consultant available. The generalist supervisor was available to all but one school, while a guidance counsellor was reported as being available to four of the six schools. Only one school had the consultative services of a physical education consultant.

Pupil Services

Pupil services include educational and vocational guidance, food, recreation, and transportation services in the school. Table 22 provides

Table 20

School Program, 1973-74: Enrolment by Subject and Grade

Subject Enrolled In	School 1		2		3		4		5		6		n and % of Total Enrolment	
	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	n	%
English (Academic)	106	VII-XI	1	XI	143	VII-XI	81	VII-XI	146	VII-XI	174	VII-XI	651	79
English (General)			144	VII-XI					19	VII			163	20
Reading	63	VII-VIII							19	VII			82	10
Mathematics (Academic)	106	VII-XI	82	VII-XI	143	VII-XI	81	VII-XI	137	VII-XI	176	VII-XI	725	89
Mathematics (General)			62	VII-X					27	VII-XI			89	11
General Science	82	VII-XI	111	VII-IX	102	VII-IX	58	VII-IX	102	VII-IX	141	VII-IX	596	73
Physical Science									14	X-XI			14	2
Earth Science	24	X-XI			41	X-XI	23	X-XI					88	11
Biology			27	X-XI	41	X-XI			25	XI			93	11

...continued

Table 20 (continued)

Subject Enrolled In	School 1		2		3		4		5		6		n and % of Total Enrolment	
	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	Enrol.	Gr.	n	%
Physics			6	X	22	XI							28	3
Geography (Academic)	106	VII-XI	6	XI	143	VII-XI	81	VII-XI	100	VII-XI	173	VII-XI	609	74
Geography (General)									27	VII,XI			27	3
History	106	VII-XI	146	VII-XI	143	VII-XI	81	VII-XI	165	VII-XI	171	VII-XI	812	99
Civics									46	VII-VIII			46	6
Economics	10	XI	6	XI	22	XI					12	XI	50	6
Health									76	VII-VIII			76	9
Physical Education			150	VII-XI			81	VII-XI	146	VII-XI			377	46
French					143	VII-XI			95	VII-XI			238	29
Art	106	VII-XI							19	VII			125	15
Religion	106	VII-XI	150	VII-XI	143	VII-XI	81	VII-XI	152	VII-XI	175	VII-XI	807	98
Total Subjects		10		12		11		8		17		7		

Table 21

Consultative Services, 1973-74: Number and Type of Consultants Available to School

Type of Consultant	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	%
Generalist Supervisor	1	1	1	1	1	0	5	83.3
Guidance Counsellor	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	66.7
Phys. Ed. Consultant	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	16.7
Religion Consultant	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	33.3
Library/ Media Consultant	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	33.3
Art Consultant	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	33.3
Total	3	4	1	1	2	5	16	100.0

Table 22

Pupil Services, 1973-74: Type of Pupil Services Available[1]

School	Type of Service: Educational & Vocational Guidance			Food			Recreation		Transportation	Total Services
	School Personnel	Extra-School Personnel	School Literature	Cafeteria	Canteen	Lunch Room	Pupils' Rooms	Rec. Equip.	Busses	n
1	*	*	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	6
2	*	*	*	–	*	–	–	–	*	5
3	*	*	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	6
4	*	*	*	*	–	*	*	*	*	8
5	*	*	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	6
6	*	*	*	–	–	–	–	–	*	4
Total	6	6	6	1	4	4	1	1	6	9
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	16.7	66.7	66.7	16.7	16.7	100.0	100.0

[1](*) indicates presence of service

a view of these services to the six schools.

Guidance. Educational and vocational guidance for the pupil is determined by the availability of guidance personnel in the school, guidance personnel outside the school, and guidance literature in the school.

All the schools had available to some degree these three elements of guidance. For the most part, however, guidance was provided by classroom teachers and family members, none of whom had received any special training in educational and vocational guidance. Guidance literature was relatively limited and in many cases consisted of advertisement brochures.

Food Services. Food services are said to exist if the school makes available food and a place in which to eat it. This service is measured by the presence in the school of a cafeteria, a canteen, or a lunchroom.

One of the six schools had a cafeteria, four provided a cold canteen, and four had a lunchroom. School 6 provided no food services whatsoever.

Recreation. Recreation services are measured by the existence in the school of pupils' recreation rooms and recreation equipment. School 4 was the only school providing recreation services in terms of spaces and equipment.

Transportation. Transportation services are determined by the existence of school busses for these sample schools. All six schools had access to school busses, and pupils in each school were bussed daily

to and from school. Busses were not readily available for transportation other than the morning and afternoon runs.

In summary it should be noted that School 4 provided eight of the nine services, while School 6 provided four of the nine. No school provided all elements of the services.

III. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOLS

For the purposes of this study, school effectiveness is measured in terms of pupil retention, promotion and retardation, and graduation for the sample schools over a five-year period. Tables 23-28 inclusive present the information relating to these four aspects of school effectiveness for each of the six schools from 1969-70 to 1973-74. Table 29 summarizes these data for the sample schools.

Annual Retention Rate

The number of pupils who ceased to attend school before completing their year ranged from 3 percent to 20 percent of the school enrolment annually. Table 25 shows that for School 3 in 1971-72 and 1973-74, 3 percent of the pupils left school before completing their year. Table 28 shows that 20 percent of the pupils in School 6 left school before graduation during 1970-71. When the number of dropouts is totalled for the six schools on an annual basis, the number of pupils who ceased to attend before completing their year ranged from 9 percent in 1969-70, 1970-71, and 1973-74 to 14 percent for the year 1971-72. As Table 29 illustrates, the average annual pupil attrition rate for the six schools was 10 percent, leaving a retention rate of 90 percent.

Table 23

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 1

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*	34	25	34	16	5	114	100
	D	0	3	6	4	1	14	12
	R	6	4	12	2	1	25	22
	P	23	13	2	6	3	47	41
1970-71	E	46	33	13	27	13	132	100
	D	0	2	0	2	1	5	4
	R	11	10	0	0	5	26	20
	P	32	21	13	15	9	90	68
1971-72	E	39	36	21	16	19	131	100
	D	1	3	3	1	4	12	9
	R	10	4	0	3	11	28	21
	P	22	20	13	12	11	78	60
1972-73	E	37	29	25	14	10	115	100
	D	4	5	4	2	4	19	17
	R	18	7	5	1	2	33	29
	P	26	15	14	11	8	74	64
1973-74	E	33	30	19	14	10	106	100
	D	0	4	1	2	1	8	8
	R	0	5	5	0	0	10	9
	P	25	18	13	11	7	74	70

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 24

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 2

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*	34	27	18	26	20	125	100
	D	4	2	0	3	7	16	13
	R	4	3	1	3	9	20	16
	P	30	24	17	23	14	108	86
1970-71	E	21	33	24	21	24	123	100
	D	0	0	2	1	3	6	5
	R	1	0	0	3	11	15	12
	P	20	33	24	18	18	113	92
1971-72	E	41	21	27	19	15	123	100
	D	0	1	4	4	11	20	16
	R	0	0	0	0	5	5	4
	P	41	21	27	19	11	119	97
1972-73	E	32	38	19	21	14	124	100
	D	2	3	2	6	4	17	14
	R	0	0	0	0	3	3	2
	P	32	38	19	21	8	118	95
1973-74	E	45	33	32	21	6	137	100
	D	0	1	2	6	6	15	11
	R	0	5	0	3	2	10	7
	P	45	28	32	18	4	127	93

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 25

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 3

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*	--	33	40	18	26	117	100
	D	--	2	1	3	0	6	5
	R	--	6	8	0	5	19	16
	P	--	30	19	12	17	78	67
1970-71	E	45	24	32	23	23	147	100
	D	1	4	7	1	1	14	10
	R	22	3	10	1	7	43	29
	P	28	19	21	20	14	102	70
1971-72	E	61	28	21	25	22	157	100
	D	0	2	0	1	1	4	3
	R	7	1	2	1	5	16	10
	P	41	22	18	16	17	114	73
1972-73	E	29	41	25	19	19	133	100
	D	3	4	0	0	3	10	8
	R	3	3	3	0	1	10	8
	P	23	31	20	16	6	96	72
1973-74	E	44	34	32	22	21	153	100
	D	1	3	1	0	0	5	3
	R	3	7	2	0	4	16	10
	P	31	27	29	20	18	125	82

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 26

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 4

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*							
	D							
	R							
	P							
1970-71	E							
	D							
	R							
	P							
1971-72	E							
	D							
	R							
	P							
1972-73	E	27	15	12	10	13	77	100
	D	2	0	2	1	1	6	8
	R	2	2	0	1	2	7	10
	P	25	11	11	7	8	62	81
1973-74	E	16	28	11	15	8	78	100
	D	1	1	0	1	0	3	4
	R	2	2	0	0	0	4	5
	P	11	27	11	15	8	72	92

This central high school was established in 1972.

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 27

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 5

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*	40	48	43	40	26	197	100
	D	0	0	1	0	6	7	4
	R	1	0	9	1	13	24	12
	P	33	34	31	32	15	145	74
1970-71	E	32	45	43	37	41	198	100
	D	2	1	2	2	6	13	7
	R	3	12	12	8	12	47	24
	P	21	45	40	37	28	171	87
1971-72	E	38	28	49	38	32	185	100
	D	3	6	5	3	15	32	17
	R	1	7	4	1	11	24	13
	P	30	28	45	38	22	163	88
1972-73	E	40	29	28	41	25	163	100
	D	2	3	3	7	5	20	12
	R	0	2	3	3	5	13	8
	P	26	28	28	27	13	122	75
1973-74	E	46	26	27	28	27	154	100
	D	3	3	4	5	4	19	12
	R	10	3	3	5	4	25	16
	P	27	21	26	24	21	119	77

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 28

School Effectiveness in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation, 1969-70 to 1973-74

School 6

Year		Gr. VII	Gr. VIII	Gr. IX	Gr. X	Gr. XI	Total	Percent
1969-70	E*	48	22	32	8	13	123	100
	D	2	4	6	4	1	17	14
	R	16	0	6	1	0	23	19
	P	35	22	18	8	6	89	72
1970-71	E	43	32	28	20	13	136	100
	D	2	4	6	9	6	27	20
	R	6	1	6	10	9	32	24
	P	16	12	11	12	3	54	40
1971-72	E	61	28	21	19	12	141	100
	D	9	10	4	4	7	34	24
	R	18	19	8	2	3	50	35
	P	46	26	16	14	9	111	79
1972-73	E	54	44	25	17	13	153	100
	D	7	4	4	4	3	22	14
	R	20	3	2	0	3	28	18
	P	40	36	17	10	7	110	72
1973-74	E	53	39	38	20	9	159	100
	D	7	4	2	3	2	18	11
	R	9	3	2	3	0	17	11
	P	40	27	34	17	9	127	80

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Table 29

Effectiveness of Sample Schools in Terms of Pupil Retention, Promotion, and Retardation for Total School Enrolment from 1969-70 to 1973-74

Year		School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total n	%
1969-70	E*	114	125	117	--	197	123	676	100
	D	14	16	6	--	7	17	60	9
	R	25	20	19	--	24	23	111	16
	P	47	108	78	--	145	89	467	69
1970-71	E	132	123	147	--	198	136	736	100
	D	5	6	14	--	13	27	65	9
	R	26	15	43	--	47	32	163	22
	P	90	113	102	--	171	54	530	72
1971-72	E	131	123	157	--	185	141	737	100
	D	12	20	4	--	32	34	102	14
	R	28	5	16	--	24	50	123	17
	P	78	119	114	--	163	111	585	79
1972-73	E	115	124	133	77	163	153	765	100
	D	19	17	10	6	20	22	94	12
	R	33	3	10	7	13	28	94	12
	P	74	118	96	62	122	110	582	76
1973-74	E	106	137	153	78	154	159	787	100
	D	8	15	5	3	19	18	68	9
	R	10	10	16	4	25	17	82	10
	P	74	127	125	72	119	127	644	82

*E = Enrolment at end of school year

D = Pupils who ceased to attend school

R = Pupils who repeated the grade in which they were placed

P = Pupils who were promoted

Promotion and Retardation

Promotion refers to the movement of the pupil to the next higher grade after successful completion of a year's work, while retardation is measured in terms of the pupil repeating the grade in which he is placed in any given year.

Table 28 illustrates that School 6 in 1970-71 had the least number of pupils promoted, 40 percent; School 2 promoted the greatest number of pupils, 97 percent, in 1971-72 (Table 24). For the six schools combined, as Table 29 illustrates, the least number of pupils promoted was 69 percent in 1969-70; the greatest number promoted was 82 percent of the enrolment in 1973-74.

The minimum number of repeaters in any one school for a given year was 2 percent for School 2 in 1972-73 (Table 24); the maximum was 35 percent for School 6 in 1971-72 (Table 28). For the six schools combined, the minimum number of repeaters amounted to 10 percent of the pupil enrolment in 1973-74, and the maximum number amounted to 22 percent in 1970-72 (Table 29).

Graduation

The number of pupils passing the Grade XI Public Examinations is used for the present study to determine pupil graduation. Table 30 provides a detailed view of the Public Examinations results for each sample school over a five-year period. The lowest rate of pupil graduation was 23 percent in 1971 for School 6; the highest rate was 100 percent in 1974 for School 4 and School 6. When the results for the six schools are combined, the lowest rate of pupil graduation was 53 percent in 1973, while the highest rate was 83 percent in 1974.

Table 30

Grade XI Public Examinations Results for Sample Schools, 1970-74

Year	School	Total Candidates n	Repeating Candidates		Successful Candidates	
1970	1	5	1	20	3	60
	2	20	9	45	14	70
	3	26	5	19	17	65
	4	--	--	--	--	--
	5	26	13	50	15	58
	6	13	0	0	6	46
	Total	90	28	31	55	61
1971	1	13	5	38	9	69
	2	24	11	46	18	75
	3	23	7	30	14	61
	4	--	--	--	--	--
	5	41	12	30	28	68
	6	13	9	69	3	23
	Total	114	44	39	72	63
1972	1	19	11	58	11	58
	2	15	5	33	11	73
	3	22	5	23	17	78
	4	--	--	--	--	--
	5	32	11	34	22	69
	6	12	3	25	9	75
	Total	100	35	35	70	70
1973	1	10	2	20	8	80
	2	14	3	21	8	57
	3	19	1	5	6	32
	4	13	2	5	8	62
	5	25	5	20	13	52
	6	13	3	23	7	54
	Total	94	16	17	50	53
1974	1	10	0	0	7	70
	2	6	2	33	4	67
	3	21	4	19	18	86
	4	8	0	0	8	100
	5	27	4	15	21	78
	6	9	0	0	9	100
	Total	81	10	12	67	83

This analysis of pupil retention, promotion and retardation, and graduation is given to provide a view of the effectiveness of the sample schools. In a later stage of this analysis, school effectiveness will be evaluated in terms of the components that were used to establish the present status of the schools.

IV. PROFILE OF THE SMALL CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

This profile of the small central high school in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador includes the components analyzed in the sample schools' present status and effectiveness. The analyzed data for the six sample schools are combined on each of the components and utilized in the profile development on a "total" and "average" basis. The extrapolation is based on the premise that the six schools studied are a true random sample of the small central high school population in the Province.

Instructional Facilities

The small central high school in the Province has on an average the following facilities: 5.2 regular classrooms, 0.8 libraries, 0.3 science laboratories, 0.3 gymnasiums, 0.2 outdoor playgrounds, 0.5 outdoor ice rinks, 0.2 ball fields, 1.0 teacher preparation rooms, and 1.7 administration rooms. Viewed another way, this means that all such schools in the Province have regular classrooms, teacher preparation rooms, and administration rooms, 83 percent of the schools have libraries, 33 percent have science laboratories and gymnasia, 50 percent have access to outdoor ice rinks in winter, and 17 percent have access to outdoor playgrounds and ball fields.

Teaching Staff

Measuring staff education in terms of type of hometown, type of school from which they graduated, university degree, and teaching certificate held, the small central high school in the Province employs staff of which 72.5 percent were raised in small fishing/farming communities, 55 percent graduated from small schools, 45 percent hold no university degree, and 57 percent hold below a Grade V Certificate.

An examination of the professional development efforts of the teachers shows that on an average 31.5 percent of the Province's small central high school staff involve themselves to some degree in various professional development activities.

Thirty percent of small central high school staff have one year of teaching experience, and 85 percent have fewer than 15 years experience. When teaching experience is measured by the different types of school in which teachers taught, it is found that 45 percent of the staff have had experience, prior to 1973-74, in small all-grade schools. One-eighth or 12.5 percent of the staff have had experience in primary and elementary schools, and 10 percent of the staff have had experience teaching in high schools other than central high schools.

With respect to staff mobility, 10 percent of the teachers in the Province's small central high schools have taught in more than 5 different schools, while 37.5 percent have taught in only one school. Over three-fourths, 77.5 percent, of the staff in question intend to remain teaching in their present school system.

School Program

All small central high schools in Newfoundland and Labrador offer

an academic program, one-third of them offer a general program, and two-thirds of them offer a special education program.

All of the schools have some form of organized athletic activities, and up to 83.3 percent of them offer some other type of extra-curricular activity.

The Province's small central high schools, on an average, offer a total of eleven approved subjects for the aggregate of the five grades taught.

Consultative Services

The schools studied have, on an average, consultants in 2.7 different specialist areas. The generalist supervisor is available to 83.3 percent of this type of school; the consultants in the other five specialist areas are available, on an average, to 37 percent of the Province's small central high schools.

Pupil-Services

The small central high schools in the Province have access to some degree to guidance personnel and literature. Educational and vocational guidance for the most part is provided by regular classroom teachers and family members, none of whom had specialist training in the area. The guidance literature in the schools is limited in quantity and quality.

Only one out of six, or 16.7 percent of these schools, has cafeterias and recreation services for the pupils.

School Effectiveness

On an average, the Province's small central high schools have an

annual retention rate of 90 percent. This means that each year 10 percent of the pupils enrolled in Grade VII to Grade XI in these schools cease to attend school before successfully completing their year. This type of school each year has 15 percent of its pupils repeat a grade, and promotes 76 percent of its pupils. On an average, 66 percent of the Grade XI pupils from this type of school pass the Provincial Public Examinations annually.

The preceding profile provides an external, non-critical, and non-comparative view of the small central high school in Newfoundland and Labrador. However, when the school is examined for weaknesses and problems, a more comprehensive view may be provided. This is the purpose of the following stage of the analysis.

V. PROBLEMS OF THE SMALL CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

The effectiveness of a school as defined in the present study is generally accepted as the indicator of the school's success in accomplishing its purpose. Frequently, the majority of the education community measure a school's success by the percentage of annual graduates.

Table 31 provides a five-year comparison of Grade XI Public Examinations results from the sample schools with those from high schools in the Province as a whole. On an annual average, 62 percent of the candidates from the sample schools passed the Public Examinations; the provincial average was 50 percent.

Notwithstanding, the staff, pupils, and consultants identified pupil attrition, retardation, promotion, and graduation as problems and weaknesses in these schools. These school members also identified six areas as causes or sources of the problems related to school effective-

Table 31

Grade XI Public Examinations Results for the Six Sample Schools and All Schools in the Province, 1969-1973

Year	Six Sample Schools			All Provincial Schools		
	Number Writing	Number Passing	Percent Passing	Number Writing	Number Passing	Percent Passing
1969	112	66	59	7,318	3,822	52
1970	90	55	61	8,698	4,583	53
1971	114	72	63	9,124	4,352	48
1972	100	70	70	9,610	4,892	51
1973	94	50	53	9,478	4,587	48
Annual Average	102	63	62	8,846	4,447	50

Source: Annual Reports, Department of Education, Newfoundland and Labrador

ness. These areas include facilities, employment and retention of qualified teachers, program, consultative services, pupil services, and socio-economic conditions of the school area. These problem areas identified as affecting the school's effectiveness are combined and presented in relation to the type of school member who identified and commented on them.

Problems as Seen by Teachers

Table 32 shows that teachers (including principals) considered all six areas to be problems of small central high schools. The curricular program was considered a problem by 86 percent of the teaching staff. They were particularly critical of its narrowness, rigidity, and irrelevancy. Low student interest was considered to result, in large part, from an inadequate program.

Seventy-one percent of the teachers considered instructional facilities a problem. In fact, teachers from all but one school expressed dissatisfaction with the existing facilities. During personal interviews, teachers stated that they felt lack of proper facilities was the chief causal factor of problems related to employment and retention of specialist teachers, provision of a broad and relevant program, and pupil services. Teachers felt that proper facilities would attract the qualified teachers needed, and motivate the present staff to higher work achievement. A broader and more relevant program, in conjunction with desired pupil services, would decrease pupil attrition, and increase pupil promotion and graduation because of the resultant high teacher and pupil satisfaction.

Certain socio-economic conditions of the area were considered a

Table 32

Responses of Teachers (Including Principals) Regarding Sources of School Problems (n=40)

Source of Problem	Percent Responding "Yes"	Percent Responding "No"
Instructional Facilities	71	29
Employment and Retention of Qualified Teachers	26	74
Curricular Program	86	14
Consultative Services	45	55
Pupil Services	69	31
Socio-Economic Characteristics of Area	62	38

problem mainly because of the poor match between community values and activities and those of the school. A relatively rapid change of community values and life style was at variance with the efforts of the school. Teachers felt that, for the most part, the community placed a high value on one's earning power. This attitude negated the school's efforts since there seemed to be no relationship between one's high school education and his earning power in the community.

Forty-five percent of the teachers felt that lack of consultative services was a source of the school's problems. In spite of the number and kind of consultants apparently available at the school board office, relatively few visits were actually made. Table 33 shows the number of visits each sample school received from different consultants. On an average, the schools received a total of six visits from all available consultants for the year. Most of the teachers felt that few productive contacts and visits were made by consultants.

Employment and retention of qualified teachers was considered to be the least serious problem for the school.

Problems as Seen by Pupils

Table 34 shows the percentages of Grade XI pupils from the sample schools who indicated they believed the six areas to be problems related to their school's effectiveness.

The most frequently mentioned problem was lack of adequate facilities. The pupils from School 4 were an exception in that they expressed satisfaction with the facilities of their new school. Many pupils expressed indignation and disgust when their school's facilities were mentioned. The pupils felt that the school program and the pupil

Table 33

Consultative Services, 1973-74: Number of School Visits by Consultants

School	Generalist Supervisor	Guidance Counsellor	Phys. Ed. Consultant	Relig. Ed. Consultant	Library Consultant	Total
1	4	2	-	-	-	6
2	3	-	3	1	-	7
3	10	-	-	-	-	10
4	2	-	-	-	-	2
5	2	3	-	-	-	5
6	-	-	-	2	4	6
Total	21	5	3	3	4	36
Average	3.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.7	6.0

Table 34

Responses of Grade XI Pupils Regarding Sources of School Problems (n=73)

Source of Problem	Percent Responding "Yes"	Percent Responding "No"
Instructional Facilities	67	33
Employment and Retention of Qualified Teachers	29	71
Curricular Program	42	58
Consultative Services	41	59
Pupil Services	53	47
Socio-Economic Characteristics of Area	36	64

services would improve with improved facilities.

Employment and retention of qualified teachers was not considered by pupils to be a major problem. Many of the 29 percent who did indicate that this was a problem expressed the belief during the interviews that the present staff would not improve under any circumstances.

Overall, 42 percent of the pupils interviewed indicated that the program was a cause of the school's low effectiveness. Table 35 shows the number of Grade XI pupils who indicated the degree of benefit of the school program regarding their vocational plans. The majority, 67 percent, indicated that the program was of some benefit.

In relation to school board consultants, 41 percent of the pupils indicated lack of consultative services to be a problem. Pupils felt they would be helped directly, and indirectly through the teachers, if there were more such services. The majority of pupils who indicated that lack of consultative services was a problem felt that such services was a good means by which to improve their teachers' abilities.

Over half the number of pupils, 53 percent, indicated that all aspects of pupil services were sources of the school's effectiveness problems.

Table 36 shows that pupils received most of their educational and vocational guidance from their parents. Many pupils felt that their teachers either could not or would not give them guidance/assistance. Apparently there was an insufficient quantity of guidance literature in the schools; the literature that did exist provided inadequate information.

The 53 percent who did see lack of pupil services as a problem were especially critical of food and transportation services. Only one

Table 35

Number of Pupils Indicating the Degree of Benefit of Program Regarding/Vocational Plans (n=73)

Degree of Benefit	School 1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	No. of Pupils						
Great	2	–	2	–	7	2	13
Some	5	3	12	5	17	7	49
Little	1	1	4	1	2	–	9
None	1	–	1	–	–	–	2

Table 36

Number of Pupils Indicating the Amount of Educational and Vocational Guidance from Various Sources (n=73)

Source	Amount of Guidance			
	Much	Some	Little	None
Principal	12	25	13	19
Teachers	14	20	26	9
Parents	30	26	6	9
Brothers and Sisters	16	22	13	21
Friends Own Age	11	23	17	13
Guidance Literature	5	32	29	3
Other	5	2	3	3
Total	93	150	107	77

school provided a cafeteria, and the cold canteens offered only candy and soft drinks. Many pupils stated that the busses were unsafe and uncomfortable to travel in over gravel roads, especially in winter. Busses were rarely available for inter-school competitions, and when they were, they were very expensive. Bussing also prevented students from participating in after-school activities. Table 37 shows the extent of bussing in the six sample schools for 1973-74. For the six schools, 65 percent of the pupils were bussed daily.

The pupils who did indicate that the socio-economic conditions of the communities in the area were sources of problems related to the school's effectiveness, 36 percent, felt that school life was unrelated to real living and life in the community. Compulsory attendance kept many of the pupils in school.

Problems as Seen by Consultants

Table 38 shows the proportion of consultants that considered the various components to be problem areas for the small central high schools.

The majority of the consultants, 83 percent, indicated that the school program was a chief source of problems related to school effectiveness. These consultants felt that, in turn, the inadequate program was largely a result of inadequate facilities and unqualified staff.

Lack of pupil services was thought to be a major cause of pupils' lack of interest and high dropout rate. All services, including consultative services, for these schools were considered by the consultants to be grossly inadequate. Distance from the schools, seasonal transportation difficulties, and absence of requests from the schools were given as major causes for infrequent visits to the schools.

Table 31

Pupil Bussing in the Sample Schools Showing Number of Pupils Bussed, Number, and Distance of Feeder Communities

School	No. of Pupils Bussed	Percent of Pupils Bussed	No. of Feeder Communities	Distance in Miles of Feeder Community from School
1	36	33	3	2.0; 2.5; 3.0
2	20	13	1	2.0
3	120	71	4	1.0; 4.0; 8.0; 12.0
4	20	25	1	2.0
5	130	77	2	4.0; 10.0
6	77	44	3	7.0; 14.0; 16.0
Total	403	65	14	87.5

Table 38

Responses of Consultants Regarding Sources of School Problems (n=10)

Source of Problem	Percent Responding "Yes"	Percent Responding "No"
Instructional Facilities	75	25
Employment and Retention of Qualified Teachers	71	29
Curricular Program	83	17
Consultative Services	71	29
Pupil Services	67	33
Socio-Economic Characteristics of Area	60	40

Nearly two-thirds of the consultants felt that there was little or no relationship between the schools and the communities in terms of school program relevancy and communications. Some consultants felt that the school as an institution of society was not representative of the communities in terms of values, mores, and work ethic.

VI. SUMMARY

This chapter has included an analysis of the data under five main headings: (1) the setting of the six small central high schools in relation to the socio-economic characteristics of population, occupations, and employment and income of the school area; (2) the present status of these schools, particularly as it relates to instructional facilities, teaching staff, curricular program, consultative services, and pupil services; (3) the effectiveness of the sample schools in terms of pupil retention, promotion, retardation, and graduation; (4) a profile of the small central high school in the Province in relation to facilities, staff, program, consultative services, pupil services, and school effectiveness; and (5) problems of the school as seen by principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants.

A detailed summary of the findings and recommendations will be included in the final chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY OF PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES

The main purpose of this study was to examine the present status of "remote and necessary" small central high schools in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. More specifically, it focused on three aspects of a selection of these schools: (1) the present status of these schools as it relates to facilities, staff, program, and services; (2) the effectiveness of the schools in terms of pupil retention, promotion, retardation, and graduation; and (3) problems of these schools as seen by principals, teachers, pupils, and school board consultants. The following four questions helped to focus on these aspects:

1. What is the current status of a selection of "remote and necessary" small central high schools with respect to facilities, staff, program, pupil services, and consultative services?
2. What has been the effectiveness of such schools over a five-year period in terms of pupil retention, pupil promotion and retardation, and public examinations results?
3. What are the problems being faced by such schools as seen by principals, teachers, pupils, and school board consultants?
4. What are the views of principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants concerning what might be done to alleviate the problems identified in (3) above?

Of the one hundred forty-six central high schools in the Province in 1973-74, fifteen were arbitrarily classified as "remote" and "small" for the purposes of the study. From these fifteen schools, six were randomly selected for intensive study.

Information for the study was obtained from the schools, school boards, and various departments of governments. Data guide sheets listing the various selected components of the schools and characteristics of the school areas were used to collect previously recorded data. The interview method was used to gather information from school principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants. Written questionnaires were developed and used as data guides in the structured interviews with these various school members. The researcher visited the selected schools and the appropriate school board offices and conducted interviews and discussions with individuals and groups over a five-week period.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In answer to the question regarding present status, it was found that instructional facilities were relatively limited in five of the six schools. Apart from regular classrooms, these facilities were almost non-existent. Science laboratories, libraries, and physical education facilities were particularly scarce.

Most of the teaching staff of these schools had been raised in small fishing/farming communities, and therefore had graduated from small schools. Approximately half of these teachers held no university degree and held below a Grade V teaching certificate. Approximately one-third of the teachers were teaching for the first time, while the majority of the other two-thirds had gained their experience in small schools. The

majority of all the teachers planned to remain teaching in their present schools for the upcoming year.

All six schools offered the academic or university preparatory program. Five of the six schools offered either a general program, a special program, or both in conjunction with the academic program. Pupils from Grade VII to Grade XI were offered on an average eleven different subjects over this five-year high school period. The smallest enrolments were in the sciences.

On an average, there were 2.7 different kinds of consultants available at the school board offices. On an average each school received one visit annually from each one. The generalist supervisor was available to five of the six schools, while most of the schools lacked consultants in the specialist areas.

Pupil services were limited or non-existent in most schools, particularly in the areas of food, recreation, and guidance. Most guidance was centered in the regular classroom teacher and family members.

In answer to the question regarding school effectiveness, it was found that these schools have an annual retention rate of 90 percent. Each year 10 percent of the pupil enrolment ceased to attend school before graduating. Approximately three-fourths of the pupils enrolled were promoted each year, while 15 percent repeated a grade annually. Nearly two-thirds of the Grade XI candidates passed the Provincial Public Examinations annually.

In answer to question three, principals, teachers, pupils, and consultants identified six problem areas related to school effectiveness. These included facilities, employment and retention of qualified staff, curricular program, consultative services, pupil services, and socio-

economic conditions of the communities served by the schools. It was found that teachers (including principals) considered the "narrow and irrelevant" program to be the most serious problem, and that this problem was caused mainly by the lack of adequate facilities. Lack of proper facilities was mentioned most frequently by pupils as the chief problem which, in turn, inhibited the development of a meaningful program and proper services. The majority of the school board consultants identified the school program as a chief source of the problems related to school effectiveness. The inadequate program, they indicated, resulted from inadequate facilities and unqualified staff.

The findings related to question four have been incorporated in Recommendations for Improvement, Section IV of this chapter. Generally, it was found that the views of the persons interviewed as to what might be done to alleviate their schools' problems were similar to the recommendations found in current literature related to small high schools.

III. CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions were drawn for the data collected for this study. These are as follows:

1. Generally, small central high schools in Newfoundland and Labrador lack the basic instructional facilities considered essential to the provision of a comprehensive high school program.

2. The school curriculum is generally considered narrow, rigid, and irrelevant in terms of meeting the needs of all students. Not only are many subject areas lacking, but there is widespread dissatisfaction with existing curricular offerings.

3. Regarding teaching staff, it was found (a) that most teachers

had been associated with such small high schools in terms of their own high school education and teaching experience, (b) that the majority of the teachers are sufficiently qualified to teach the program being offered, and (c) that the heavy workload of principals and teachers seems to prevent them from initiating and developing curricular and extra-curricular programs other than those presently existing.

4. Consultative services are grossly inadequate for these schools. Consultative services in the specialist areas such as guidance, physical education and the fine arts are extremely scarce or totally lacking.

5. There are few services for pupils, the clientele that the school serves directly. Data show that transportation, food, and recreation services are inadequate in all the schools, and educational and vocational guidance services are extremely limited.

6. The results of the Public Examinations for these schools are better than those of the Province as a whole. High pupil attrition may mean, however, that only the more able students reach Grade XI.

7. Characteristic weaknesses of small high schools cited in the related literature exist in these sample schools. A conclusion resulting from this finding is that unless and until there are marked improvements in the five school components examined in this study, the future prospects for these schools are the same as their current status.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The findings and conclusions of this study suggest a number of recommendations for small remote central high schools in Newfoundland.

Recommendation I. That funds and services be allocated to small

remote central high schools on the basis of need. Since most large schools are in a position to obtain more of what they already have in terms of funds and services, unequal allocations must be made to reduce educational disparity in the Province.

Recommendation II. That adequate facilities be provided for small remote high schools. These facilities would satisfy the needs of schools and communities generally, since duplication would be uneconomical.

Recommendation III. That itinerant specialists be made available to small remote central high schools to provide instruction, clinics, and workshops in specialized areas. The availability of personnel in specialized areas such as the fine arts, special services, and vocational education is generally lacking in small, remote communities and schools. These specialists could help broaden the school program, improve services, and enrich the lives of pupils and adults. Working with the human resources in the communities, these specialist personnel could better accomplish a good match between the culture of the communities and that of the school. Various departments of governments, such as the Department of Education, the Department of Health, and the Department of Manpower could work together in this effort.

Recommendation IV. That professional development workshops be provided for principals, teachers, and consultants of small remote high schools to improve the organization of the school, the program offerings, and the effectiveness of the consultative services for these schools.

Recommendation V. That the Department of Education, Memorial University, and the Province's school boards facilitate effective communication among small central high schools for the purposes of sharing

and helping. Inter-school visitations, workshops, and publications could help accomplish this.

Recommendation VI. That the Department of Education, Memorial University, and school boards undertake research and experimentation to develop programs for small central high schools. These agencies could research and develop projects in these schools. At least one pilot project could be undertaken in the Province to serve as a model for development in small high schools.

Recommendation VII. That the available teacher talents in the small central high school be improved through the adoption of organizational and instructional procedures including semester programming, multiple classes, and flexible scheduling.

Recommendation VIII. That the scarce teacher resources of the small remote central high school be supplemented by available educational technology and human resources in the communities. Such educational technology as educational television, prepackaged materials, and prepared courses could be easily utilized. Human resources of the communities could be utilized more extensively.

Recommendation IX. That teachers in small remote central high schools in Newfoundland and Labrador be provided with attractive incentives, such as high quality housing or funds to facilitate travel, to compensate for the extra work and time that these teachers must necessarily contribute to improve their schools.

Recommendation X. That the Department of Education in conjunction with other appropriate departments and agencies embark on an effective information program to educate the citizens of these small communities regarding recent and impending changes in high school education,

and engage these citizens in a search for means and ways to improve high school services in their communities.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It is recommended that further studies be conducted in this area. Studies related to a particular component or problem of the small central high school would add to the findings of this study. Studies comparing the status, effectiveness, and problem areas of small central high schools generally with other types of schools in the Province could be helpful in promoting greater equality of educational opportunity.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Alexander, William M., and Saylor, Galen J. Modern Secondary Education: Basic Principles and Practices. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Alexander, William M., Saylor, Galen J., and Williams, Emmett L. The High School Today and Tomorrow. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Barker, Roger G., and Gump, Paul V. Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Bent, Rudyard K., and Kronenberg, Henry H. Principles of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Brown, Frank B. New Directions for the Comprehensive High School. New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1972.

Chisholm, Leslie L. The Work of the Modern High School. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1953.

Conant, James B. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Davis, Dale E. Focus on Secondary Education. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966.

Douglass, Karl R. Trends and Issues in Secondary Education. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education, 1962.

Herrick, John H. From School Program to School Plant. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956.

Rowe, Frederick W. The Development of Education in Newfoundland. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1964.

Tamblyn, L. R. Rural Education in the United States. New York: Rural Education Association, 1971.

Turner, Claude C., and Thrasher, James M. School Size Does Make a Difference. San Diego: The Institute for Educational Management, 1970.

Warren, P. J. Quality and Equality in Secondary Education in Newfoundland. St. John's, Newfoundland: Committee on Publications, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1973.

B. PERIODICALS

Bohrson, Ralph G. "The Small High School--Its Strengths and Limitations," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 47, No. 282 (1963).

Cashen, Valjean M. "High School Size as a Factor in College Academic Success," Journal of Secondary Education, Vol. 45, No. 6 (1970).

Evans, N. Dean. "How Large Should a High School Be?" Delaware School Journal, Vol. 30, No. 4 (1965).

Ford, Paul. "Small High Schools: Myth, Reality, Potential," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 51, No. 317 (1967).

Forrest, William B. "What Size School is Best?" The Nation's Schools, Vol. 54, No. 4 (1954).

Gallant, Thomas F., and Zimmner, Larry J. "Teaching in the Smaller Secondary School--Its Demands and Opportunities," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 50, No. 307 (1966).

Government of Alberta. "Annual Report of Department of Education, Province of Alberta, 1965," The Alberta Teachers' Association Magazine, Vol. 45, No. 8 (1965).

Kleinert. "Effects of High School Size on Student Activity Participation," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 53, No. 335 (1969).

Larre, Lucien. "Small Schools, Big Schools and Needs of Students," The School Trustee, Vol. 25, No. 3 (1972).

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of School Administrators. School District Organization. Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1958.

Downey, Lawrence W. The Small High School in Alberta: A Report of an Investigation. Edmonton, Alberta: The Alberta School Trustees' Association, 1965.

Government of British Columbia. An Interim Report to The Honourable The Minister of Education, Mrs. Eileen E. Dailly From the Small Senior Secondary School Study Committee, August 27, 1974.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Report of the Royal Commission on Education and Youth, Vol. 1. Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1967.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Carlson, Franklin D. "Instructional Problems of Small Washington High Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1968.

Grey, Stuart C. "A Study of the Relationship Between Size and a Number of Qualitative and Quantative Factors of Education in Four Sizes of Secondary Schools in Iowa." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1961.

Hussein, Ibrahaim M. "The Effects of School Size Upon Teacher Satisfaction and Participation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Kaufman, Barry L. "Students' Perceptions of Secondary School Climate." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1969.

Knowles, Donald W. "The Influence of Faculty, High School Size, and Sex in Predictions of Freshman's Success Using Departmental and Principals Rating Grade XII Scores." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1964.

Ovaitt, Stanley W. "A Study of the Optimum Size of the High School." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Schulte, Bill H. "Teacher Load in Nebraska Cities Between 1000 and 5000 Population." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1961.

Shapiro, David F. "Relationship of School Size to Staff Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1957.

Shelly, Herman W. "An Analysis of Relationships Between Eight Factors and Three Measures of Quality in Thirty-nine South Carolina Secondary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1957.

Smith, Clifford B. "A Study of the Optimum Size of Secondary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960.

Sorensor, Frank D. "Teacher Load in Nebraska High Schools in Communities of Less Than 1,000 Population." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers' College, 1962.

Woods, Thomas E. "Relationship of High School Size to Curricular Offerings." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1957.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

P. O. Box 14
Education Building
Memorial University
St. John's, Nfld.
April 30, 1974

Dear

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Administration at Memorial University. At present I am conducting, under the supervision of Dr. D. Kirby, a study of the status of the small high school in Newfoundland.

I intend to develop a profile of the small high school based on the following features: program offerings, instructional facilities, staff characteristics, pupil services, board office consultative services, and socio-economic status of the community in which the school is situated.

is/are one/two of the schools that have been randomly selected for the study. I am requesting, therefore, permission to visit the school(s) and the central office to interview the principal, teachers, pupils, board supervisor, and subject specialists to gather some of the information. Also, by the interviews I will attempt to identify possible sources of problems and to discover suggested solutions.

I will appreciate your cooperation.

Yours very truly,

Louis J. Meaney

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

P. O. Box 14
Education Building
Memorial University
St. John's, Nfld.
May 6, 1974

Dear

I am a graduate student of Educational Administration at Memorial. As part of the degree requirements, I am conducting a study of the status of the small central high school in Newfoundland. Your school is one of the seven selected for the study. You may recall that I contacted you by telephone in March, at which time I received permission to visit your school. I since have spoken to your superintendent and he also supports my study and proposed visit.

I hope to be visiting the schools and board offices this month. I wish to speak with you personally, with your teachers as a group, and with your Grade XI class. I will have questionnaires to aid in my interviewing. I will telephone you a few days before my expected arrival. The enclosed data guide that I am using in the study may give you some idea of the type of study I am doing and of the kinds of information I need.

I am enclosing also an Information Sheet. If you are able to have this information for me before I arrive, my work will be greatly facilitated. I have limited funds which I will be happy to share with you for this special effort.

Good success in your work.

Yours truly,

Louis J. Meaney

Enclosures 2

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

Many of these questions can be answered by using a check mark. Please comment as spontaneously and freely as you like. Neither this school nor you will be identified in any way.

1. How many full-time teachers are in your school (counting yourself)? _____

2. How many part-time teachers do you have? _____

3. How many specialists does this school have? _____

4. If this school has specialists, please write in the space below the specialist areas.
_____, _____, _____, _____

5. How many pupils are bussed? _____

6. From how many communities are they bussed? _____

7. What is the distance of each feeder community from this school?
_____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____

8. What is the approximate population of each feeder community?
_____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____

9. Is bussing a benefit or hinderance to the functioning, performance, or production of the school? _____ yes _____ no
Please comment on bussing.

Benefit:

Hinderance:

10. Which of the following curricula does your school have?
___/___ University Program ____ General Program ____ Commercial
____ Industrial Arts ____ Home Economics ____ Other
If Other, write in _____, _____, _____

11. How beneficial are the programs which this school offers in relation to the needs of the students?
_____ great _____ some _____ little _____ none

12. What programs are needed?

13. Why are they needed?

14. What problems do you see in providing such programs in this school?

15. How could these problems be overcome?

16. Which of the following extra-curricular activities does this school have?

____ Student Government
____ School Year Book
____ Inter-School Athletics
____ Glee Club and/or Choir
____ Subject Matter Clubs
____ Debating Teams
____ Military Cadets
____ School Newspaper
____ Intramural Athletics
____ Orchestra and/or Band
____ Hobby Clubs
____ Drama Groups
____ Service Clubs
____ Other (Please write it) _____

17. What extra-curricular activities are needed in your school?

18. Why are they needed?

19. What problems do you see preventing the provision of such activities?

20. How do you think these problems could be overcome?

21. Do you have a guidance counsellor in your school? ____ yes ____ no

22. If yes, ____ full time ____ part time (check one)

23. Do you have a librarian in your school? ____ yes ____ no

24. If yes, ____ full time ____ part time (check one)

25. If this school used as a community centre? ____ yes ____ no

26. If yes, please explain in what ways and how often (on the average in a month) it is used.

27. Does the school make use of any resources or facilities of the community? ____ yes ____ no

28. If yes, please explain in what ways and how often.

29. Approximately what percentage of your time is devoted to each of the following?

	Percent
1. Classroom teaching	
2. Classroom supervision	
3. Inservice education of teachers	
4. Counselling individual students	
5. Meeting and talking with parents	
6. Administering the school	
7. Supervising extra-class activities	
8. Performing clerical work	
9. Managing the building(s)	
10. Other (Please explain)	

30. How many years (counting this one) have you been a principal? _____

31. How many years have you been a principal in this school? _____

32. In how many other schools have you been a principal? _____

33. Do you plan to remain principal of this school? ____ yes ____ no
Please comment.

34. What do you consider to be the main problems of being a principal in this school?

35. How do you think these problems could be overcome?

36. How many visits this year have you had from the following?
School Board Superintendent _____
What was the purpose of each visit? (Please explain)

School Board Supervisor _____
What was the purpose of each visit?

School Board Specialists _____
What was the purpose of each visit?

37. How much clerical assistance (hours per week) does your school have? _____

38. Which school personnel do you think you need in this school?

39. What innovations have been implemented in this school lately?

40. What innovations are planned?

41. What innovations do you think are needed in this school?

42. Other issues or topics you wish to discuss?

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

To be completed by all teachers including teaching principals and teachers who teach part-time.

Most of these questions can be answered by checking. Please check in the space provided.

1. Which of the following most nearly describes your present teaching position? Check one.
   1. _____ Classroom teacher
   2. _____ Specialist, such as guidance counsellor or librarian
   3. _____ Teaching principal
   4. _____ Teaching vice-principal
   5. _____ Other (please specify) _____

2. Please circle all the grades in which you are teaching this year.
   VII VIII IX X XI
   Now place a check above the grade in which you do most teaching.

3. Please indicate your sex.
   1. ____ male 2. ____ female

4. Please indicate your marital status.
   1. ____ single 2. ____ married 3. ____ other

5. Please indicate your age.
   1. ____ under 21 years
   2. ____ 21 to 25 years
   3. ____ 26 to 30 years
   4. ____ 31 to 35 years
   5. ____ 36 to 40 years
   6. ____ 41 to 45 years
   7. ____ 46 to 50 years
   8. ____ 51 to 55 years
   9. ____ 56 years or over

6. What licence or certificate do you hold? Check one.
   1. ____ below A Licence
   2. ____ A Licence
   3. ____ Grade One
   4. ____ Grade Two
   5. ____ Grade Three
   6. ____ Grade Four
   7. ____ Grade Five
   8. ____ Grade Six
   9. ____ Grade Seven

7. What is your position with respect to degrees? Check the highest level.
   1. ____ no degree
   2. ____ one Bachelor's degree
   3. ____ two Bachelor's degrees
   4. ____ one Master's degree
   5. ____ two Master's degrees
   6. ____ Doctor's degree
   7. ____ Other (Please specify) _____

8. Counting the present school year, what is the total number of school years you have been in the teaching profession?

1. ____ 1 year
2. ____ 2 years
3. ____ 3 to 4 years
4. ____ 5 to 9 years
5. ____ 10 to 14 years
6. ____ 15 to 19 years
7. ____ 20 to 24 years
8. ____ 25 to 29 years
9. ____ 30 years or more

9. Since you began teaching, in how many different schools have you taught?

1. ____ 1 school
2. ____ 2 schools
3. ____ 3 schools
4. ____ 4 schools
5. ____ 5 schools
6. ____ more than 5 schools

10. In what types of schools have you taught including this one. (Please indicate the size of the school by approximate enrolment in the space at the right.)

		Approximate Enrolment
1. ____	All-grade	_____
2. ____	Primary	_____
3. ____	Elementary	_____
4. ____	Central High	_____
5. ____	Regional High	_____
6. ____	Other (specify below)	_____
_____		_____

11. What were you doing the year before you began teaching?

1. ____ Attending high school
2. ____ Attending university
3. ____ Unemployed and seeking work
4. ____ Working in a non-teaching position (please specify)

_____

12. What do you expect to do in the year 1974-75? Check one.

1. ____ Continue teaching in this school system
2. ____ Teach in another Newfoundland system
3. ____ Teach outside Newfoundland
4. ____ Attend university (please specify the program you intend to enrol in) _____
5. ____ Work in a non-teaching position
6. ____ Be a full-time homemaker
7. ____ Other (please specify) _____

13. Do you plan to continue teaching until retirement?

1. ____ Yes
2. ____ Undecided, probably will
3. ____ Undecided, probably will not
4. ____ No

14. From what type of high school did you graduate? (Please indicate in the space at the right the approximate enrolment of the school for the year you graduated.)

		Approximate Enrolment
1. ____	All-grade School	
2. ____	Central High School	
3. ____	Regional High School	
4. ____	Other (please specify)	
_____		_____

15. In what type of community did you grow up? Estimate.
1. ____ in a relatively small fishing or farming community.
2. ____ in a small town (fewer than 5,000 people)
3. ____ in a town of from 5,000 to 10,000 people
4. ____ in a town of from 10,000 to 20,000 people
5. ____ in a town (city) of from 20,000 to 50,000 people
6. ____ in St. John's
7. ____ Other (please explain) _____

16. What is the enrolment of the largest class you teach?
1. ____ under 20 pupils
2. ____ 20 - 24 pupils
3. ____ 25 - 29 pupils
4. ____ 30 - 34 pupils
5. ____ 35 - 39 pupils
6. ____ 40 - 44 pupils
7. ____ over 44 pupils

17. What is the total number of different pupils that you teach in a week (or in your time table cycle)?
1. ____ under 50 pupils
2. ____ 50 - 74 pupils
3. ____ 75 - 99 pupils
4. ____ 100 - 124 pupils
5. ____ 125 - 149 pupils
6. ____ 150 - 174 pupils
7. ____ 175 -199 pupils
8. ____ 200 and over
9. (If over 200, please explain) _____

18. In how many different subject areas are you teaching this year? (For example, count Grade VII and Grade VIII as one).
1. ___ one 2. ___ two 3. ___ three 4. ___ four or more

19. Please list the different subjects you teach. (For example, count Grade IX and Grade X French as TWO subjects)

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

20. About how many hours a day, on the average, do you spend in the classroom teaching this year?
1. ____ one
2. ____ two
3. ____ three
4. ____ four
5. ____ five
6. ____ more than five

21. About how many hours a day do you spend outside of your scheduled work day in preparation for teaching?

1. ____	none	4. ____	three
2. ____	one	5. ____	four
3. ____	two	6. ____	more than four

22. What is the average number of clock hours per week that you devote to your teaching job? (Include all time spent in activities, whether you do them at home, at school or elsewhere.)

1. ____	under 30 hours	5. ____	45 - 49 hours
2. ____	30 - 34 hours	6. ____	50 - 54 hours
3. ____	35 - 39 hours	7. ____	55 - 59 hours
4. ____	40 - 44 hours	8. ____	60 or more

23. How many university semester content courses do you have in each of the following?

Subject	No. of Semester Courses
1. English	
2. Mathematics	
3. History	
4. Geography	
5. Physics	
6. Chemistry	
7. Biology	
8. Earth Science	
9. French	
10. Industrial Arts	
11. Home Economics	
12. Commercial	
13. Art	
14. Music	
15. Religion	
16. Physical Education	
17. Other (please list and explain the other content courses)	

_____

24. Do you read regularly any national educational or subject matter journals?

1. ____	No, not regularly	4. ____	Yes, three regularly
2. ____	Yes, one regularly	5. ____	Yes, four regularly
3. ____	Yes, two regularly	6. ____	Yes, five or more regularly

25. When did you do your last upgrading?
Month _____ Year _____

26. At what centre did you do your last upgrading? _____

27. Was the course given by E.T.V.? ____ yes ____ no

28. How would you classify your opportunity for upgrading?
____ good ____ fair ____ poor
Why? Please comment.

29. Of what benefit do you think these upgrading courses are?
_____ great benefit _____ some benefit _____ little benefit
_____ no benefit
In what ways? Please comment.

30. How many workshops have you attended this year? _____

31. Is attendance at these workshops compulsory? _____ yes _____ no

32. Of what benefit are these workshops to you? Please comment.

33. Are you a member of any education committee? _____ yes _____ no

34. Of what benefit do you think these committees are? Please comment.

35. How many staff meetings have you attended this year? _____
How beneficial are these meetings to your teaching?
_____ great benefit _____ come benefit _____ little benefit
_____ no benefit

36. What do you think should be done to improve the instruction in this school?

37. What do you consider the serious impediments to teaching in this school? Please explain.

38. What do you consider to be the main problems in high schools today? Please comment.

39. Do you consider the program offered in this school adequate?
_____ yes _____ no
Why? Please explain.

40. List the courses that should be offered in this school:

Academic Courses	Vocational courses
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

41. What are the problems connected with providing such courses?

42. How could these problems be overcome?

43. How many hours a week approximately do you spend outside regular class time coaching or giving individual instruction? _____

44. How many hours a week do you spend outside regular class time in all forms of supervision? _____

45. How many hours a week approximately do you spend outside regular class time giving educational or vocational guidance? _____

46. What extra-curricular activities do you consider necessary and therefore should be offered in this school? Please list.

47. What would be the benefit of such activities?

48. Why do you think such activities are not provided?

49. How could such obstacles (listed in 48) be overcome?

50. What instructional spaces do you deem necessary to provide an adequate program and to do an effective teaching job? (classrooms, labs, libraries, seminar rooms, teacher preparation rooms, stages, gymnasia, auditoriums, play fields, etc.)

51. What instructional equipment and materials do you deem necessary to provide an adequate program and to do an effective teaching job? (projectors, cameras, recorders, tapes, films, slides, film strips, records, models, maps, charts, specimens, science equipment, etc.)

52. Why do you think these facilities, materials and equipment are not provided?

The following methods are some ways by which the professional qualities and effectiveness of teachers may be improved. Please check in the spaces provided regarding the benefit and accessibility of each of these methods.

Method	Benefit of Method				Accessibility of Method			
	Great	Some	Little	None	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not Exist
1. Summer and Evening University Courses	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Workshops and Conferences	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Local Curriculum Committees	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Staff Meetings	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Reading Professional (Educational) Literature	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

Opinions

Studies conducted outside of Newfoundland have identified the features listed below as weaknesses of small high schools. In your opinion, which of these weaknesses exist in relation to this school? Write "yes" or "no" in the blank, and feel free to comment.

		Comments
A.	PROGRAM	
1.	Program too narrow and limited _____	
2.	Program not suited to the student's needs _____	
3.	Limited extra-curricular activities, mostly athletics _____	
B.	STAFF	
1.	Teacher workload too heavy (too many pupils, too many class preparations, too much supervision, etc.) _____	
2.	Teacher misplacement (teaching subjects for which they have little or no preparation) _____	
3.	Difficulty of retaining highly qualified teachers _____	
C.	FACILITIES	
1.	Lack of instructional spaces _____	
2.	Lack of instructional equipment _____	
3.	Lack of materials and supplies _____	
D.	PUPIL SERVICES	
1.	Lack of educational and vocational guidance _____	
2.	Lack of health services _____	
E.	CONSULTATIVE SERVICES	
1.	Lack of direction from board office personnel _____	
2.	Lack of cooperation from board office _____	
3.	Lack of inservice provided by board office _____	

F. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE COMMUNITY

	Comments
1. Community or district economically depressed	
2. Community's lack of interest in education	
3. Fatalism--community feels there is no way or reason to improve the situation	

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS

Most of these questions can be answered by putting a check mark in the space provided.

1. Are you male ____ female ____?

2. Age _____

3. In what grade(s) are you presently enrolled? _____

4. In what grade(s) were you enrolled last year? _____

5. In what program are you presently enrolled?
   ____ General ____ Matriculation ____ Other (explain) _____

6. Do you plan to stay in school until you graduate?
   ____ yes ____ no ____ don't know

7. What do you plan to do when you leave school (whether you graduate or not)? Check one.
   ____ attend university
   ____ attend vocational school
   ____ attend college of fisheries
   ____ attend college of trades and technology
   ____ enter apprenticeship training
   ____ get a job (what type?) _____
   ____ help at home
   ____ get married
   ____ nothing
   ____ I don't know
   ____ Other (please explain) _____

8. Of what benefit is the present program regarding your vocational plans? Check one.
   ____ great ____ some ____ little ____ no benefit

9. How many of your courses will benefit you in what you plan to do?
   ____ All of them ____ Some of them ____ None of them

10. Which of your present courses will be of most benefit to you in what you plan to do? (List them in order of importance.)
    1. _____ 4. _____
    2. _____ 5. _____
    3. _____ 6. _____

11. Which of your present courses are of least benefit in helping you in your plans? (List them beginning with the least important one.)
    1. _____ 4. _____
    2. _____ 5. _____
    3. _____ 6. _____

12. Which courses not being offered would have helped you most in your vocational plans? (List them in order of importance.)

1. _____ 4. _____
2. _____ 5. _____
3. _____ 6. _____

13. Why do you think they are not being offered? You may check more than one.

____ lack of facilities (What facilities? ____ rooms
____ equipment
____ both?
____ teachers not qualified to teach these courses
____ other reasons (please explain)

14. What courses and/or activities would you like to see provided in your school? Please list them.

15. What facilities do you think are necessary in any high school? Please list them.

16. Why do you think these facilities necessary? Please comment.

17. In making your educational and vocational plans, what help and encouragement have you received from the following?

	Much	Some	Little	None
Principal	____	____	____	____
Teacher	____	____	____	____
Parents	____	____	____	____
Brothers & sisters	____	____	____	____
Friends own age	____	____	____	____
Other (explain below)	____	____	____	____

18. How much material (books, pamphlets, films, etc.) is available in the school to help you in your career planning?

____ much ____ some ____ little ____ none

19. How often this year did people visit your school to talk to you about careers?

____ often ____ seldom ____ never

20. Is what you plan to do the same as what you would like to do regarding your career? ____ yes ____ no
If not, why not? (Please explain)

21. How important is a high school education to earning a living?
____ great importance ____ some importance
____ little importance ____ no importance
Why? (Explain as best you can your answer to No. 21).

22. What education do you think you need to work and settle in this community?
____ none ____ elementary ____ high school ____ post-secondary

23. Do you plan to live here in this community or area?
____ yes ____ no ____ I don't know

24. Where would you prefer to live?
____ large city ____ large town ____ small town ____ rural area
Please explain your answer to No. 24.

25. How would you rate your high school education as compared with that of someone who attends a larger school in a larger town or city?
____ just as good ____ not as good ____ better
Why? Please explain.

26. What things about this school would you change if you could?
____ the program ____ guidance
____ the staff ____ bussing
____ the facilities ____ food
____ the services ____ other
In what ways would you change them?

Why?

27. What do you like best about the school? Why?

28. What do you like least? Why?

How do you feel about education generally?

Causes and Solutions to condition of School Output.

Other issues or topics you would like to talk about

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONSULTANTS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONSULTANTS

1. Education:
From what type of school did you graduate? Check one.
(Small: less than 200 pupils; Large: more than 200 pupils)

____ Small all-grade school
____ Large all-grade school
____ Small central high school
____ Large central high school
____ Small regional high school
____ Large regional high school
____ Other (please specify) _____

2. University Training:
Please describe your university education, and any other training which is related to your present position, including current upgrading.

3. Experience:
Please indicate the number of years you have had experience in each of the following positions.

Position	Years of Experience
1. Teacher	_____
2. Principal	_____
3. Supervisor	_____
4. Superintendent	_____
5. Board specialist	_____
6. Other (please specify _____	_____

For how many years have you been working with small high schools as:

	Years
Teacher	_____
Principal	_____
Supervisor	_____
Specialist	_____

4. Role:
What is your exact present position? _____
Please describe your function in relation to the small high school in question.

5. Contact:
What are your usual means of contact with this school?

How often have you made contact this year?

What were the purposes of these contacts?

What were the results of these contacts?

What are the main problems of accomplishing what you want to do in relation to this school?

6. School Output:
(passes, repeaters, dropouts, absenteeism, destination)

Please indicate in the space provided if you perceive these factors as sources of problems related to output

Curriculum	____ yes	____ no
Facilities	____ yes	____ no
Pupil Services	____ yes	____ no
Staff	____ yes	____ no
Consultative Services	____ yes	____ no
Socio-economic Status of the Community	____ yes	____ no

7. If you see any of these factors as sources of problems, please explain how each is a problem and how such problems could be alleviated.

Curriculum:

Facilities:

Pupil Services:

Staff:

Consultative Services:

Socio-economic Status of Community:

8. Innovations:
In what areas are innovations needed in relation to this school?

What benefits would result from such innovations?

What problems do you see in bringing about such innovations?

How could such problems be overcome?

9. Main Problems:
What are the main problems of this school?

What would you change if you could? Why? How?

APPENDIX G

DATA GUIDE FOR PRINCIPALS

DATA GUIDE FOR PRINCIPALS

1. Education -- type of high school, university, upgrading.
2. Certification -- present, future.
3. Experience -- teacher, principal, type of school.
4. Mobility -- where, why, plans.
5. Teaching Duties (Use Teacher Guide).
6. Work Load -- teaching, administration, management, clerical.
7. Specialists, teacher aids -- benefits, needs, problems.
8. School Output.
9. The following as sources of problems as related to (8).

   curriculum -- how, possible solutions

   facilities -- how, possible solutions

   pupil services -- how, possible solutions

   staff -- how, possible solutions

   consultative services -- how, possible solutions

   Socio-economic status of the community -- how, solutions

10. Innovations Needed -- areas, benefits, problems, solutions
11. Satisfaction -- aspects most/least like, things you would change.
12. Other educational issues or education-related features of the district, community or school you would like to discuss.

APPENDIX H

DATA GUIDE FOR TEACHERS

DATA GUIDE FOR TEACHERS

1. Education -- type of high school, university, upgrading.

2. Certification -- present, future.

3. Experience -- years, type of school, grades, subjects.

4. Mobility -- where, why, plans.

5. Areas of Teaching -- specialist, major, minor, preparation for present teaching duties, other.

6. Workload -- classes, number, size, type, preparations, school hours, supervision, coaching, guidance.

7. Program -- kind, content, benefit, suitability, needs; extra-curricular activities, benefits, needs.

8. Instructional Facilities -- building, grounds, field-trip sites, equipment, materials, supplies, books, needs.

9. Serious impediments to teaching; main problems of instruction.

10. Central Office Personnel -- use, availability, benefit.

11. Inservice -- workshops, committees, staff meetings, professional literature.

12. Satisfaction -- aspects most/least like, things you would change; innovation problems.

13. Output -- causes, solutions (refer to 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11)

14. Other issues or education-related features of the district, community, or school you would like to discuss.

APPENDIX I

DATA GUIDE FOR PUPILS

DATA GUIDE FOR PUPILS

1. Present grade(s), grade(s) last year, plans.
2. Program, subjects -- benefit, needs.
3. Facilities -- needs, benefit.
4. Services -- educational and vocational, health, other.
5. School Output -- causes, solutions.
6. Other issues or topics you would like to discuss.

APPENDIX J

DATA GUIDE FOR CONSULTANTS

DATA GUIDE FOR CONSULTANTS

1. Education -- high school, university, current upgrading.
2. Experience -- teacher, administrator, supervisor, consultant.
3. Role -- in terms of this school.
4. Contact with school -- means, purposes, results, related problems, possible solutions.
5. School Output.
6. The following as sources of problems as related to (5):

   curriculum -- how, possible solutions

   facilities -- how, possible solutions

   pupil services -- how, possible solutions

   staff -- how, possible solutions

   socio-economic status of community -- how, possible solutions
7. Innovations Needed -- areas, benefit, problems, solutions.
8. Main problems of this school? What would you change? Why? How?
9. Other educational issues or education-related features of the district, community, or school you would like to discuss.