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ABSTRACT

The Advisor as Teacher Supporter: A Study of Selected Advisors' Perceptions of their Role as Compared to Guidelines for the Advisor's Role Identified in the Literature

(February 1980)

Carol Newman, B.A., New York University
M.Ed., Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Dr. R. Mason Bunker

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the role of the advisor working directly with classroom teachers to foster their professional growth and development. The advisor role is examined in relation to relevant literature and in relation to the perceptions of one group of advisors in a public school setting. Literature in the areas of inservice education and supervision reveal that too often teachers' expressed needs and interests are overlooked and personalized meaningful approaches to inservice and supervision are not adequately emphasized. The advisory approach to inservice is clarified and distinguished from a supervisory approach. It is presented as an effective non-evaluative vehicle for supporting teachers, meeting their expressed needs and promoting on-going self-directed growth.

Literature on advising and helping relationships is reviewed to identify guidelines of selected characteristics vi
and support strategies for the advisor's role. To examine how one group of advisors in a public school setting perceives its role in relation to the guidelines identified from the literature, an Advisor Role Questionnaire was designed and administered to advisors/resource teachers in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools, Charlotte, North Carolina. The questionnaire, based on the guidelines identified in the literature, was administered to determine the degree to which the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role were consistent with the identified guidelines of characteristics and strategies.

A brief description of the development of the advisor role in Charlotte-Mecklenburg is presented to establish the setting and population used for the study. The methodology used to develop and administer the questionnaire is also described.

Results and implications from the questionnaire indicate a consistency between the advisors' perceptions of their role and the identified guidelines in the areas of providing emotional support for teachers, responding to teachers' immediate and practical needs and interests, providing curriculum related resources and identifying and building on teachers' strengths. Characteristics from the literature that emphasize the advisors' own growth and the advisors' role as a model for on-going professional development and
strategies from the literature that involve long-term teacher growth and the extension of teachers' initial requests were not as consistently supported by the advisors.

Recommendations for the advisor role in Charlotte-Mecklenburg and areas of inservice and professional development for advisors are presented. Additional areas of research relating to the advisor role are suggested.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As a result of the constantly changing nature of our society, more and more professions are responding to the pressing need to continually update and renew their methods and approaches. This is especially true of the teaching profession. In recent years budgets for inservice education have been given increasing attention. However, while updating and renewal are emphasized, often within the educational community there is a tendency to introduce mass changes and to merely replace one program with another more "innovative" program. Too frequently the expectations placed on new programs are too high and the result is disappointment over the fact that significant changes do not occur to the degree hoped for. Sarason's (1971) basic premise in The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change echoes this problem, "The more things change the more they stay the same" (p. 2).

How then can schools effectively and meaningfully respond to changes in our society? How can they renew and update present practices? There are no simple solutions, but in exploring possibilities, it is useful to make the
distinction between renewal that means bringing in a new program "en masse" and renewal that means focusing on individual and self-directed growth on the part of teachers. In this study the focus will be on renewal that reflects active support for individual teacher growth.

Rubin (1968) examines the differences between change and growth:

Whereas change can be random and fragmented, growth is a logical evolution in which new ideas reconstruct old beliefs. While change may be no more than an external modifier, growth is an inner transformation. . . . Although change can be imposed upon an organization, growth must occur in an individual--and in ways appropriate to the individual. (pp. 5-6)

Thinking of renewal in light of Rubin's definition of growth, the question then arises as to what types of professional support foster teacher growth. How can that support be both appropriate and responsive to the individual needs of teachers and students, while at the same time responding to the changing demands of the society? While a number of potential supports are evident in school settings, including the principal, inservice programs and peer sharing to mention just a few, they are often not as effective as they might be in supporting teachers.

This dissertation will focus on another support becoming increasingly available to teachers. This support
is provided by a professional role called the advisor. This helper works directly with teachers in the classroom in an effort to support and to foster their professional growth and development. The study is designed to explore the role of the advisor in relation to the literature and in relation to the perceptions of one group of advisors in a public school setting. Guidelines of specific advisor characteristics and strategies which promote self-directed teacher growth and renewal will be identified from the literature. A questionnaire will be designed and administered to explore the degree to which the identified guidelines are consistent with Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role. Implications and recommendations from the findings will also be made.

Background of the Problem

Present Conditions for Teacher Growth and Inservice Education. In examining the area of support for teacher growth and development, it is helpful to consider teachers' pre-service training. Conventional pre-service education programs include methods courses, educational theory courses and a short student-teaching or internship experience. While the practical student-teaching experience provides an initial

1The advisor is also referred to in the literature as a resource person or helping teacher.
acquaintance with a teacher's roles and responsibilities, there is still much to be learned when the new teacher assumes his/her first teaching position. As Harris and Bessent (1976) state, "Pre-service preparation of professional staff members rarely is completely comprehensive" (p. 247).

To a new teacher the responsibility for the education of a large number of students may seem like an overwhelming task, and beyond an initial school orientation, regular supports vary considerably and are dependent on the particular school and situation. Much depends on the role the principal assumes, how supportive other more established teachers are and how industrious and skilled the beginning teacher is in ferreting out available resources.

For more established teachers, similar problems of support still exist. The issue does not necessarily resolve itself after a teacher's first or second year. Regardless of how many years a teacher has been teaching, there are always the demands of responding to the changing needs of the students and of the society.

Because of these circumstances, in many instances, the process of a teacher's growth and professional development can be a solitary effort that is often left very much to chance. It is not uncommon for both beginning and more established teachers to be left very much on their own. As Sarason (1971) has said, "Teachers are psychologically alone
even though they are in a densely populated setting" (p. 106). Given the task that each teacher is expected to carry out, this type of isolation is in no way justifiable.

Harris and Bessent (1969) state that

Social and educational change makes current professional practices obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools and substantive knowledge itself. (p. 4)

In response to the on-going social and educational changes combined with other individual needs of teachers, there is a strong case for on-going supports on which teachers can rely. From another point of view, teachers' developmental growth should be given as much attention as students' growth is given. Just as a student's growth must be constantly nurtured in a manner that encourages self-direction, a teacher's inservice education and growth should also be nurtured.

Ralph Tyler (1971) emphasizes the importance of self-directed growth in the following statement,

The teacher must participate in the governance of his own professional growth. Those who serve as facilitating agents must themselves acquire the skills of collaborative interaction which permits them to work effectively with teachers. (p. 17)

At present, however, this is not generally the case. Many inservice programs still operate on a short-term basis and are administratively imposed. Robert Bush (1971) states,

As things now stand, much in-service training has been conducted for administrative purposes, and the results have been used for rating teachers for promotion and tenure. This effectively destroys a substantial amount of the potential for in-service education. (p. 67)
In Edelfelt's (1973-74) "Review of In-Service Literature" he found that

Very few programs seem to have based in-service activities on the needs of teachers. . . . Most programs seem to have developed from purposes that a popular innovation or current fad might be good for teachers. None of the latter are necessarily poor sources of ideas or programs. However, when in-service programs are dictated and prescribed without consultation with teachers, it is common knowledge that they are often resisted by teachers and usually result in only temporary change while the pressure is on. (p. 3)

The above comments once again support the need for inservice programs that focus on growth and not just short-term changes. In discussing some of the pitfalls in the actual practice of inservice programs, Harris and Bessent (1969) point out three significant "areas in which serious mistakes occur." Among these are the following:

1. Failure to relate in-service program plans to genuine needs of staff participants.

2. Failure to select appropriate activities for implementing program plans.

3. Failure to implement in-service program activities with significant staff and other resources to assure effectiveness. (p. 4)

These pitfalls indicate a serious need for more personal types of inservice and staff development experiences that truly reflect teachers' needs and interests. As Bishop (1976) states,

Good staff development, in-service education, and instructional change programs are intensely human and personal processes. If humaneness is not included in the conceptualizing and structuring of these plans, it is unlikely that it will surface in the implementing and evaluating phases. (p. vii)
"Humaneness" and taking into account the personal process of growth in teachers' development require increased person-to-person contact and support.

In response to the above stated needs for a more personal, individualized and humane approach to teacher and staff development, the role of the advisor has been introduced in many school settings to provide regular and responsive support for teachers. The advisor role is seen as an effective means of responding to the changing needs and priorities of teachers and of the educational community. In many instances the advisor is replacing the supervisor and consequently is taking on a new and different focus and direction. Whereas the supervisor often "monitered" teachers' development, the advisor is more of a supporter and nurturer of teachers' development. The differences occur in the approach to people's growth, the psychological framework from which the advisor operates and in his/her involvement and emphasis. (A further description of the advisor's role will be presented later in this chapter.)

In Blumburg's (1974) book Supervisors and Teachers his focus on human interaction between teachers and supervisors points up valuable evidence and information for the development of new support roles, such as that of the advisor.

If you ask a supervisor where his job becomes difficult, the chances are good that he will focus on his relationship with teachers and not on his ignorance of new curriculum materials. Teachers, though some of them
tend to devalue the experience of their supervisor, will also point to the same relationship as the crux of their problems with supervision. (p. 1)

The above statement along with other research including Combs (1971) and Manolakes (1975) in the areas of staff development, teacher growth and renewal, and supervision all point to the importance of carefully considering the process through which teacher growth, renewal and professional development occur.

Summary. Given the current conditions in inservice, one needs to examine the potential means available to aid and support teachers' growth and renewal. At present it is evident that:

1. Pre-service programs must be supplemented by a variety of regular supportive programs and experiences which encourage on-going teacher development.
2. Inservice programs for teachers have too often overlooked teachers' expressed needs, interests and priorities.
3. There is a need for more inservice programs that emphasize a personal approach and encourage self-directed, relevant and meaningful learning and growth.
4. In the past, teachers' development has often been unsuccessfully "monitered" by supervisors; the outcome of this approach has suffered due to poor human relationships between teacher and supervisor.
In response to these problems, the role of the advisor is emerging as one type of support that can productively and effectively respond to teachers' needs and can enhance conditions that presently exist for teacher growth and inservice education.

Need for the Study

Potential means of support for teacher growth. Within each school setting there are a variety of support systems that have the potential to foster teacher growth and renewal. The principal of a school can be instrumental in setting a tone and climate that is trusting, supportive and encourages professional growth. Through on-going contact with teachers and students, the principal has numerous opportunities to be responsive and to initiate support for teacher growth. However, because the principal's role also includes the evaluation of teachers, he/she must find ways of combining evaluative and supportive responsibilities in a productive and non-threatening approach.

Teachers' contact with teachers is another valuable means of support that can aid teacher growth. Once an environment of mutual respect, trust and cooperation has been established and ample time provisions are made for teachers to be in contact with one another, they can collaborate, share ideas and take risks together. Brearley (1972) summarizes the value of this vehicle for support, "There are
probably few schools in which our efforts are more important than what happens when teachers talk and work together" (p. 30).

A third source of support for teachers involves inservice programs. As more inservice programs incorporate teachers' strengths and skills, in addition to responding to their needs, the inservice experiences will become not only for the teachers but also by the teachers. In Rubin's (1971) book, Improving Inservice Education, Bush's article "Curriculum-Proof Teachers" confirms this position. "Programs of professional growth should take advantage of teachers' potential for teaching one another" (p. 70).

An emerging vehicle for supporting teacher growth is the role of the advisor. This role has significant potential to respond to teachers' needs through a personal, relevant and on-going approach. The advisor works cooperatively with the teacher in areas such as identifying needs and strengths, generating support for trying new ideas, establishing long and short-term goals and planning and developing appropriate curriculum. Devaney (1974) summarized the key objective for advisors as "to look for growing points from which to develop the teachers' professional skill, rather than to evaluate the teacher" (p. 71). Since the role of the advisor does not include the evaluation of teachers, as do principal and
traditional supervisory roles, channels for establishing a mutually trusting climate and relationship between the advisor and teacher can be more easily realized.

The advisor is actively involved with the teacher and his/her class. By working with the teacher in the classroom as well as before and after school, the advisor establishes credibility and also gains a deeper understanding of the teacher's unique situation. The total approach of the advisor responds to many personal and practical needs of teachers that often have been overlooked in inservice programs and in traditional supervisory approaches.

In Nurturing Teacher Growth Rubin (1968) focuses on the role of a "supporting ally" as a means of fostering teacher renewal. This role parallels the goals and purposes of an advisor's role:

Given a favorable environment and a supporting ally many of the nation's teachers would relish an opportunity to engage in small-scale, self-directed investigatory procedures which gave promise of self-renewal and greater mastery. (p. 9)

Since the role of an advisor has only recently been established in school settings, it is necessary to investigate research and literature in the fields of helping relationships and inservice to identify specific characteristics and strategies that can be used as guidelines for the role. While the need for personalized types of teacher support is apparent, a clear definition of how this need can be met
through the advisor's role has not been fully examined and
explored by many educators.

In "The Roles, Strategies and Problems of the Advisor
in Public Schools," Wood (1974) summarized the need for
clearer definitions and guidelines:

There continues to be a growing interest in the advisory concept. This is evident both in St. Louis and in other metropolitan areas. There is a need, therefore, for a clearer delineation of the advisor role and for a more disciplined description of the ways in which support can be extended to those teachers and administrators. . . . (p. 1)

An examination of dissertation abstracts from 1968 through 1978 provides few studies that directly relate to the role of the advisor or to specific guidelines for that role. Yet more and more of the current literature on supervision, teacher growth (Rubin, 1971), helping relationships (Combs, 1973), and inservice (Bishop, 1976) stresses the need for the development of an advisor role—one that offers on-going, classroom-related support to teachers.

During the past ten years in both America and England, the role of the advisor has been most consistently related to informal/open education or integrated day approaches. However, at the present time there is a move to develop advisory-type support for teachers of many different orientations.

In Katz's (1973) article "The Advisory Approach to In-Service Training," this classification is made in the introduction:
This report presents the highlights of a year's experience with the advisory approach to the in-service education of elementary school teachers. The term "advisory" is frequently associated with informal or open education (Armington, 1972; Amarel et al., 1973). However, for the purpose of this project, the use of the term was not limited to open education. (p. 1)

The results of an informal survey on the advisor role conducted within the Southeast area of the United States in 1976 by a team of Charlotte, North Carolina advisors (resource teachers) were consistent with Katz's comment. The purpose of the survey was to find out how many school systems had a role similar to that of Charlotte's role of advisor. The results of the survey revealed that 75 percent of the public school systems sampled had redirected the role of supervisor to that of advisors and that this new role is not focused on one particular approach to teaching.

Because of this move from supervisors to advisors, guidelines for the advisor's role are more necessary than ever. These guidelines could lend insight into the training and inservice of people assuming advisor positions. Manolakes (1975) states:

The advisory system has evolved rapidly and has taken many forms. At this point there is little standardization in advising practice. . . . In spite of this range of practices, there appear to be several basic functions common to the work of advisors. (p. 53)

Manolakes goes on to itemize specific functions and strategies used by advisors. This same type of role definition
had been explored by several other educators such as Katz (1973), Rubin (1968), Spodek (1972), Dropkin and Weber (1975) and Wood (1974). Each of these educators has developed guidelines and definitions from his/her own experiences and point of view. It now seems appropriate to synthesize the literature and experiences of these educators to:

1. clarify the advisor's role and distinguish it from that of the traditional supervisory role
2. identify important characteristics for a person functioning as an advisor
3. identify effective strategies from which an advisor can draw
4. combine these characteristics and strategies as guidelines for an advisor's role.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the role of the advisor in relation to the literature and in relation to the perceptions of one group of advisors in a public school setting. Guidelines consisting of characteristics and strategies for the advisor's role will be identified from the literature in the areas of inservice, helping relationships, modern supervision and advising. An exploration of the degree to which Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina advisors' perceptions of their role are consistent with the
identified guidelines will be presented through means of a questionnaire and an analysis of the results. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg school setting will be used as a case example of a school setting where the advisor role has been developed and implemented. Implications of the study and recommendations will be made in the final chapter.

This study will focus on and address the following questions:

1. In the research and literature on helping relationships, modern supervision and inservice education, what evidence exists that indicates a need for the role of an advisor?

2. From practical findings and the literature on advising, what characteristics and strategies are indicated as important for an effective advisor?

3. To what degree are Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role consistent with the guidelines of advisor characteristics and strategies identified as important in the literature?

4. What are the implications and recommendations for the advisor's role in a public school setting?

5. What recommendations for further research can be suggested in relation to the advisor's role?
Methodology

The following methodology was used to conduct this study and to explore the role of the advisor. To determine what evidence exists that indicates a need for the advisor's role, the writer examined the literature and research in the areas of inservice, helping relationships and modern supervision as each area related to and had implications for the role of the advisor. Through an examination of the literature on advising, specific characteristics and support strategies were identified as appropriate for guidelines for the advisor's role.

To assess the degree to which Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role were consistent with the identified guidelines from the literature, data were collected through an Advisor Role Questionnaire. The methodology used to design and administer the questionnaire, as suggested by Weiner (1969), follows:

1. **Planning**: Definition of the problem
2. **Development of the Sampling Plan**: Description and identification of the population being used to administer the questionnaire
3. **Questionnaire Construction**: Presentation of questionnaire items; description of pilot group used to check clarity of questionnaire items; revision of items as necessary
4. **Data Collection:** Description of how questionnaire was administered

5. **Translation of Data:** Construction of categories through which questionnaire results can be analyzed. (p. 287)

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg setting is described briefly to place in perspective the way in which advisors in Charlotte function within the schools. Data for this description were collected through an in-depth interview and the writer's direct experiences as an advisor in Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

The implications and recommendations for the advisor's role in a public school setting are addressed through an analysis and discussion of the results of the questionnaire.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study focuses on the role of the advisor as it has been defined in this chapter, namely as a person providing practical and meaningful classroom-related support for teachers to foster their professional growth and development. The study uses a small sample population of advisors from one school setting, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina; because of the size of this population, the generalizability of the data to other populations will be somewhat limited.

The study is also limited by the bias of the writer since she is directly involved as an advisor in the
population being sampled. The use of a questionnaire to gather data for this study is limited by the process of self-reporting.

The study is exploratory in approach; it does not aim to "prove" anything but rather to identify and uncover findings that are pertinent to the advisor's role in supporting teachers.

Chapter Outline

Chapter I: The Problem. Chapter I has presented the need for effective support to foster teachers' professional development. In exploring this need, the role of the advisor was presented as the focus of the study and as an effective on-going vehicle to support teacher growth. The need for specific characteristics and strategies which together can serve as guidelines for this role was addressed. The purposes, methodology and limitations of the study were described briefly.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature. Chapter II explores a selected review of the literature in the areas of modern supervision, inservice, helping relationships and advising. These areas are examined to determine a need for the advisor's role and to identify important characteristics and support strategies for the advisor's role which can be used as guidelines.
Chapter III: Methodology. Chapter III presents a brief description of the research population and its development. The methodology used to design and administer a questionnaire which assesses the degree to which the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role are consistent with the identified guidelines (see Chapter II) is also presented.

Chapter IV: An Analysis of the Questionnaire Results. Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data collected through the questionnaire. The data are examined in terms of the identified characteristics and strategies to determine the degree to which the advisors' perceptions of their roles are consistent with the guidelines. The results of two open-ended questions relating to the advisor's role are also presented.

Chapter V: Conclusions and Recommendations. Chapter V draws implications and conclusions from the scope of the study. Recommendations and extensions for the role of the advisor, specifically in Charlotte-Mecklenburg are also presented. Specific implications for the training of advisors as suggested by the guidelines and results of the questionnaire are discussed. Recommendations for further research are also suggested.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the role of the advisor in relation to current research and understanding in the areas of inservice education, supervision, advising and helping relationships. These areas of literature will be reviewed to identify and suggest a set of guidelines which describes characteristics and strategies for the role of an advisor.

The role of an advisor will be clarified and distinguished from the role of a supervisor. In making this distinction, literature on effective inservice and successful helping relationships will be considered as each area influences and applies to the role of an advisor.

Assumptions Upon Which This Study Is Based

The advisory approach to inservice is consistent with the notion of development as the aim of education. This view of education approaches each person as an evolving individual and emphasizes self-awareness, self-actualization and learning as developmental processes. In "Development as the Aim of Education" Kohlberg and Mayer (1972) identify three
educational ideologies: romanticism, cultural transmission and progressivism. The romantic ideology stresses that "what comes from within the child is the most important aspect of development" (p. 451). The adult's role is to allow the natural curiosity to take over and not to place overly confining restrictions on the child. Cultural transmission ideology identifies the task of educators as transmitting to the present generation all the bodies of knowledge, skills, moral rules and values of the culture. Progressivism "holds that education should nourish the child's natural interaction with a developing society or environment" (p. 454).

Of these three ideologies, the progressive approach, which emphasizes thinking and learning as active developmental processes, most clearly encompasses the goals of advising. In an advisory approach, teachers and advisors are cooperatively involved in determining meaningful areas of focus and adequate time is allowed for the development of workable plans. Progressivism, as described by Kohlberg and Mayer, also supports "an educational environment that actively stimulates development through the presentation of resolvable but genuine problems or conflicts" (p. 454). Dewey (1938) also stresses the importance of growth based on real-life experiences and what he defines as "problems." By using present experiences and problems, the source of learning is relevant and therefore meaningful. He has written,
Once more, it is part of the educator's responsibility to see equally to two things: First, that the problem grows out of the conditions of the experience being had in the present, and that it is within the range of the capacity of the students; and secondly, that it is such that it arouses in the learner an active quest for information and for production of new ideas. (p. 79)

Also incorporated into the progressive view is the need for the learner to be involved in directing the learning experience. Dewey (1938) underscores this point:

There is I think no point in the philosophy of progressive education which is sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which direct his activities in the learning process. (p. 67)

This perspective is appropriate for the advisory approach which deals with the teacher's present classroom situation and encourages the teacher to explore personally defined areas of interest and need.

Within a theoretical framework, Third Force and phenomenological psychology are also consistent with the advisory approach specifically in terms of how the advisor views him/herself and the teacher. The advisor sees his/her role as one of fostering the teacher's development beginning with the teacher's defined needs. The advisor does not approach the teacher with an independently developed or pre-determined plan. Combs (1974) defines phenomenological psychology as

a point of view that sees people as growing, dynamic organisms. It regards human beings not as things to be made or molded but as unique events in the process of becoming. (p. 13)
Phenomenological psychology views behavior in terms of the meaning it has for an individual. This perspective is significant in terms of both the advisor's and the teacher's perceptions of themselves and of one another.

Combs (1974) presents three principles of phenomenological psychology:

1. behavior of a person is the direct result of his field of perception
2. self-concept greatly influences and affects a person's behavior
3. the basic need for personal adequacy includes continuous striving for both self-maintenance and self-enhancement. (pp. 12-19)

The principle of self-concept influencing behavior is particularly relevant to the advisor-teacher relationship. Purkey (1978) explores three areas related to self-concept:

1. the significance of positive self-regard
2. sources of self-regard
3. self-concept as a guidance system for behavior. (p. 23)

Purkey (1978) cites Szasz (1976) to support his cause: "The more self-esteem a person has, the greater, as a rule, is his desire, and his ability to control himself" (p. 24). This lends insight into how crucial it is for the advisor to foster the teacher's self-esteem since one goal of advising is to encourage the teacher toward more self-direction and control of his/her professional development. Rogers (1951) supports this and describes individuals as becoming "fully functioning persons when they move from external evaluations and
motivations to a greater awareness and dependence upon the internal self as an evaluator and motivator" (pp. 19-20). Related to Rogers' theory is Purkey's (1978) reference to a number of researchers who have found that the development of self-concept is largely based on how one thinks other significant people perceive and relate to him/her (p. 27). Both Rogers' and Purkey's references have bearing on the teacher-advisor relationship and the necessity for the advisor to build a trusting, open and honest relationship and at the same time to foster the teacher's sense of independence and self-direction.

Literature in the areas of education and psychology (Combs et al., 1971, 1978; Jersild, 1952, 1965; Patterson, 1973; Rogers, 1951, 1967) has focused, in Purkey's (1978) words, "on the assumption that when teachers better understand and accept themselves, they have a much greater capacity to accept and understand students" (p. 54). From the above statement, it is logical to conclude that when an advisor better understands him/herself, he/she would have a greater capacity to accept and understand teachers. And also, that by modeling this type of behavior with teachers, the advisor might influence the teacher's behavior with students.

Few studies have focused on helpers' perceptions of their own role or on teachers' attitudes about themselves. However, Purkey (1978) cites a study pioneered by Jersild which
focused on teachers' attitudes in relation to self-understanding. Consistent with findings in similar areas, self-understanding was viewed as a necessary factor for teacher effectiveness (p. 46). In response to this finding, Purkey suggested that in-service group counseling sessions be offered for teachers to explore their attitudes and feelings in a safe environment. The advisory approach, which incorporates several aspects of counseling, provides an opportunity for teachers to explore personal and professional issues in a safe environment and thereby, supports Purkey's suggestion by encouraging teachers to deal with personal concerns while solving problems and exploring interests.

Relevant to the advisor's view of him/herself is a series of studies done by Combs et al. (1969) which focused on the perceptual organization of effective helpers and found that

> effective teachers, counselors and priests could be distinguished from ineffective helpers on the basis of their attitudes about themselves and others. . . . The way the evidence points is that each teacher needs to view himself with respect, liking and acceptance. (p. 46)

How a person views him/herself is closely related to how he/she views others. Related to this, Purkey (1978) discusses the idea of what he calls "invitational skills." This term refers to respecting and accepting others so that they feel worthy and acceptable. Coupled with this is the notion that "the principles most useful for inviting others also apply
in inviting oneself. Perhaps the most important principle is respect for oneself and one's feelings" (p. 62). The advisor supports teachers in this area by demonstrating acceptance and a willingness to begin working with each teacher where he/she perceives a need.

Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs provides yet another framework that relates to advising in terms of teachers' needs. The hierarchy includes five areas of need: physiological, security and safety, belonging and affiliation, esteem, and self-actualization. Maslow postulates that each area of need must be satisfied before the next area can be developed. A person must satisfy his/her affiliation needs before needs for esteem emerge. Once a teacher's physiological and safety needs are met, an advisor can begin to support the needs for belonging and affiliation.

Sarason (1971) stresses throughout his book The Culture of School and the Problem of Change how isolated teachers are from one another. In response to this problem, the advisory approach can provide one vehicle for beginning to meet teachers' needs for affiliation and belonging. Weber's Open Corridor program in New York City dealt directly with the need for affiliation by involving teachers. Alberty and Dropkin (1975) state, "Building a community of teachers around a corridor breaks through the teacher's isolation, humanizes the school. . ." (p. 60). According to
Maslow (1968) until the need for affiliation is adequately met, esteem needs, which are so vital to a person's full development and effectiveness, cannot be satisfied.

**Summary.** This section presented a theoretical framework that is consistent with the advisory approach to teacher support. The aim of education was defined as development of an evolving individual and emphasized self-awareness, self-actualization and learning as continual processes. The progressive ideology was referred to as an approach that actively involves the learner in meaningful, real-life experiences. Phenomenological psychology, which views behavior in terms of its meaning for an individual, was discussed with an emphasis on self-concept as it influences behavior and as it is influenced by others. High self-esteem was cited as a factor which supports teachers' independence and self-directedness; and self-understanding was referred to as a positive factor which influences both teachers' and helpers' effectiveness. Maslow's hierarchy of needs was defined and offered as a framework to view the way in which an advisor can support teachers' affiliation and esteem needs.
Historical Background: The Role of the Supervisor

An historical overview of American school supervision indicates interesting developments as the role changed and evolved. Stoops (1971) presents a chart on the Historical Periods in the Development of American School Supervision that outlines movement through five broad periods which include: inspection of school and classroom with an emphasis on inspection for the sake of control, supervision of classroom instruction with an emphasis on improvement of instruction, and cooperative educational leadership with supervision as a cooperative effort (p. 11). Examination of these developments indicates a shift from evaluative supervision that focused primarily on teachers' weaknesses to an approach that focuses on both teachers' strengths and teachers' needs. As the emphasis shifted from maintaining rules and regulations to improving instruction, the responsibility for supervision shifted from state or local superintendents to people more directly related to the school setting such as principals and curriculum coordinators.

Boardman, Douglas and Bent in Stoops (1971) note that in an effort to move toward more democratic processes of supervision, supervision has moved from techniques that inhibit initiative to those that encourage experimentation and creativity (p. 12). In trying to establish a more
cooperative and democratic approach, teachers' perceptions of their situation become an essential factor. If a cooperative approach is assumed, change or adjustments in a classroom can no longer be arbitrarily dictated by the supervisor.

A further clarification of the shift from traditional supervision is illustrated in the Handbook of Educational Supervision where Marks et al. (1971) cites Burton and Brueckner's six major points that contrast traditional and modern supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Supervision</th>
<th>Modern Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inspection</td>
<td>1. Pragmatic study and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher-focused</td>
<td>2. Goal, material, techniques method, teacher, student and environment-focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visitation and conference</td>
<td>3. Many diverse functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poorly planned or a meager formal plan</td>
<td>4. Definitely organized and planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Imposed and authoritarian</td>
<td>5. Derived and cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Usually by one person</td>
<td>6. By many persons (p. 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modern Supervision has moved from an authoritarian approach to a more democratic, teacher-directed approach. The advisor role, to be described later in this chapter, incorporates many of the points listed under the Modern Supervision category and develops it further to establish a climate of joint problem solving where the teacher initiates the direction of the focus for change, improvement or
development.

Stoops (1971) cites the implications for Modern Supervision on a local school level:

1. Supervision includes far more than it did in times past. This expansion is the result of continual critical thinking in connection with the nature of education and its relation to the individual and to society.

2. Supervision is increasingly objective and experimental in its methods.

3. Supervision is increasingly participatory and cooperative.

4. Supervisory activities and opportunities are distributed among an ever increasing number of persons as all come to contribute and to accept the challenge to exercise leadership.

5. Supervision is increasingly derived from the given situation, rather than imposed from above. (p. 17)

The above factors are significant in setting the climate for the new role of an advisor. In addition to establishing a fully cooperative and participatory approach, advisors deal directly with the "given" situation, as cited in item five, by working within the context of the teachers' perceptions of his/her classroom situation. This factor is one of the major distinctions between traditional supervision and an advisory approach.

Although it seems that modern supervision brings with it new approaches and new hope, some educators still see supervision as being outmoded. Blumberg (1974) writes of teacher' perceptions,
They may also see supervision as a part of the system that exists but that does not play an important role in their professional lives, almost like an organizational ritual that is no longer relevant. (pp. 12-13)

Rubin (1970) also supports this view by predicting the disappearance of the present supervisor role. He cites "the supervisor's failure to develop techniques that are most appropriate to the particular teacher and situation involved" (p. 42) as one reason for the disappearance of the role.

As mentioned above, various factors have influenced the change from traditional supervision where teachers were the recipients of the experience and it was something done to them to modern supervision where teachers may be viewed as partners in a cooperative venture which takes into account teachers' needs and interests.

Sergiovanni (1975) in an examination of the development of supervision identifies three general theories that have emerged: "traditional scientific management, human relations and neo-scientific management" (p. 1).

The traditional scientific management theory involves the teacher in a superior-subordinate relationship with the supervisor. The teacher is viewed as someone to carry out a curriculum plan and not as an initiator. The content, process and plans for teaching are established by someone other than the teacher.

In reaction to this, the human relations mode of supervision was established with its roots in the democratic
school philosophy begun in the 1930's. Emphasis was put on viewing the teacher as a "whole person." However, while the affective domain was attended to, as Sergiovanni views it, the cognitive side was too often overlooked.

The third approach has been labelled neo-scientific management. In part, this approach is seen as a reaction against the human relations mode. Neo-scientific management emphasizes teacher competencies and performance objectives. However, in this approach a problem occurs when, in an effort to be accountable and specific, human relation needs such as acceptance, choice and active participation are overlooked.

In examining the three theories or approaches cited by Sergiovanni, a fourth approach—that of clinical supervision—seems appropriate to add. A clinical supervision approach, as Reavis (1976) has described it,

rests on the conviction that instruction can only be improved by direct feedback to a teacher on aspects of his/her teaching that are of concern to that teacher; rather than items on an evaluation form or items that are pet concerns of the supervisor only. (p. 360)

The clinical supervision approach, as conceptualized by Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969), structures the interaction between teacher and supervisor into pre-observation, observation and post-observation contacts. Consideration of both cognitive and affective needs of teachers are taken into account as well as an acknowledgement that progress can only be made when work starts from the teacher's perceptions of the situation.
The first three theories defined by Sergiovanni are based on the assumption that the supervisor has a deeper interest in the development of teacher performance than the teacher him/herself may have. The results of this assumption are seen in rather unproductive relationships between supervisors and teachers. Blumberg (1974) states, "The character of the relationships between teachers as a group and supervisors as a group can be described as somewhat of a cold war" (p. 2). In contrast, the clinical supervision approach engages the teacher and supervisor in more of a partnership-type relationship. The issue then focuses on how to continue to move the teacher-supervisor relationship away from one of defensive and offensive positions to that of a cooperative venture. In a reconceptualization of the supervisor's role Blumberg (1974) suggests "that the process should become one of people giving to one another and not, as seems to be current, one of the supervisor's giving and the teacher's receiving--a sort of one-way street" (p. 3).

In an effort to move away from this "one-way street," it becomes evident that a new role for the previously defined supervisor is in order. The emergence of the advisor's role is a logical next-step and has the potential to prove more productive for teachers' professional growth and development.
Evaluation: An Issue for Supervisors and Advisors

One of the most significant differences in the changing role from supervisor to advisor involves the issue of evaluation. Evaluation is often a concern of teachers in their relationships with both supervisors and advisors. Goldhammer (1969) emphasizes the problem in discussing the supervisor's role of evaluator, "Because it generally counts for so much, supervision often counts for nothing" (p. vii). By this he appears to be saying that the issue of evaluation often carries a stigma that inhibits other productive interactions between supervisors and teachers.

In contrast, the advisor's approach, as Devaney (1974) refers to it, is "unofficial." Browse and Kallet (1972) support this stand:

Because advisors are removed from any source of power, the advice they offer is just that--advice; sometimes taken, sometimes not. . . . Advisors . . . bring to the attention of teachers a wide range of materials and ideas, without anyone feeling that because these are suggested they must be used. (p. 48)

A conference on "The Roles, Strategies and Problems of the Advisor in Public Schools" also dealt with the issue of evaluation and arrived at the following consensus, as Wood (1974) summarizes, "it is very important in the early days of forming advisories in America that the advisors not have the role of evaluation of teachers because it might kill the idea from the outset" (p. 36). The issue of evaluation is
often a dilemma because of requests made by principals to advisors to assist in assessing a teacher's performance. While contact with the principal is important, the success and credibility of the advisor is very much tied to the notion of the advisor role being non-evaluative. For this reason the advisor must be able to articulate the purposes for his/her role and help the principal understand its non-evaluative nature. As Mai (1978) points out:

Most teachers who use advisors would like to feel that there is a level of confidentiality to their talk and activity that permits them to speak freely. . . . This confidentiality is often essential for certain kinds of critical self-examination, performance review and growth to occur. (p. 48)

This view is also confirmed by Rogers (1971) in "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship." In detailing how a helping relationship is created, Rogers states:

Evaluations do not make for personal growth and hence I do not believe that they are part of a helping relationship. . . . I have come to feel that the more I can keep a relationship free of judgement and evaluation, the more this will permit the other person to reach the point where he recognizes that the locus of evaluation, the center of responsibility, lies within himself. (p. 17)

The above position is also supported by Combs, Avila and Purkey (1971), "As a consequence the net effect of evaluation externally applied often boomerangs to destroy the very motivations it sought to produce" (p. 116).

The above comments reinforce the importance of a non-evaluatory role for both supervisors and advisors. In their article, "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision and
Evaluation," Heichberger and Young (1975) cite a survey they conducted:

When asked to select the kind of relationship teachers would like to have with their supervisor, 62% of the teachers wanted a helping relationship, 36% desired a collegial relationship. Only 1% selected an evaluator or rater relationship. (p. 210)

Using research and the writer's experience as an advisor as a point of reference, the effectiveness of the advisor role is greatly increased when evaluation is not a factor. This difference in the role brings with it many implications. Whereas previously a supervisor could enter a teacher's room and offer suggestions on the basis of evaluation, now the advisor enters a teacher's room on the basis of that teacher's initiative or request. The advisor holds no power over the teacher. As cited in the "Proceedings for the Teachers' Center Exchange Workparty" (1977):

The advisor is in a lateral relationship with the classroom teacher, not a hierarchical one. The advisor and the teachers are part of a mutual learning process, and adapt to each other, offering each other support. (p. 42)

This approach to advising closely resembles the advisor model developed and implemented in England. In referring to the English "advisor-teacher" Devaney (1974) states, "He was, in sum, not an administrator or a supervisor, but a roving teacher of teachers" (p. 72).
Inservice--Implications for the Advisor's Role

Literature in the area of inservice education offers significant implications for the development and implementation of the advisor's role. Consistent with the progressive development of supervisory models, increasing numbers of inservice programs are evolving to a point where teachers' interests and needs are given higher priority.

In "Staff Development: Staff Liberation," Randolph (1977) poses the question, "Do we want to shape things up or to free people up?" She goes on to comment that more and more staff development programs "are emphasizing the liberation, freeing, self-actualizing self-growth of individuals as increasingly valid ways of bringing about staff improvement" (p. vi). This implies that effective inservice must focus on the people involved and not just on content, curriculum or even processes. Bunker's (1975) "Beliefs which guide our thinking about in-service education" is a good summary of guidelines that support teacher growth:

* Participants should be involved in decision-making about design, implementation and evaluation of their own inservice programs.

* Inservice programs should meet needs of the participants.

* Participants respond positively to the opportunity to work from their strengths.

* Participants should be actively-involved in solving real problems.
* Participants seem better able to apply new learnings, refine their skills and continue growing as they get feedback and support from others.

* Growth takes time and is a continuous process.

* The aim of inservice is toward self-direction. (p. 1)

These beliefs provide a meaningful foundation upon which the advisor’s role can be set. Past approaches to inservice which ignore teacher needs, interests and strengths have long been deemed inappropriate. However, it is interesting to note that Edelfelt’s 1973-4 Review of ERIC In-Service Education Programs indicates that "very few programs seem to have based inservice activities on the needs of teachers" (p. 3). As Edelfelt goes on to point out, the fact that these programs did not incorporate teachers’ needs does not immediately indicate that they are poor programs. However, "it is common knowledge that they are often resisted by teachers and usually result in only temporary change while the pressure is on" (p. 4).

Rubin (1971) supports Bunker’s and Edelfelt’s stand to actively involve the teacher in determining and implementing inservice programs.

If we can turn the policy corner so that professional growth is regarded not as something the system does to the individual but rather as something the individual does to himself, the possibilities for nurturing a self-evolving teacher become more viable. (p. 273)

This need to focus inservice on the teacher so that the locus of control is within his/her domain is essential. Schiffer (1978) points out why this approach is so important:
Although hopes for school renewal often centered on aspects of schooling other than teacher training, such as improvement in curriculum, materials and programs, it soon became apparent that teachers were the bottom line in any change that might take place. If teachers were unwilling or unable to implement an innovation, even the most "teacher-proof" package was doomed to failure. (p. 4)

The missing link in most inservice programs is adequate support for new ideas to be implemented and reflected on within the classroom environment. Both Mai (1978) and Rubin (1969) support this need. Mai (1978) states,

> Since there is no vital tradition in education for professionals sharing and reflecting about their practice or solving pedagogical problems of colleague staff, it is not surprising that the effectiveness of the occasional inservice workshop or course usually stops short of the classroom door. (p. 2)

Reflection on the previous comment and on effective and ineffective inservice programs as they relate to the emerging role of advisors indicates a strong need for a person who has an inside perspective on the teacher's situation and can support teacher growth on a relevant and regular basis. The need for this role is echoed by Manolakes (1975), Katz (1974), Bussis et al. (1977), Devaney (1974), Rubin (1969) and Crandall (1977).

Highlighting specific characteristics of successful programmatic efforts at school change, the Rand Study (1975) included two items that are of particular interest to the advisor role. They are:

- training whose objectives were determined by those to be trained and which reflect the real needs and issues of the particular school setting
- training resources that are consistent and ongoing—available over time to support extended growth.

Both of these characteristics of successful school change programs are incorporated into the advisory approach. The advisor always starts from where the teacher determines a need and provides support that is ongoing and not on a one-time basis. Alberty (1975) underscores these two aspects of the advisor role.

Thus, from the very beginning of our work in the schools, there were these two aspects of our approach; the teacher was the central agent in whatever change was to take place, and the teacher needed support. (p. 87)

Another important aspect of the advisor role responds to one of the main problems with inservice programs—lack of relevance. A key area of failure Harris and Bessent (1969) point to is "Failure to relate in-service programs plans to genuine needs of staff participants" (p. 4). The advisor overcomes this problem by always working from the teacher's stated needs. Also, by often working directly in the classroom with the teacher, the advisor gains a fuller understanding of the teacher's situation and thereby offers more relevant support.

Rubin (1969) states, "There does not seem to be any way to escape the need to individualize teacher inservice education" (p. 16). The advisor role is a clear response to the need to individualize inservice experiences. In support of an advisor-type role, Rubin (1969) goes on to write, "The capacity of the teacher-facilitator to stimulate and support
behavioral change far exceeded our expectations" (p. 19).

Literature in the area of inservice indicates the need for experiences that are meaningful and relevant, focus on teachers as opposed to special programs or materials, actively involve teachers in terms of their perceived needs, interests and strengths and provide regular and ongoing support. The advisory approach is one significant vehicle for inservice education that responds to each of these needs in a way that fosters and increases self-directed teacher growth.

The Advisor's Role

Earlier in this chapter some distinctions were made between the role of the supervisor and the role of the advisor. The following section will further elaborate on the role of the advisor as it has been developed and described by educators in the field. In examining the advisor's role, the general context of advising, stages of the teacher-advisor relationship, characteristics of the advisor, and specific strategies used by the advisor will be described. The final section of this chapter will synthesize the characteristics and strategies for advisors into a list of guidelines for the advisor role.

General contexts of advising. Advisors function within a variety of different settings. Some advisors work within a public school system, while others work out of a university
based inservice program. Still others work from an independent organization. Within each of these contexts, Katz's (1974) description of four guidelines can be generally applied.

1. Providing inservice assistance to teachers only when such assistance has been requested by them.

2. Providing assistance in terms of the requestor's own goals, objectives and needs.

3. Providing such assistance in situ rather than in courses, institutes or seminars and

4. Providing assistance in such a way as to increase the likelihood that teachers become more self-helpful and independent rather than helpless and dependent. (p. 154)

These four guidelines are based on the assumption that with proper support and guidance teachers are motivated to improve and enhance their teaching situation. Teachers are regarded as professionals who should be in control of their professional development. Manolakes (1975) supports this assumption:

... teachers are professionals with talent and ability ... they do not require coercion or direction from an outside authority to achieve high quality results in their work. The advisory view places the individual teacher in control of help to be received, and assumes that he or she will use, in a support system, those elements that are of most benefit at a given time... the teacher is the core and the heart of the instructional program. (pp. 51-52)

This notion places the emphasis on the teacher's perceptions and development as opposed to an emphasis on any single teaching approach, curriculum activity or specific learning material. It is the teacher who guides the relationship and
not a particular innovative package. The advisor's role described by Bussis et al. (1973) is to assist teachers to broaden their perception of the teaching/learning process to enrich and increase their response repertoires so that they (the teachers) become better able to respond effectively to the cognitive and emotional needs and resources of children. (p. 6)

Within this context of support, time becomes a critical factor. Manolakes (1975) comments on the issue of time in relation to the advisory approach: "It assumes that real growth on the part of people is a generally slow evolution and that direct efforts to bring about dramatic changes often result in a cosmetic effect" (p. 52). In light of this, an advisor's expectations of progress and results must be tempered with the awareness that growth is a gradual process. In working with teachers over a long period of time, advisors must maintain a degree of patience to allow ideas to become assimilated and implemented. Alberty (1975) comments on the high and low periods of activity in the teacher-advisor relationship: "Clearly there was an ebb-and-flow of the teacher's need for the advisor and a tremendous need for the advisor to work along with this ebb-and-flow" (p. 26).

The issue of time-allowance and not pushing for immediate results contributes to the effectiveness of the relationship between teacher and advisor. Several educators (Spoedek, 1972; Katz, 1974; Bussis et al., 1976; and Mai, 1976) have noticed a developmental process that occurs over a period of time in the teacher-advisor relationship. By
paying close attention to the stages this relationship moves through, specific characteristics and strategies appropriate for the advisor's role become evident.

Stages of the teacher-advisor relationship. Following is a brief summary of several views of the stages or functions through which the teacher-advisor relationship may pass. Mai (1976) describes three general stages from the advisor's perspective that include: gaining entry, being a resource person and influencing growth and change. The first two stages involve setting the groundwork within which the relationship can be built and bringing materials and ideas. In the third stage more extensive types of problem solving are approached.

Manolakes (1975) examines the advisor's role in relation to various functions. While these functions are not defined in an exact developmental sequence, evidence from other practitioners such as Spodek (1972) and Mai (1976) indicate that they could be organized from a general developmental perspective. Manolakes' (1975) description of the advisor's functions include:

1. The advisor as seed planter and extender
2. The advisor as technical helper
3. The advisor as a personal support person
4. The advisor as expediter
5. The advisor as informant and communication stimulator. (pp. 53-56)
Devaney (1974) cites Bussis et al.'s classification scheme that describes advisory offerings within two areas, "... advisory offerings that the teacher sees herself as 'taking in,' to advisory activities that require 'self-investment' by the teacher" (p. 91). This distinction between offerings that are used by the teacher but only "added to" the on-going curriculum as compared to offerings that require a deeper investment by the teacher and are more fully "integrated" into the curriculum lends insight into the appropriate strategies for the advisor's role. An advisor's awareness of this difference in approach on the teacher's part is helpful in his/her choice of strategies and resources.

Spodek (1972) takes a slightly different view in describing what he calls an "onion construct." He views teachers as being made up of different levels; the external levels deal with concrete areas such as room arrangement, classroom materials, etc., while the levels closer to the core involve specific strategies used, professional beliefs, values, the role of the teacher and the nature of education (p. 6). Using Spodek's metaphor as a guide, the advisor would initially deal with the external levels and then gradually move into dealing with issues closer to the core which require more trust and time.

Each of the previous structures for viewing the advisor role or the teacher-advisor relationship indicates a need for the advisor to establish credibility, trust and
open communication with the teacher. The process of accomplishing this takes time and effort; it requires sensitivity, patience and skill, all of which can be conveyed through the characteristics of the advisor and through the strategies he/she uses in working with the teacher.

Characteristics of the advisor. For the purpose of examining both the characteristics and the strategies appropriate for an advisor, the writer will draw from the models that were briefly described in the preceding section.

In much of the literature on advising, specific characteristics for the person functioning as an advisor are referred to either directly (Devaney, 1974; Mai, 1977, 1978) or indirectly (Manolakes, 1974; Alberty and Dropkin, 1975; Katz, 1974; Spodek, 1972). While it is difficult to make an exact prescription as to which people make the best advisors, the following characteristics and qualities have been found to contribute to the advisor's effectiveness in working with teachers and in supporting their growth.

Positive self-concept. As referred to earlier in this chapter, an advisor's view of him/herself contributes significantly to the way in which he/she relates to and interacts with teachers. Combs et al. (1973) and Rogers (1973) refer to a helper's ability to use "the self as instrument" (Combs, p. 195) to help others. This term refers to the helper being able to draw on past experiences as one way of relating to
the helpee. In doing this however, it is important for the advisor to maintain a balance between sharing his/her own experiences and focusing on the teacher's needs. While drawing on his/her own experiences, Combs (1973) recommends that the helper demonstrates a willingness to "postpone immediate need satisfaction in the interest of another" (p. 197). Spodek (1972) supports this: "... the advisor seems to be successful because he uses himself in an extending relationship with another human being" (p. 5).

In studies of the perceptual organization of a good teacher, Combs et al. (1974) found that "perceptions of self leading to adequacy" (p. 22) is a crucial factor. While this study focused on teachers, it seems that the findings can also be applied to advisors in their work with teachers. In order to provide meaningful help and support, an advisor must feel capable and adequate.

Another reason a positive self-concept is so important to the advisor's role involves the goal of establishing a cooperative, collegial relationship with the teacher. If the advisor has an inadequate self-concept, he/she may need to assert his/her position and attempt to create a hierarchical or superior-inferior relationship. This type of relationship was one of the key liabilities in past supervisory models. Ideally, an advisor with a positive self-concept will not have the need to control or feel a sense of power over the teacher and thereby can more readily establish a healthy
supportive relationship with the teacher.

**Respects teacher's individuality.** Respecting a teacher's individuality is another essential characteristic for the advisor. The advisor must be willing to work with a teacher from where he/she perceives a need, value and allow for differences and respond to the needs and strengths of each teacher. In discussing how helping relationships begin with respect and acceptance, Combs et al. (1973) write: "... the atmosphere for helping must start from a base which accepts the person as he is and where he is" (p. 228). They go on to note that use of the word "acceptance" does not imply approval or disapproval. Rather, it has to do with a willingness to begin with people's perceptions of their own situation.

It is important that this respect is sincere and that the advisor demonstrate it through both actions and words. Various strategies reflect this characteristic, including building on teachers' strengths and allowing the teacher to initiate the focus of the relationship. Manolakes (1975) states: "The advisory view places control of help to be received with the individual teacher and assumes he or she will use, in a support system, those elements that are of most benefit at a given time" (p. 52). In this way, the advisor must trust and accept the teacher's perceptions and allow for differences in point of view that might occur.

While much of the literature (Mai, 1978; Alberty and
Dropkin, 1975; Spodek, 1972; and Manolakes, 1975) supports the above point of view, Katz (1974) cites this as a problem area for her advisors:

The intention we had to help teachers in terms of their own goals and objectives, rather than the advisor's was very difficult to implement. Advisors do indeed have preferences and ideologies of their own concerning teaching methods. To respect ideologies and methods which are not congenial to one's own preferences, is very difficult. Advisors felt more comfortable and more positively reinforced by those teachers whose ideologies came close to their own. (p. 160)

This problem area points to the need for advisors to be very clear in articulating the parameters within which they can and will work. It is essential that the teacher has a feeling of acceptance and support by the advisor. In some cases, advisors establish "conditions" or "agreements" at the beginning of their work with the teacher (Teachers' Center Exchange Philadelphia Workparty Proceedings, 1977, p. 45).

Devaney (1974) refers to the characteristic being discussed as "Respect for teachers' individuality and privacy" (p. 95). She highlights the privacy aspect by insisting that an advisor be "specifically invited" before going into a teacher's classroom. While most of the advisory literature supports this point of view, the National Education Association booklet, Teacher Centers and Advisory Work (1978) refers to times when it may be appropriate for an advisor to drop in on a teacher (p. 5). Even within this context however, the initiative for establishing an on-going relationship
remains with the teacher.

The way in which an advisor presents him/herself is a crucial factor. An advisor must actively demonstrate a clear respect for teachers in their differing styles and approaches. One way this can be demonstrated is by working with teachers who have different styles and needs so as not to be labeled as responding to only one type of teacher. Wood (1974) stresses that working with both experienced and new teachers who have visibly different strengths and styles helps the advisor to be seen as someone who respects and responds to teachers' individuality (p. 27).

**Understands and draws on principles of developmental learning.** The decisive quality in this characteristic involves the advisor's ability to translate developmental learning principles into practical application. The advisor must be able to share understanding of developmental learning principles in a constructive, meaningful and non-threatening manner. It is not sufficient for the advisor to understand the principles; he/she must also be able to share with the teacher how these theories can be applied within the classroom setting.

Devaney (1974) cites this characteristic and stresses the need for the advisor's "talent for clarifying and making real this approach to instruction--so that teachers gain a point of view" (p. 95). Given the vantage point of working
directly in the classroom, the advisor has an opportunity to work together with the teacher in bridging the gap between theory and practice by using theory as a tool for understanding what is occurring with the classroom.

**Enjoys being involved in other people's growth.** Katz (1974), Mai (1978), Devaney (1974) and Alberty and Dropkin (1975) emphasize an advisory approach that fosters independence as opposed to dependence and encourages self-actualization through self-helpful and self-directed approaches. Because the advisor is in a helping position, it is easy for the relationship to become one that fosters dependence. The advisor must stay constantly aware of this possibility and work to promote the teacher's independence and self-helpful behavior.

**Combs (1973) refers to this dilemma:**

Because it is nice to be needed and wanted, it is easy for helpers to be seduced into dependent relationships. Persons in need of help are likely to look upon their helpers as rather special people. This is a pleasant feeling for helpers too; in fact, it is so pleasant that it is tempting to continue the feeling and so, quite unconsciously, contribute to the further dependence of the persons one seeks to help. . . . The helping atmosphere must be one which provides the client with experience which reassures him that he can deal with life. (p. 238)

Several assumptions on which the advisor's role is based help to combat this dilemma. The advisory approach views the teacher and the advisor in a cooperative relationship. Since the advisor does not evaluate the teacher, a
more balanced relationship can exist. Also, the advisor begins interaction with the teacher by building on the teacher's strengths and interests. In this way the teacher's resourcefulness is fostered and developed.

Another key ingredient related to people's growth is patience. An advisor must be willing to wait through periods of higher and lower activity and involvement. Mai (1978) refers to patience as a "key characteristic of successful advisory work" and adds to it "an appreciation for the individuality of self-development in professionals" (p. 10). Although an advisor may see possibilities for change in a situation, it is crucial that the decision to move ahead be made by the teacher him/herself or jointly by teacher and advisor. As stated in the St. Louis Workparty Proceedings (1977), "The main thrust of the work must always be the teacher's development" (p. 2).

Some practitioners view their role as gradually moving the teacher away from needing their help and support. The St. Louis Workparty Proceedings (1977) include an advisor's statement supporting this position, "The advisor's long-term goal is to be not needed any longer. Advisors strive to work themselves out of their jobs" (p. 3). Thomas (1979) cites an advisor with a different perspective on this topic:

Just when I think an end point has finally been reached with one teacher or a group of teachers, that my work with them is no longer valuable to them or to me, they
come to me asking to be trained as advisors themselves. . . . they need help with learning to work with adults and support for reaching out beyond the confines of their previous work. So it seems the work never ends, it is just transformed. (p. 17)

Devaney (1974) views this characteristic by contrasting involvement in people's growth with involvement in particular methods or instructional materials. The focus for an advisor must be with the person and not with a specific technique or approach.

While the growth of adults is somewhat different from that of children, many of the same principles of learning can be applied. Adults, like children, must be approached with an acceptance of their own point of view. They require an environment that is supportive, stimulating, non-threatening and challenging. Devaney's distinction between focusing on people or focusing on programs is significant, particularly in how the teacher views the advisor. An advisor's effectiveness rests heavily on how he/she is viewed by the teachers. If the advisor is seen as an advocate of one particular approach, it is possible that teachers may hesitate to call on the advisor for help in other areas. An effective advisor must be sensitive to teachers' needs and be willing to work through the struggles and disequilibrium that growth sometimes brings.

Leadership ability in working with adults. This characteristic is closely related to the characteristic of
being involved in people's growth. The advisor must be skilled in interpersonal communications and able to actively involve teachers. Since many advisors have been successful teachers, they often apply their skills in human relations, organizing and managing groups, and meeting individual interests and needs while working with teachers.

In *Teacher Centers and Advisory Work* (1978) a teacher describes a non-threatening approach as a key element in her contacts with advisors.

They aren't judgemental. There aren't any strings attached. They can deal with very specific requests. They have their individual expertise and a belief that learning should be on-going and in-depth. They don't see themselves as having just one meeting with you and that's it. There's lots of follow-up. (p. 11)

This aspect of non-threatening leadership is very important to the advisor's acceptance by teachers. In many ways an advisor leads from behind. And yet, because an advisor works with teachers on a voluntary basis, the advisor must have certain leadership qualities that attract and interest teachers. While some advisors are quite dynamic or charismatic, others are more reserved; regardless of personality, the advisor in all cases must convey an open and thoughtful attitude in working with teachers.

Another essential factor involves the advisor being viewed as having something of worth to offer and as someone who actively promotes, fosters and supports teacher growth. Katz (1974), Mai (1978) and Blumberg (1974) cite teachers
who desire an advisory approach which incorporates a balance of both task and maintenance functions. This indicates a need for the advisor to work toward concrete-type achievements as well as to offer general emotional support and involve the teacher in questioning and thoughtful discussions.

In defining characteristics of advisors Mai (1978) writes:

The most important quality . . . is an unobtrusive style of relating to other professionals. An advisor has a kind of professional humility with a capacity to put people at ease, while at the same time challenging them to accept real responsibility for their own growth. (p. 10)

Skilled teacher with depth in at least one area of the curriculum. An advisor's own experiences as a classroom teacher are quite important since much of the advisor's work revolves around the classroom. Devaney (1974) refers to this characteristic as "mastery of classroom teaching--as David Hawkins says, 'the advisor needs to be a teacher who has gotten his "second wind"'" (p. 95). There is full agreement (Katz, 1974; Manolakes, 1975; Weber, 1975; Spodek, 1972; and Mai, 1977) that an advisor needs a broad and successful background in classroom teaching. However, the issue of whether an advisor should be a specialist or a generalist is not generally agreed upon. While some educators such as Manolakes (1975) feel that curriculum expertise is not a crucial requirement, others such as Devaney (1974) feel that "some depth in one area of curriculum or scholarship"
(p. 95) is important. In working with teachers in the area of curriculum development, an advisor's in-depth background in a curricular area would be a definite asset in light of its general application.

In addition, however, the advisor also needs skill in general areas such as classroom organization and management and ways of meeting individual needs. These process skills are as essential as skills in the content areas. In discussing the process/content and specialist/generalist distinctions, Spodek (1972) states:

> While none of our advisors were competent in every area of the curriculum in which they had to deal, or at every grade level, each did have an area of specialization in which their substantive knowledge was greater than in others. Beyond that, however, they had to use what might be called process skills to move people along. Perhaps their performance in one area of the program allowed their credibility to be carried over to other areas. (p. 5)

**Actively involved in own learning and growth.** An advisor who is actively involved in pursuing his/her own growth and development communicates an approach to learning that can influence the teacher's perspective on learning. By viewing him/herself as both a learner and as a teacher, the advisor conveys a certain enthusiasm and curiosity that is often contagious.

Devaney (1974) pinpoints this characteristic in her list of "Characteristics of Advisor": "Enthusiasm to learn more, especially in a personal interest--inquisitiveness and
resourcefulness that communicate naturally to teachers and children" (p. 95). Often in the course of working with a teacher, an advisor will encourage the teacher to pursue a particular personal interest. By doing this, the advisor is supporting the teacher's personal growth, which in turn influences his/her growth as a teacher. Mai (1978) states:

Advisors we have observed also conveyed a questioning attitude and a willingness to explore, a self-confidence that typically drew people to them rather than repelled, and an enthusiasm for teaching, as well as for thinking and talking about teaching practice. (p. 10)

The above characteristics have been referred to both directly and indirectly in the literature on advising. While no absolute formula can be presented for a good advisor, the characteristics cited here represent those qualities that through the literature and experience have been found to be most essential to an advisor's effective support of teachers in their professional growth and development.

Strategies for the advisor's role. This section describes the strategies appropriate for an advisor's role. These strategies will be defined within the context of three different types of support offered by advisors. These include: 1) concrete and material support; 2) emotional support; and 3) extending and investigating support. It is important to note that these three support areas and the strategies described within them are not mutually exclusive. While a developmental process often emerges in an advisor's
relationship with a teacher, there is no rigid or definite pattern. Devaney (1974), Weber (1975), Katz (1974) and Mai (1978) all agree that advisors are used in different degrees and for different purposes at different times. It is the teacher's needs and interests that dictate the pattern of support and not a pre-set plan. As Mai (1976) has stated, "... both quality and quantity of resources provided by the advisor will probably change with each teacher over a period of involvement" (p. 2).

Concrete and material support. Concrete support is one of the most readily used resources an advisor initially offers to teachers. It is part of what Mai (1976) describes as the entry stage and includes offering concrete materials for the classroom, active demonstrations and other specific resources. Because it focuses on materials or action taken by the advisor, as opposed to the teacher, it is often viewed as less threatening by teachers. Concrete support involves strategies that can be "added to" what already exists in the classroom. The materials offered do not necessarily require changes within the on-going plan. The interesting aspect, however, is that concrete resources, while they can be simply "added to" the regular routine, can also have the effect of encouraging one to look beyond what presently exists, at such things as how the routine of the day is organized or how the students are using materials in the room. This exploration may be carried out in an effort to assess exactly how the
concrete resources can be adapted as a more integral part of the ongoing classroom structure. Therefore, from one point of view, this initial type of support meets teachers' immediate, daily survival needs while also encouraging further exploration of the teaching/learning process.

Within this type of support, Mai (1978) and Wood (1974) describe advisors initiating their work with teachers through follow-up help offered after seminars and inservice workshops. As with most work of advisors, the request is initiated by the teacher. Because the contact stems directly from a specific workshop, the teacher usually has a clear understanding of why the advisor is coming into the classroom. However, in some cases this way of initiating a relationship may be limiting. The teacher may only view the advisor as helpful in the area in which the workshop focused. The responsibility then is on the advisor to use this contact as a bridging experience that can lead into other areas of interest and concern for the teacher.

Literature in the area of advising highlights several specific strategies that fall within the category of concrete and material support. Several of these strategies relate to the advisor's direct classroom involvement. Wood (1974), Bussis et al. (1976), Devaney (1974), Katz (1974), Manolakes (1975), Feinman (1977), Nelson (1978), Mai (1978) and Alberty (1975) all view this aspect of the advisor's role as crucial in establishing credibility with the teacher, in understanding
the 'teacher's point of view, the students and the environment, and in developing a collegial relationship.

Wood (1974) summarizes specific strategies within the area of direct classroom involvement. These include observation, teaching alongside the teacher, demonstrating new materials and techniques, sharing ideas and extending ongoing classroom activities (p. 25). Manolakes (1975) labels this aspect of the advisor role as "technical helper" (p. 54). In mentioning strategies similar to those referred to above, Manolakes (1975) also stresses the importance of fostering independence.

The emphasis is not to do for the teacher, but to be a resource and aid. Always the intent of the advisor is to work toward the strengthening and growth of independence on the part of the teacher. (p. 55)

This theme underscores all strategies used by an advisor. However, it can often be a subtle issue and therefore needs to be dealt with as directly as possible by the advisor.

In categorizing types of support teachers perceive advisors offering, Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976) identify thirteen support categories. Of these thirteen categories, three relate directly to the area of classroom involvement. These include:

B. Extension of Teacher (helping hand, parallel activity)

* works with children in the classroom
* helps teacher with room arrangement
* helps teacher make materials
* works with children in the corridor or in the resource room.
E. Stage Director and Demonstrator (teacher's apparent intent is to "copy" what advisor does or transmit an idea directly into the classroom)

* shows teacher how to work with children
* shows teacher what to do/what not to do
* shows teacher how to use materials
* shows teacher how to set up room
* determines teacher's needs and points out next steps
* suggests specific ideas that teacher follows literally

I. Modeling Agent

* teacher infers general principles or patterns of new behavior by observing the advisor interact with children over materials or with other teachers over classroom or school issues. (pp. 144-146)

As mentioned previously Bussis et al. (1976) view the categories of support they identify as ranging from those that the teacher "takes in" to those where the teacher has a sense of "self-investment." Feinman and Peters (1977) point out that of the strategies described above, the first (B) "is based on the idea that the advisor makes a direct contribution to the classroom. In contrast, categories (E) and (I) depend on the notion that teachers perceive the advisor as contributing something to them" (p. 7). While (B) will have an effect because it is carried out for the purpose of complementing the teacher's activity, the other two strategies will be effective only if the teacher deems them so and decides to incorporate them into his/her repertoire.

This distinction brings out the complexity inherent in help offered within a teacher's classroom. Much depends on how the help and support are viewed and why they are being
offered. Within the literature on the advisor's role, there are mixed opinions on the effects of modeling within the classroom (Katz, 1974; Mai, 1978; Manolakes, 1975; Dropkin and Alberty, 1975; and Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel, 1976).

Katz (1974) notes two potential problems in modeling or demonstrating techniques. The first involves undermining the authority of the teacher and the second refers to a teacher's sense of discouragement or fear of failure when observing an accomplished advisor and stating, "I could never be that good" (p. 5). However, in a speech Katz delivered in 1977 (Charlotte, North Carolina), she confirmed the necessity of the advisor's working in the teacher's classroom to develop credibility and to gain an understanding of and sensitivity to the teacher's position.

Alberty and Dropkin (1975) feel an advisor's work with children is essential.

By what she does with children and by how she uses materials with them, the advisor models some of the possibilities for the teacher. . . . A significant, often subtle aspect of this help lies in modeling relationships with children. Such modeling can sometimes open a next step for the teacher. It is a particularly important part of the advisor's role in helping a teacher who has reached a plateau in her own development. (p. 16)

Mai (1978) makes an important distinction in reference to modeling that helps to clarify the issue.

If an advisor is able to convey in modeling that he is not modeling himself as an extraordinary teacher, but rather an approach to a given situation, this tactic more than any other can help some teachers move beyond that "plateau." (p. 20)
Further highlighting the complexity of this particular strategy is research done by Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976). In exploring how teachers view an advisor's modeling behavior, some teachers interpreted it as "extra help in the classroom" and not as a here's-the-way-to-do-it approach. They state:

It may be that modeling is an effective support activity for many teachers only when they are beyond initial stages of understanding an open approach to teaching. On the other hand, most advisory programs would not advocate a modeling strategy for experienced teachers who had already developed their own style of open teaching. Modeling, in the final analysis, must be an "in-between" or "it depends" strategy that calls for sensitive judgement on the part of advisors. (p. 150)

While the issue of modeling continues to be debated, the strategy of working alongside a teacher in the classroom remains as one of the distinguishing characteristics of the advisor role. Any work carried out in the classroom by an advisor may be viewed as a subtle type of modeling, but it seems more important to note that by providing what Katz (1974) calls in situ help, the advisor is able to offer practical assistance that goes far beyond regular inservice courses or workshops.

The writer agrees with Katz that intentional modeling should be carefully carried out on a very limited basis, but feels that the idea of working together with a teacher in the classroom provides a common experience that could not easily be gained in any other manner. By spending several hours or a full day in a teacher's classroom, the advisor
can then proceed in working with a teacher to assess alternative teaching methods, create appropriate curriculum or explore management techniques with a perspective that carries more depth of understanding and meaning.

Another strategy related to active, concrete and material support is identified by Wood (1974) as "Identifying and providing material resources" (p. 26). This strategy is also cited by Weber (1975), Katz (1974), Nelson (1977), Mai (1978) and Devaney (1974). As Katz (1974) defines it, it includes skill in "locating, identifying and preparing instructional materials to meet specific instructional needs and alerting teachers to available resources to help them with instruction" (p. 156). Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976) refer to this function as "Service/Administrative Agent" (p. 144). Within this area of provisioning resources the advisor must stay abreast of new developments, materials and ideas and must also develop skill in assessing and evaluating them.

While it is quite easy for an advisor to bring large quantities of materials, ideas and resources to a teacher as a way of demonstrating support, it is wise when this is done with some degree of moderation. A teacher may become easily overwhelmed by a great number of new ideas all showered upon him/her at once. Also, as Katz (1974) mentions, this function can "serve to increase teachers' tendency to see themselves as consumers of 'answers' and 'solutions'
rather than as generators of them" (p. 154). In an effort to avoid what Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel (1976) refer to as a "consumer orientation toward support," the advisor's strategy in sharing resources may sometimes involve making the teacher aware of existing resources and services within the school system and community instead of always securing the materials for the teacher. The advisor's sensitivity to not always doing the work for the teacher but rather sharing resources with the teacher reinforces Katz's fourth characteristic of promoting self-helpfulness and independence on the part of the teacher.

Provisioning resources falls within the category of concrete support; however, it also provides opportunities for both advisor and teacher to further explore other facets of the classroom such as students' development, classroom climate or the teacher's educational values and beliefs.

Observation is another strategy within the area of active, concrete support. An advisor's approach to observation is directed toward providing the teacher with information that can be used for the teacher's own purposes. Since advisors have no evaluative responsibilities in relation to teachers, the information gathered during an observation is never used to assess the teacher for tenure or evaluative purposes. Consistent with the advisor's general approach, observations are made at the teacher's request and for purposes specified either by the teacher or decided on
mutually by teacher and advisor. The advisor does not bring a preconceived agenda for an observation. As a result, the observation carried out by an advisor is less threatening than that of a principal and therefore may provide more useful data for the teacher.

An advisor's observations may focus on any of a wide variety of areas, such as student interaction, levels of questioning, use of materials or classroom organization and management. In preparing for an observation an advisor may draw on strategies from the Cogan (1973) clinical supervision model, particularly in the use of pre- and post-observation conferences. However, an advisor may modify the clinical supervision approach in different ways. Often an advisor's interaction with the teacher is fairly informal. In addition, an advisor and teacher may decide that instead of the advisor carrying out the observation, it would be best for the teacher to carry out the observation. To do this, the advisor would assume a supportive role by working with the students while the teacher observed. Within this context, the advisor is encouraging the teacher to develop and apply his/her observation skills and thereby become more independent and self-directed.

Once an observation is completed, the advisor and the teacher carefully reflect on the information that has been gathered. How this information is used depends a great deal on the advisor's skill in applying and extending the
factual data. In some instances the data will be used to deal with immediate problems or concerns, to explore alternatives and to look at the strengths and needs of the classroom and/or teacher. In other situations an observation may be used to look ahead at future plans and possibilities. At this point, observation moves from a concrete type of support strategy into an extending type of support. This is an example of the difficulty in placing any one strategy totally in one area of support. It is more helpful to think of these strategies as originating within one area of support and then moving out into the other areas referred to previously.

The above strategies do not comprise an all-inclusive list of active, concrete and material support. They do, however, represent a wide range of what can be offered in this area.

**Emotional support.** Proceedings from the Teachers' Center Exchange Workparty (1977) which focused on the role of the advisor included the following statement, "Building one-to-one personalized relationships is the key to the advisory position" (p. 3). Many educators (Lortie, 1975; Jackson, 1968; Sarason, 1971; and Katz, 1974) document numerous accounts of teachers referring to loneliness and isolation as a major problem in their profession. In response to this, Katz (1974) cites field notes from advisors that suggest a major effect of their role helped to alleviate
the teacher's sense of loneliness and isolation (p. 5). By providing non-judgemental and accepting types of support, advisors are able to establish collegial relationships that foster a teacher's growth and development and relieve the sense of loneliness.

Documentation of how advisors offer concrete support to teachers is more available than the documentation of how emotional support is offered by advisors. While much of the literature (Katz, 1974; Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel, 1976; Manolakes, 1975; and Mai, 1978) points to the importance of emotional support, only a few sources identify strategies used to accomplish this.

In citing Bussis, Chittenden and Amarel's categories of support, Devaney (1974) refers to two categories that are identified as being "seen by teachers as emotional support."

E. Emotional Stabilizer/Stimulator
(reinforcing, praising, boosting morale, listening, "caring," inspiring a sense of group belonging).

F. Respecter of Individuality
(accepting where the teacher is, respecting his/her professional integrity). (p. 92)

Spodek (1972) takes a slightly different view of how emotional support is offered. While acknowledging that trust and acceptance are important components of any helping relationship, Spodek writes:
For the advisor, the trust aspect of the relationship seemed less to be a function of a feeling of safety on the part of the teacher, and more to be a function of the degree of credibility that the advisor had. The advisor had to establish himself as one who could be helpful, who had something of practical worth to offer the teacher. (p. 4)

While Spodek and Bussis et al. differ slightly in emphasis, they concur on the idea that an advisor must offer both practical and emotional types of support. If an advisor offered the teacher only practical, material support without emotional support as well, it seems apparent that the relationship would be lacking and consequently result in less growth for both parties involved.

It is difficult to prescribe exactly how one person should support another. Much depends on how the people involved view one another. In defining the characteristics of a helping relationship, Rogers (1973) refers to communicating clearly and unambiguously, being perceived as trustworthy and accepting, feeling and demonstrating positive attitudes toward the other person, and not being perceived as a threat as several essential considerations (p. 13). All of these characteristics can be applied to the teacher-advisor relationship.

Drawing on Rogers' points coupled with Bussis et al.'s categories, several specific strategies can be elicited and applied to the advisor's role. These include skill in listening and responding to teachers' needs and interests, identifying and drawing on teachers' strengths, and verbally
and actively demonstrating acceptance of the teachers' unique styles of teaching and learning.

Alberty and Dropkin (1975) highlight the advisor's need for good listening skills.

The advisor becomes a listener to the teacher, creating an opening wedge to break down the teacher's isolation by providing a supportive and nonjudgemental atmosphere in which the teacher can struggle with problems. (p. 25)

They go on to suggest that by taking the above approach, the advisor also reinforces the teacher in taking a similarly supportive stance with the other people involved with his/her class, such as assistants, student-teachers and parents.

Proceedings from the Teachers' Center Exchange Workparty (1977) support this:

The quality of the discussion between the advisor and the teacher is most important. During these talks the advisor needs to try and discover exactly what the teacher means, and what the teacher really cares about. The advisor is a careful listener. Rather than taking responsibility for changes, the advisor works with the teacher to decide together what the next steps should be. (p. 51)

Related to the skill of listening is the skill of helping the teacher to clarify needs or problems. Therefore, the advisor must be skilled in both these areas and able to help teachers sort through various concerns and clarify issues that are of interest to them. In brainstorming new and well-established characteristics and strategies for the advisor role, Teachers' Center Exchange Workparty Proceedings (1977) also identified the need for skill in clarifying issues: "An advisor must be able to help teachers express
their problems and help them find ways to deal with these problems" (p. 42). Manolakes also refers to this issue:

For many teachers, growth and development in professional practices carries with it risk. There is no assurance that efforts will succeed. The availability of an interested and concerned person who is at least psychologically willing to share risks with the teacher is an important ingredient in the growth process. (p. 55)

This comment indicates the advisor's need to sensitively guide and support the teacher, always keeping in mind the goal of fostering more self-direction on the part of the teacher.

Bunker's (1973) Inventory of Competencies for the Helping Relationship, based on Combs' work in this area, is another source that supports much of what has been mentioned above. Of the competencies Bunker identifies, two important items are:

* Assisting helpers to free themselves from internal impediments to fulfillment
* Assisting helpee in the active process of discovering new meanings—likely to lead to self fulfillment. (p. 1)

Both of the above items are essential to a teacher's growth. The difficulty arises in assessing how this type of support is offered. From the literature cited previously, it can be said that a safe, warm and trusting environment are crucial conditions. But what can the advisor offer beyond this to provide emotional support and foster further growth on the part of the teacher?
One effective strategy referred to by numerous educators (Manolakes, 1974; Devaney, 1974; Weber, 1975; Rubin, 1969; Bussis et al., 1976; and Mai, 1978) involves networks of support. Through this strategy the advisor helps teachers make contacts with one another, so that in addition to drawing on the advisor for support, they can also use one another for similar types of support. In essence, they are broadening their options and their perspectives. Devaney (1974) quotes an advisor's description of this aspect of her job, "I always try to point teachers toward each other as resources, not toward me" (p. 89). Also in support of this Manolakes states: "A part of the functioning of an advisor is in helping teachers know what other colleagues might be doing, and of helping teachers establish communication networks" (p. 56). This strategy accomplishes several purposes. It relieves the isolation teachers may feel, encourages sharing by identifying strengths and common interests, helps teachers see themselves as valuable resources, and fosters a joint problem-solving approach. Networking may be encouraged within a school, among several schools or between schools and community agencies. Teachers may visit one another's classroom, meet together before or after school, establish study groups or have informal get-togethers.

Regardless of how the networking is done, it always increases the teachers' resources while providing another type of emotional support. Other terminology used for this
strategy include Mai's (1978) term of "the advisor as broker" and Crandall's (1978) term "liking agents."

One of the goals in providing emotional support for teachers is to help teachers become more self-reliant. The strategy of networking and linking one teacher with another fosters this goal. By offering what Manolakes (1974) refers to as "useful allies in the change process," the advisor can help increase the teacher's sense of autonomy and power. As teachers make contacts with other colleagues who share their interests and concerns, their dependence on the advisor may lessen.

As mentioned earlier, the advisor role is characterized by change and flexibility. As teachers' needs change so the role alters and changes. This remains true in examining the different types of emotional support offered. While one teacher may need only a listening ear, another teacher may require an active problem-solving approach to meet his/her concerns. The advisor must have many strategies from which to draw and, equally important, the advisor must be sensitive to understanding what the teacher is requesting and needing at a particular time.

**Extending and investigating support.** Extending and investigating support helps a teacher explore the teaching/learning process in depth. This support focuses not only on the "what" of a given situation, but also on the "how" and "why." Katz (1974) defines this type of support as "helping
teachers to think through alternative methods and approaches to teaching specific skills and content" (p. 156). Bussis et al. (1976) list several categories of support that fall within the area of extending and investigating support. These include:

G. Provider of Alternatives

* teacher receives new ideas for instructional activity, but retains responsibility for selecting a particular idea and deciding upon an appropriate time, place and manner for trying it out.

J. Appreciative Critic and Discussant

* teacher gains insights from a thoughtful analysis of the classroom provided by an observer whom the teacher judges knowledgeable and understanding.
* in-depth discussion with advisor leads to new ideas or insights.

K. Provocative and Reflective Agent

* advisor's questions stimulate thought
* discussion leads to teacher's awareness of self-progress
* advisor helps teacher come to identify self-needs and priorities
* "bouncing ideas off advisor" and "playing with ideas" in discussion leads to clarification and crystalizing of teacher's thought.

L. Leader and Challenger

* stimulates new efforts and ways of doing things on teacher's part
* provides model of a person who can rationally challenge arbitrary decisions; leads teacher to see himself capable of doing this when necessary (pp. 146-147)

In examining these categories of support, several specific strategies seem relevant. These include skill in questioning,
problem solving, goal setting and clarifying and analyzing issues.

With each of the categories outlined by Bussis et al, it may seem that the advisor could dominate the direction and focus of the relationship. It should be emphasized here that even in the area of extending support, the advisor responds and initiates according to the teacher's needs, interests and concerns. While the advisor may sometimes act as a catalyst to the teacher's thinking, it is still within the context of the teacher's needs.

Extending support takes on different forms; it may involve developing a curriculum suited to students' interests and therefore result in something concrete or it may take the form of a reflective discussion exploring how certain children are interacting with one another. In the Proceedings from the Teachers' Center Exchange Workparty in St. Louis (1977), a discussion on the advisor's role included the following question: "Should the advisor-teacher relationship be task-oriented rather than discussion/advice oriented?" (p. 2). The response at that session indicated a preference for recognizable results, a straightforward sense of achievement that might be lacking in conversations about what is happening within a class. However, in looking only for "straightforward" results, something less tangible, but equally important, is lost. An excellent example of this is described in Supporting the Learning Teacher (1975) where
van der Eyken and Turner describe how Robin Turner worked as an advisor. A good part of what Turner offered involved bringing teachers together after school and exposing them to experiences that provoked, challenged and supported them as learners. In this way he extended their thinking both professionally and personally (p. 57). Unless an advisor offers both concrete, tangible and informal, less tangible types of extending support, the teacher's options are limited.

One aspect of extending support focuses on the daily routines, mandated curriculum and limitations inherent in many school structures and organizations. Often a teacher feels frustrated within this environment. The advisor can provide support in this area by helping teachers learn how to cope with the limitations, and as Thomas (1978) states, "find creative ways not only to survive but to maintain their beliefs" (p. 6).

This type of support involves cooperative problem solving and goal setting. Being skilled in various approaches to problem solving and goal setting increases the advisor's options in helping the teacher. Also required in this type of situation is a full and practical awareness of the circumstances and resources within the school, school system or community. The intention is not that the advisor solves the problem, but rather that in a joint effort, the teacher and advisor create a workable solution. Proceedings from the Teachers' Center Exchange Philadelphia Workparty (1977)
support this position:

The advisor, therefore, does not bring solutions. At the beginning a teacher may expect solutions, while the advisor will hope for a discussion. Teachers will develop personal investment in the work if they are directing it. (p. 51)

Through a problem solving and goal setting approach, both advisor and teacher extend their thinking by clarifying intentions, goals and values and by setting priorities.

Curriculum development is another extending support strategy. Skill in helping teachers develop curriculum that meets students' needs and interests is a vital part of the advisor's role. While extensive curriculum development is not usually one of the initial areas that engages the teacher and advisor, some aspect of curriculum development often evolves from meeting teachers' immediate needs for concrete materials and ideas. What begins as an initial request for a specific book or activity may grow into an in-depth analysis of the present curriculum and the creation of some new curriculum material. Manolakes (1975) states, "It may well be that stimulating and extending the thinking of teachers about ways of improving their work is at the heart of positive advisory functioning" (p. 54).

Extending and investigative support strategies challenge and stimulate teachers' thinking. It is important to note however, that the extending types of thinking or concrete changes that occur always build on what already exists. By using this approach, the advisor is confirming
that what presently exists is worthwhile and beneficial to build on. Extending support expands the teacher's present strengths and interests in a developmental process.

Specific strategies within the area of extending support, such as questioning, clarifying issues and problem solving, can be presented and used by the advisor in both an informal and formal way. The writer believes that formal knowledge, training and practice in each of these strategies can have a direct effect on the advisor's effectiveness in working with teachers. Each skill contributes to the advisor's ability to help the teacher extend his/her thinking into new and/or different areas. This does not imply that the way in which an advisor raises questions or helps a teacher clarify an issue should be formal or stilted, but rather that the advisor has a rich background in each strategy that he/she can draw on. The end result, hopefully, is that the advisor can integrate and apply formal strategies while still working in an informal manner that encourages growth and self-directedness on the part of the teacher.

In examining the ways in which advisors offer concrete, emotional and extending types of support, it is helpful to consider Mai's (1978) "Advisor Problem-Solving Orientation" schema. This schema (Figure 1) shows how the advisor's strategies are influenced to a great degree by the teacher's potential for initiative-taking. He writes,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Teacher</th>
<th>High Initiative</th>
<th>Low Advisor Initiative</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Supports Questioning and Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests Ideas and Materials</td>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges Professional Visits</td>
<td>Helps to Define Problems and Set Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Questioning and Reflection</td>
<td>Co-teaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>Acts as Sounding Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models &amp; Demonstrates</td>
<td>Critiques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Buys Time&quot; for Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collects and Translates Information

(p. 25)

Figure 1

Advisor Problem-Solving Orientation
Four basic kinds of problem solving situations are suggested by the intersection of two axes, each representing, as a continuum from low to high, the degree of "initiative-taking" for the teacher and for advisor in a given problem solving relationship. (p. 24)

Mai points out that it would be artificial to think of a "clean separation of categories" (p. 24); but rather to think of each quadrant as a type of request and acknowledge that a teacher may have several needs at any given time to which the advisor would respond by crossing several quadrants.

The lower and upper left quadrants represent what is most often the initial phase of a teacher-advisor relationship. Although the teacher almost always initiates the request for involvement, what ensues initially is often characterized by a higher degree of involvement on the advisor's part. As the advisor proves his/her credibility and establishes a trusting climate, the teacher's involvement most often increases and together teacher and advisor enter a joint approach to problem solving.

It is interesting to note that as the shift described above occurs, the advisor's involvement in the classroom may move from what is viewed as "demonstrating or modeling" to "co-teaching."

While Mai places the strategy of "acts as sounding board" in the quadrant of high teacher initiative and low advisor initiative, the author sees a need for this strategy in each of the four quadrants. What seems most significant about the schema however, is the clarity it lends in
considering how the teacher-advisor relationship develops over a period of time. As mentioned previously in this chapter, there are no set patterns in the relationship's development. However, it is cited in many instances (Katz, Spodek, Weber) that only with time and the proper support does the relationship move into a highly cooperative venture. While this cooperative approach is fostered throughout the relationship, an advisor may find that he/she needs to attend to and respond to the teacher's immediate need for demonstrations or observations before moving on to more cooperative activities.

This phenomenon presents a challenge for the advisor. While meeting the immediate requests and needs of the teacher, he/she must also be fostering a cooperative and eventually self-directed approach to the solving of problems. Manolakes (1975) points out the advisor's dual role in this area:

Without mature goals on the part of advisors and a willingness to engage the teacher in thinking about next steps, the work of the advisor is one of blind technical engineering and can be an aimless activity. (p. 54)

Havelock (1970) also supports this view and stresses the need for a "mutual transfer of information." In discussing the helping relationship between client and change agent he states: "Oneway relationships tend to breed dependency and inhibit the initiative of the client to help himself" (p. 51). This is especially important for the advisor to keep in mind
while working with teachers to support self-helpful and independent behavior.

Guidelines for the Advisor's Role

In synthesizing the characteristics and strategies appropriate for the role of an advisor, seven characteristics and eleven specific strategy areas emerge. It is important to note that each of the strategy areas may be used in one or more of the three types of support described earlier: concrete, emotional, and extending support. The strategies also cross the boundaries of the four quadrants of Mai's "Advisor Problem-Solving Orientation" schema in Figure 1.

Viewed as a composite, the following list is representative of the essential characteristics and strategies deemed important by educators within the field of advising. As a set of guidelines for the advisor's role, these characteristics and strategies reflect the type of support for teachers which promotes professional growth and development. Specific illustrations of each strategy area are described in Appendix C.

Characteristics and Strategies for the Role of an Advisor

Characteristics

. Positive self-concept

. Respects teachers' individuality

. Understands and uses principles of developmental learning
. Enjoys being involved in other people's learning and growth

. Leadership ability in working with adults

. Skilled teacher with depth in at least one area of curriculum

. Actively involved in own learning and growth

Strategy Areas

. Communicating

. Clarifying

. Diagnosing

. Identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests

. Problem solving

. Goal setting

. Awareness and sharing of resources

. In-classroom involvement

. Theory interpretation and practical application

. Developing curriculum

. Extending teachers' thinking and actions
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used to assess the degree to which Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role are consistent with the characteristics and strategies of the advisor's role identified as important in the literature on advising. A description of the development of the advisor (resource teacher) role in Charlotte-Mecklenburg will be described for the purpose of presenting the setting and population used for the study. The research questions and how they have been addressed are presented. The development of the questionnaire and how it was administered are also described.

Research Population and Setting:
The Development of the Resource Teacher Role in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

Information for the following description of the development of the Resource Teacher/Advisor role in the

\footnote{The terms Resource Teacher and Helping Teacher have been used in Charlotte-Mecklenburg for personnel working with teachers in a supportive, non-evaluative position. Although the name of this position has been changed, the basic functions of the role have remained the same and are consistent with the role of an advisor.}
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools was gathered through an in-depth interview with the former Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and from available files relating to the Resource Teacher role.

In 1960 the Charlotte city schools and the schools of Mecklenburg County merged to become one consolidated school system called the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System. Prior to the consolidation each school system had staff members functioning as supervisors; however, these roles were carried out differently in the two systems.

In the county schools the supervisors followed the traditional model of supervision (as described in Chapter II). They observed the teacher, did classroom demonstrations and made sure the set program of curriculum was carried out. Supervision in the city schools was somewhat different. Specialists in the various curriculum areas were responsible for the supervision of curriculum. They did not do many classroom demonstrations, but instead carried out demonstrations in workshop settings.

When the two school systems merged the superintendent took supervisory personnel from both systems and tried to create a program that used what was best from the city and county models. From 1962 to 1964, supervision in Charlotte-Mecklenburg consisted of fifteen elementary supervisors each of whom had responsibility for five schools. They were responsible to the principals in the five schools where they
worked and spent one day a week in each school. The principal could direct the supervisor's activities and consequently supervisors were used differently in different schools. Some principals encouraged teachers to have a voice in how the supervisor was used while others authoritatively outlined what the supervisor would do.

In addition to these supervisors, one specialist for each major curriculum area was used. These specialists had responsibility for their area of curriculum on a system-wide level.

In 1964, after two years of this approach, both teachers and administrators felt the elementary supervisory program was unsuccessful. Teachers referred to the supervisors as "snoopervisors" and felt generally threatened by their presence. Part of this problem was related to the fact that county supervisors had previously shared responsibility with the principal for the evaluation of teachers. This previous aspect of their role still raised suspicion in the teachers. The principals also began to feel they wanted someone in the school who would be viewed by teachers as helpful and supportive.

A decision was made by the central office administration to gradually do away with supervisors. Consequently many supervisors were assigned as principals. Four people remained and were assigned to central office in the area of language arts. Their title was changed to coordinator and
although they were assigned to the specialist in language arts, they also worked with teachers in the area of math. The major change in their role involved the removal of their authority over teachers.

In 1965 a Director of Inservice was appointed and the four coordinators were assigned to him. Eventually each of the coordinators who was previously a supervisor was replaced and the new people coming in functioned more and more as generalists. By 1972 the original four coordinators all had been replaced and the new people were called Helping Teachers.

Part of the name change was an effort to reduce the sense of hierarchical levels of personnel. It was also an attempt to bring in a role that would be accepted and used by the teachers. Principals and professional organizations were conferred with in the process of this change. Another aspect of this change involved a move to give more responsibility to principals for the evaluation of teachers. This was fostered by the Tenure Act of 1973 which required a formal evaluation of teachers by the principal.

The new Helping Teachers were sensitive to how teachers viewed them. An effort was made to clearly define their role and responsibilities to principals. They were each assigned a group of elementary schools for which they would be the contact person. This did not mean that they would be responsible for meeting the needs of each school,
but rather that they would call on different resource people
to make sure that the school's needs were met. As their role
developed, one-third of their time was spent responding to
identified problems. In addition to this, their other
responsibilities included:

- meeting with new teachers in their schools at the
  beginning of the year to make sure they understood
  the curriculum;
- helping the personnel department interview prospective
  new teachers;
- carrying out inservice workshops;
- setting up and staffing a learning-resource center
  with learning centers in all curriculum areas and
  demonstrating how these centers could be used in the
  classroom.

Each Helping Teacher staffed the learning-resource center
one day a week and approximately ninety-five percent of all
elementary school teachers visited the center to make mate-
rials.

Training for the Helping Teachers was primarily
"on-the-job." They had all been highly successful classroom
teachers. Using each other as resources, they met together
for a half-day once every two weeks to problem solve, dis-
cuss their role and to bring in outside people for areas
in which they felt they needed help. Also, they occasionally
functioned as a team to work together in a school that was
having significant problems.

In 1974 and 1975, as more money was put in the budget for curriculum and inservice, the idea to add more Helping Teachers was accepted. At the beginning of the Helping Teachers' program, because of the small number of Helping Teachers and the tasks that needed to be done, the idea of Helping Teachers as generalists was a necessity. With additional positions, however, the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Staff Development gradually changed his viewpoint and came to feel the need to move "from generalists to specialists in an area." By 1977 there were thirty-five Helping Teachers who worked out of the Division of Program Service which included three departments: Curriculum, Human Resources and Special Support Services (see organizational chart in Appendix A). Five of these Helping Teachers functioned as generalists working in areas such as inservice, human relations or curriculum development. The other thirty Helping Teachers were assigned to curriculum, media or special support area directors and they functioned specifically on an elementary, junior high or senior high level. While the majority of Helping Teachers became specialists, they still were asked to carry out generalist functions as the need arose. These functions included help and support for teachers in classroom organization, management, planning, discipline and special projects.

For the purpose of clarifying the roles of all the
Helping Teachers, a directory was sent to all the schools in 1974 with a general description of the Helping Teacher's role (see Appendix B) and a brief description of the services each Helping Teacher could offer. Two functions clearly defined as not a part of the Helping Teacher's job description were substituting and evaluation.

Starting in 1974 and continuing through 1979, staff development experiences were planned for Helping Teachers. Although the frequency of offerings and the level of involvement fluctuated through this five year period, a Helping Teacher or committee of Helping Teachers was consistently involved in the selection and planning of the offerings. Topics ranged from awareness sessions and information sharing in a particular curriculum area to more general topics such as Sexism in the Curriculum and Motivating Students. Leaders for the offerings were sometimes drawn from within the Helping Teacher group, but more often came from outside the system. During 1978-79 several in-depth courses were offered on topics such as classroom observation, classroom organization and management, and planning workshops.

During the first years of organized staff development offerings, Helping Teachers were required to attend. However, in 1978-79 Helping Teachers have had the option of attending or not attending.

In January 1977 a study committee of Helping Teachers, principals, curricular directors and Area
Superintendents was appointed by the Interim Management Team. The purpose of the committee was to study:

1. the role of the Helping Teacher;
2. whether or not Helping Teachers who were centrally located should be assigned to feeder areas;
3. what plan of rotation should be used for Helping Teachers if they remained centrally located.

The recommendations of the committee included:

1. to change the name of Helping Teachers to Resource Teachers in an effort to clarify the role of Helping Teachers. The title Helping Teacher had been used for a number of different job functions mainly for payroll purposes.
2. to gradually decentralize Helping Teachers in an effort to support the system's reorganization plan for decentralization.
3. to not automatically rotate Helping Teachers every three years as was initially intended when the role was redefined. Instead a Helping Teacher's term would be determined according to the individual's job effectiveness and the need for the services

---

2From August 1976 to June 1977 a four person team functioned in place of a system-wide Superintendent.

3The school system was divided into ten feeder areas. Each area had one high school, two junior highs and eight to ten elementary schools. In 1977 several feeder areas were combined and there are currently eight feeder areas.
provided.

As a result of the committee's recommendations, in August 1977 the name Helping Teacher was changed to Resource Teacher. Most of the other recommendations were also eventually carried out.

Throughout the history of Helping Teachers and Resource Teachers, some principals consistently challenged the idea that these individuals were needed at a central level. Several principals felt that the positions would be better used if they were divided among the schools.

Each year rumors passed around that Resource Teachers might be eliminated, but for seven years the position remained in the budget and centrally located. Resource Teachers continued to work in response to teachers' and/or principals' requests. Much of their work centered around obtaining or developing materials for teachers and trouble shooting or working with a teacher who was having management, organizational and/or discipline problems. Some schools were visited often by Resource Teachers while others rarely saw a Resource Teacher within a year's time. Since the Resource Teachers did not have a regular group of schools to which they were responsible, they went to the schools and teachers that requested their services.\(^4\)

In December 1978 Resource Teachers were called

\(^4\)Resource Teachers in the area of early childhood were the only ones who regularly worked with a set group of schools.
together for an announcement about their roles for the coming year. They were told by the Superintendent that in an effort to continue decentralization and to bring services and resources closer to the schools most of the Resource Teachers' positions would be "nationalized." This meant that most Resource Teachers' positions would be eliminated. In their place a new position of a school-based Coordinating Teacher for Curriculum and Instruction would be established for each elementary and junior high school. Some schools would share a position depending on the size of the staff. Resource Teachers were encouraged by the Superintendent to apply for this new position which would begin in August 1979. Those Resource Teachers who applied and did not get the job and those people who chose not to apply would be reassigned to a school in a classroom situation. Many Resource Teachers were shocked by the decision although it always had been considered a remote possibility. Many people thought that if decentralizing of positions did occur it would be carried out on a more gradual basis. The idea of going back into the classroom was received differently by different Resource Teachers. Some were willing to re-enter the classroom while others felt it was a step backwards. Some Resource Teachers saw their role as an opportunity for leadership training and as a means by which to become a principal. That possibility was now removed.

Learning about the job change six months in advance
of its actually happening meant that morale was quite low for the remainder of the school year. Many Resource Teachers who specialized in one curricular area at first felt unsure about applying for the new Coordinating Teacher position because it meant working in all curricular areas. However, when the job was opened for applications, more than half of the Resource Teachers applied for the job. In addition to fifty-two elementary positions and twenty-one junior high positions, eight area Coordinating Teacher positions were also created. The area Coordinating Teacher would coordinate and support the school-based Coordinating Teachers. Job descriptions for both area and school Coordinating Teachers included support for teachers in the areas of curriculum and instruction, contact with parents, assessing and planning for inservice needs, assisting with the reading and math management systems and interpreting test scores. The fact that this new position would not involve any administrative duties was stressed continuously. The Coordinating Teacher was not to function as an assistant principal, but only in the areas of curriculum and instruction.

At the time that the Superintendent announced the change, he also stated that several positions would remain. He emphasized the fact that those people who remained would be kept because of their functions and not because of who they were. The idea that these positions were not also opened for competitive hiring was an uncomfortable issue all
during and after the changes that took place.

After all hiring for the new positions was completed, four Resource Teachers had been chosen for the new positions: one as an area Coordinating Teacher, two as elementary school Coordinating Teachers and one as a junior high Coordinating Teacher. Since Reading Teacher positions and several discretionary positions were also "nationalized" in order to create enough openings for the new role of Coordinating Teacher, a number of people previously functioning in those roles also applied and were chosen for the new role. Those Resource Teachers who did not maintain their position, did not apply for the new role, and those who applied but were not chosen all returned to classroom situations.

Although the Resource Teacher program in Charlotte-Mecklenburg has been significantly cut back, the creation of the new role of school-based Coordinating Teachers is seen as a way of expanding the previous Resource Teacher role and bringing it closer to the school setting on a more regular basis.

The population used for this study is the group of people functioning as Resource Teachers for the year 1978-79.

Research Questions and How They Have Been Addressed

This study focuses on the following questions:

1. In the research and literature on helping relationships,
modern supervision and inservice education, what evidence exists that indicates a need for the role of an advisor?

2. From practical findings and the literature on advising, what characteristics and strategies are indicated as important for an effective advisor?

3. To what degree are Charlotte-Mecklenburg's advisors' perceptions of their role consistent with the guidelines of advisor characteristics and strategies identified as important in the literature?

4. What are the implications and recommendations for the advisor's role in a public school setting?

5. What recommendations for further research can be suggested in relation to the advisor's role?

Questions one and two have been dealt with in Chapters I and II through a review of the literature on helping relationships, modern supervision, inservice education and advising as each area relates to and has implications for the role of an advisor. Specific guidelines delineating important characteristics and support strategies were also gleaned from the above areas of literature and were presented in Chapter II.

Question three is addressed in Chapters III and IV through a collection and presentation of data gathered from a questionnaire designed to reflect the identified guidelines.
Questions four and five are addressed in Chapter V through a discussion of the implications and recommendations for the advisor's role in a public school setting. Suggestions for specific areas of further research are also presented.

Development of the Questionnaire

In order to determine the extent to which Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role were consistent with the guidelines of characteristics and strategies deemed important in the literature, a field study approach was undertaken. Kerlinger (1964) defines field studies as any scientific studies, large or small that systematically pursue relations and test hypotheses, that are ex post facto, and that are done in life situations like communities, schools, factories, organizations and institutions. . . . (p. 405)

This study is consistent with Kerlinger's definition as it focused on people presently functioning as advisors in a public school setting.

To implement the field study, the writer decided that a questionnaire was the best way to acquire data that could determine the degree of congruence between the advisors' perceptions of their role and the identified guidelines for the role. While other methods including interviews and documentation were considered, the writer felt that a questionnaire would be the most effective method in terms of an unbiased technique for collecting data.
Because the writer is also an advisor within the population being studied, the question of bias was given a great deal of thought; the advantages and disadvantages of interviews, self-documentation and questionnaires were carefully weighed.

Orlich (1975) cites one of the main advantages of an interview approach as "the opportunity to collect in-depth information in terms of the respondents' feelings, beliefs and perceptions" (pp. 6-7). Disadvantages of an interview approach as discussed by Wiersma (1969) include lack of uniformity of response which makes analysis difficult, and face-to-face contact and data recording techniques which may inhibit responses. Wiersma also mentions two items which had particular significance for the writer:

- the interviewer may imply a preferable response
- the S's responses should not be a function of the specific interviewer. (p. 280)

Since the writer's own position is very similar to the respondents, the possibility of influence during the interview seemed likely.

The documentation approach was also considered. Documentation involves detailed accounting and recording of a person's activities, interactions and reflections. While this approach can reveal interesting data, it was thought to be impractical given the advisor's regular work load and the most recent role change that has been referred to in the description of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg setting.
In contrast with these two approaches, the advantages and disadvantages of a questionnaire, when carefully studied, seemed best suited to the data needed for this study. Orlich (1975) examined the work of several other educational researchers to generate a list of common advantages and disadvantages of the questionnaire approach.

The advantages include:

1. many individuals can be contacted at the same time
2. each selected respondent receives identical questions
3. a written questionnaire provides a vehicle for expression without fear of embarrassment to the respondent

The disadvantages include:

1. a question may have different meanings to different people
2. the investigator is prevented from learning the respondent's motivation for answering questions
3. complex designs can cause poor results
4. the return of all questionnaires is difficult to achieve (pp. 3-5)

Wiersma (1969) also states: "The problem of non-response is often viewed as the primary disadvantage of questionnaire surveys" (p. 281). In this study the return of questionnaires did not prove to be a problem. Thirty out of thirty-one questionnaires were returned. The process of administering the questionnaire will be described later in this chapter.
Question development. Using Wiersma (1969), Orlich (1975), and Kerlinger (1964) as guides for question development, the writer used three different types of questions in the questionnaire: factual questions, open-ended questions and forced response questions.

Factual questions including items such as "Highest college degree" and "Area of concentration" were used to collect some demographic information. These questions were placed at the beginning of the questionnaire as Orlich suggests.

Place the easy non-threatening questions at the beginning of the questionnaire. . . . These informational questions are short, unoffensive and allow the respondent to become accustomed to completing items. Once a rapport has been established, the respondent is more committed to the tasks and more sensitive questions are tolerated. (p. 31)

Open-ended questions were used to explore aspects of the respondents' perceptions of their role that might not be revealed through the forced response questions. "What aspects of your role are most rewarding?" and "What types of assistance do teachers request your help in most often?" are two examples of open-ended questions used in the questionnaire.

Two consultants in the area of tests and research also suggested the use of an open-ended question format to determine respondents' perceptions of important characteristics for advisors. The research consultants felt that a forced choice or closed format for this type of item would result in a set-response pattern from the respondents.
Orlich (1975) gives three reasons for using open-ended questions.

1. to probe an idea further
2. to accommodate categories which are incomplete or inadequate in a forced response list
3. to provide projective types of situations. (p. 33)

Responses from open-ended questions must be categorized and coded for analysis. To compensate for the writer's own bias in categorizing and coding the open-ended responses, two other individuals familiar with the area of study were used to help develop the appropriate categories and consequently to do the actual coding of the responses. The writer and these two other individuals independently coded each set of responses. Items which did not fit into any of the established categories were coded miscellaneous. Suggestions from Orlich and Wiersma were used in coding survey items.

The third type of question used was the forced response. As described by Orlich (1975), "Forced response questions include response categories which are predetermined by the researcher" (p. 31). A five-point Likert scale was used to rate individual strategies relating to the advisor's role. A Likert scale is defined by Orlich (1975) as being "used primarily for assessing opinions" (p. 40) and therefore was chosen as most appropriate for determining the advisors' perceptions of their role.

While the writer's initial intent was to compare the
advisors' perceptions of their role with the literature through use of a standard Likert questionnaire format, early on the concern of set-response patterns became an issue. Set-response patterns would result in the respondents rating each statement as "most important" or "used very often." Thus, after careful consideration, the consensus of both the writer and the researchers working with her was to use Q sort methodology which would force respondents to indicate five degrees of usage and five degrees of importance and thereby avoid the problem of set-response patterns. (A further description of the refined research question and the results are the focus of Chapter IV.)

**Q Sort methodology as used in the questionnaire.** Kerlinger (1964) describes Q sort methodology:

> It centers particularly in the sorting of decks of cards called Q sorts and in the correlations among the responses of different individuals to the Q sorts. . . . A set of objects--verbal statements, single words, phrases, pictures, musical compositions--is given to an individual to sort into a set of piles according to some criteria. (p. 581)

Using a five-point Likert scale such as:

> Very Often  Often  Sometimes  Seldom  Very Seldom,

the respondents were asked to sort a pile of cards into the categories that most closely reflected their use of each strategy. Respondents were limited as to how many cards they could place in each response category. Kerlinger (1964) states that the "Q technique is mainly a sophisticated form
of rank-ordering objects and then assigning numerals to subsets of the objects for statistical purposes" (p. 581).

He goes on to cite the flexibility of Q sorts as one of the main advantages of this approach. He also views it as a useful tool for educational investigators:

Although they have hardly been used, such methods hold great promise for experimental social, psychological and educational studies. Another strength of Q is its usefulness in exploratory research. (pp. 592-3)

In discussing how the Q sort is administered, Kerlinger states:

Many individuals will no doubt believe that the possibilities of Q for the objective study of the individual in more than test score fashion are more important than the structured sort idea. With Q we have a methodology peculiarly suited to intensive study of the individual. One individual can be given two, three or more related Q sorts. One individual can sort a Q sort many times. The data of such sortings can be analyzed quite objectively without entirely sacrificing the richness of the usual clinical, and much less objective, methods. (p. 595)

Using background readings on Q sorts (Kerlinger, 1964), the writer developed a Q sort that asked respondents to sort the same set of fifty-five items in two different ways: once for usage of strategies cited and once for felt degree of importance of these same strategies. Each sorting was done with a Likert five-point scale. In this way, areas of consistency and discrepancy between perceived usage and perceived importance of items could be discerned.

The two main disadvantages of Q sort discussed by Kerlinger are that the method is not well-suited for a cross-section or large sample population and that the forced-choice
aspect of placement of cards has the potential to misrepresent subjects' responses. The first disadvantage does not apply to this study since only thirty advisors were surveyed rather than a large population. The second disadvantage of forced-choice and limiting the number of cards in each response pile was taken into consideration but thought not to be a liability for the purposes of this study. Because of an initial concern about set-response patterns in ranking items, the forced-choice aspect of the Q sort was seen as an asset. Respondents were told prior to taking the questionnaire that they might encounter some frustration in not being able to place as many cards as they would like in each pile. After taking the questionnaire, several respondents said they appreciated the advanced warning about the limited number of cards in each pile. It seemed that knowing about the forced-choice aspect of the Q sort ahead of time alleviated some of their frustration.

In developing the Likert scale response categories to be used with the Q sort, the writer felt it was important to create categories that would indicate definite degrees of usage or importance for each scale. A response category such as "not at all important" was not used. Instead, items were ranked from those used "very often" to those used "very seldom," and from those deemed "most important" to those deemed "least important."
Construction of content items for the Q sort. At the end of Chapter II eleven strategy areas were identified as important for the advisor's role in supporting teacher growth. For the purpose of developing the questionnaire, illustrations of each strategy area were identified from available literature on advising (Bussis et al., 1973; Katz, 1974; Mai, 1976, 1978; Morpurgo, 1975; and Thomas, 1979) and from the writer's own direct experiences as an advisor. The complete list of these illustrated strategy items can be found in Appendix C. The final content of the Q sort included fifty-five illustrations. For each of the eleven strategy areas there were five illustrations. Each illustration was placed on a separate card; a second set of the same cards was used for the second sorting.

Summary of the questionnaire format. The final format of the questionnaire included:

- a cover letter describing the purpose and intent of the questionnaire
- one page of demographic and open-ended questions
- two Q sorts of advisor strategies: one for usage, and one for perceived importance. (See Appendix D for the complete questionnaire.)

The pilot. The questionnaire was given to a pilot group of seven individuals. Four of these people function or have
functioned as advisors; the other three work in the area of staff development and are familiar with the role of an advisor. The questionnaire was administered to each person at a separate time so direct feedback about the clarity of the items and basic understanding of the questionnaire could be shared without the influence of other respondents. Respondents were asked to pay particular attention to the clarity of directions, questions, Q sort items and the general format of the questionnaire. The pilot group was also used to determine an approximate time for completing the questionnaire. Suggested revisions and deletions were discussed with each person. An additional and key purpose for using a pilot group was to refine the illustrated strategy items for the Q sort and to reduce the number of items from sixty-three items to fifty-five.

The results from the pilot respondents were very useful in refining the questionnaire and many of their suggested revisions were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. Examples of changes made as a result of the pilot included:

1. Restating one step in the directions for the Q sort so that respondents clearly understood that they could only put a limited number of cards in each response category.

2. Leaving more space to allow for answers to open-ended questions.
3. Rewording the question "What three areas of training would you recommend for advisors?" to "What three areas of professional development or inservice training would you recommend for advisors?"

4. Eliminating items in the Q sort that were unclear or ambiguous such as, "Helping teachers set specific goals for themselves or for their students."

5. Eliminating one of two items in the Q sort that seemed redundant such as, "Using the library to research resource materials" and "Reading books, journals and ERIC documents to identify useful teaching resources."

6. Rewording items in the Q sort for more clarity such as changing "Talking with students about their work in order to make follow-up suggestions to the teacher."

7. Changing the response categories in the Likert scale for importance from "Very important" and "Not at all important" to "Most important" and "Least important." Several people in the pilot group felt all the activities cited had some degree of importance and they did not want to totally disregard any of them. They all felt more comfortable rating the items from most to least important.

8. Using two different colors of card stock for the Q sort; one for usage and one for importance.
Based on the pilot respondents' suggestions, the sixty-three items for the Q sort were reduced to fifty-five, with each of the eleven strategy areas having five illustrations.

**Final administration of the questionnaire.** The questionnaire was administered to thirty advisors from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System. Each respondent was asked ahead of time if he/she would be willing to participate in the study by taking the questionnaire. The purpose of the study was briefly described verbally. The advisors were then told that they would be contacted at a later date to set up a time to take the questionnaire. All advisors working directly with classroom teachers were asked and agreed to take the questionnaire. These advisors all work within the Program Services Department of the school system.

The questionnaires were administered over a three week period. Each respondent chose a time best suited to his/her schedule. The majority of respondents took the questionnaire in groups of three to five. Five respondents asked to complete the questionnaire at home.

The questionnaire was given to each respondent in a large envelope with self-explanatory directions on the outside (see Appendix D). Additional verbal directions were given as follows:

1. The term "advisor" and "resource teacher" are used interchangeably. They mean the same thing.
2. The questionnaire has three parts. The first part is one page and asks some demographic questions and open-ended questions. The second and third parts are both Q sorts where you will be asked to sort items according to your usage of each activity and according to how important you feel each activity is. You will be limited as to how many cards you can place in each pile. This might be a bit frustrating, but just think of it as placing each item along a continuum without eliminating any one item.

Validity and reliability of the instrument. The validity of a test is defined by Wiersma (1969) "as the extent to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure" (pp. 190-91). The purpose of the questionnaire used in this study was to measure advisors' perceptions of their role in terms of important characteristics and strategies for the role and to then contrast these perceptions with the characteristics and strategies deemed important in the literature on advising. The items used in the questionnaire all have face validity; they are stated in a straightforward manner and directly relate to the strategy areas defined in the guidelines.

The items in the Q sort are also representative of what Wiersma (1969) refers to as the "universe of items" (p. 193) in that they were culled from a variety of sources in the area of advising. The clarity of the open-ended
questions was determined through the pilot study and through consultation with experienced researchers. These factors all contribute to the content validity of the instrument.

Wiersma (1969) refers to the reliability of a measurement instrument as "the consistency of the test in measuring whatever it does measure" (p. 185). The reliability of the instrument used in this study is reflected in the design of the items used in the Q sort. The advisors' perceptions are being assessed, in part, in relation to the eleven identified strategy areas. Instead of having only one item for each strategy area, there are five items that relate to each area. Orlich (1975) supports this decision by stating that, "When you rely on more than one question to assess an attitude, the response reliability is greater" (p. 50). The five items for each strategy area comprise a subscale and responses to these items will be viewed as a group because each group of five items attempt to discover the advisor's perceptions of the same strategy area.

The following chapter will analyze the results of the data gathered by means of the questionnaire designed for this study.
CHAPTER IV
AN ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter addresses research question three: "To what degree are Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role consistent with the guidelines of advisor characteristics and strategies identified as important in the literature?" The chapter presents an analysis of the data collected through the Advisor Role Questionnaire which was administered to thirty advisors in an effort to determine their perceptions of their role.

To present the results of the questionnaire, research question three has been refined to include the following sub-questions:

1. What characteristics do Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors perceive as most important for an effective advisor?

2. How do the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of important characteristics compare with the characteristics identified as important in the literature?

3. When given a list of advisor strategies identified as important in the literature, how do Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors rank these strategies in terms of perceived "usage"
and "importance"?

4. How do Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their own "usage" of the strategies compare with their perceptions of the "importance" of the strategies? The results of the questionnaire will be analyzed and presented as they relate to each of the above questions.

In addition to the data directly related to research question three, data from two other areas of the advisors' perceptions of their role were collected through open-ended questions. These questions were: "What would you like to be doing as an advisor but cannot find enough time for?" and "What three areas of professional development or in-service training would you recommend for advisors?" A summary and brief analysis of the data collected from these questions will also be presented.

What Characteristics do Charlotte-Mecklenburg Advisors Perceive as Most Important for an Effective Advisor?

Participants were asked an open-ended question to determine their perceptions of the six most important advisor characteristics. The data from this question were organized into twenty-three response categories. Categories were developed by a content analysis of key words in the participants' responses. Each response was then sorted into the most appropriate category by three different raters. The
percent of agreement among raters was 92 percent. This indicates a high degree of consistency in the raters' sorting of responses.

Table 1 presents the response categories with representative statements, how many responses were within each category and how many advisors were represented within each category. In some instances there are more responses than advisors represented because a respondent listed two characteristics that were sorted into the same response category.

The data in Table 1 indicate that 23 or 76 percent of the advisors listed "Able to work well with others" as an important characteristic. "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area" was the only other characteristic that received an almost equally high frequency. The characteristic that received the third highest number of references was "Effective communicator" with 17 or 56 percent of the advisors listing it as important. "Understanding," "Broad awareness of resources" and "Flexible" were listed with the next highest frequencies.

The range of characteristics with a high number of references suggests that respondents support both affective and cognitive qualities as important for advisors. Overall, the respondents emphasized competency coupled with flexibility, understanding and a strong interest in working with people as key characteristics for advisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Representative Statements</th>
<th>Number of Advisors (%)</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Able to Work Well with Others</td>
<td>Ability to interact constructively</td>
<td>23 76%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to relate to students and adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human relations skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth Knowledge of a Curriculum Area</td>
<td>Expertise in an area</td>
<td>22 73%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum content area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communicator</td>
<td>Good communications skills</td>
<td>7 56%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathetic listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to communicate ideas clearly and concisely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>11 36%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Awareness of Resources</td>
<td>Knowledge of resources that are available</td>
<td>10 33%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarity with resources not immediately available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>9 30%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to learn and change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized</td>
<td>Good organizational skills</td>
<td>7 23%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to organize and see things through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number of Representatives</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stamina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Able to Assess Needs and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solve</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to assess needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-threatening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable, personable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility as a professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Educational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to demonstrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respects Teachers' Individuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness to different</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinds of teachers and their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Representative Statements</td>
<td>Number of Advisors</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Classroom experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Child Growth and</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Knowledge of child growth and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good self-concept</td>
<td>Good self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Faith in education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Advisors' Perceptions of Important Characteristics Compare with the Characteristics Identified as Important in the Literature?

Table 2 presents a comparison of important advisor characteristics identified by the writer from the literature and similar advisor characteristics identified by respondents. Table 3 presents additional characteristics frequently mentioned by respondents. Several of the characteristics in Table 3 are related to the literature-identified characteristics.

In Table 2, which compares the characteristics listed by respondents with those identified in the literature, there is a high level of similarity in two areas. The first area is referred to in the literature as "Enjoys being involved in other people's learning and growth"; the similar category for respondents' responses is "Able to work well with others." The second area is identified from the literature as "Skilled teacher with depth in at least one area of curriculum." This characteristic included two categories from the respondents: "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area" and "Experienced classroom teacher." It is interesting to note that while 73 percent of the respondents emphasized the importance of knowledge of a curriculum area, only six percent of the respondents mentioned classroom experience as important. The respondents' emphasis on curricular...
### TABLE 2

**COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT ADVISOR CHARACTERISTICS IDENTIFIED IN THE LITERATURE AND BY RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-Concept</td>
<td>Good Self-Concept</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects Teachers' Individuality</td>
<td>Respects Teachers' Individuality</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands and Uses Principles of Developmental Learning</td>
<td>Knowledge of Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys Being Involved in Other People's Learning and Growth</td>
<td>Able to Work Well with Others</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Ability in Working with Adults</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Teacher with Depth in at Least One Area of Curriculum</td>
<td>In-depth Knowledge of a Curriculum Area</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively Involved in Own Learning and Growth</td>
<td>Experienced Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number of Advisors</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communicator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Awareness of Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Organized</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expertise has implications for their view of the advisor's role.

"Positive self-concept" and "Understands and uses principles of developmental learning," both referred to in the literature, each had only one reference in the respondents' listings.

The characteristic identified in the literature as "Respects teachers' individuality" was referred to directly by six percent of the respondents. However, 13 percent of the respondents listed "Understanding" as an important characteristic and 30 percent listed "Flexible" as an important characteristic (Table 3); and although these responses were included under separate categories, they can also be viewed as important aspects of "Respects teachers' individuality."

"Leadership ability in working with adults" is another instance of a characteristic that was listed directly by only one respondent. It is significant, however, that several other characteristics such as "Effective communicator," "Flexible" and "Well organized" included in Table 3, are closely related to this characteristic identified in the literature. Therefore, the advisors' response in this area can be assessed as having a higher correlation to the literature than is apparent from viewing only Table 2.

The characteristic "Actively involved in own learning
and growth," identified as important in the literature, was not mentioned by any respondents in their listings of important characteristics.

The results of this comparison indicate that of the seven characteristics identified as important in the literature, two were directly referred to by respondents with a high degree of frequency. However, additional characteristics frequently mentioned by respondents, presented in Table 3, are closely related to several of the other literature-identified characteristics. This indicates a somewhat higher correlation between the advisors' choice of characteristics and the literature than is at first apparent. In addition, two of the characteristics frequently listed by advisors which were included in Table 3 ("Effective communicator" and "Broad awareness of resources") were identified in the literature as strategies for the advisor's role. This may indicate a difference in point of view in distinguishing characteristics from strategies.

**When Given a List of Advisor Strategies Identified as Important in the Literature, How do the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Advisors Rank these Strategies in terms of Perceived "Usage" and "Importance"?**

Using a Q sort process, participants were asked to rate fifty-five strategy statements (representing the eleven strategy areas) according to perceived "usage" and "importance." The participants' rating of these statements resulted
in a score for each of the eleven strategy areas. Table 4 presents the rank order of mean scores for each of the eleven strategy areas in "usage" and in "importance."

For perceived "usage" of the strategy areas, the data identify "Sharing resources" and "Communicating" as having the highest mean score and therefore perceived as the most frequently used strategy areas for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg group as a whole. It is possible that the sharing of resources provides an entree for communications between teacher and advisor and consequently both strategies are perceived as being used often. "Theory interpretation and practical application" and "In-classroom involvement" received the two lowest scores and are in tenth and eleventh place; these strategy areas are perceived as being the least "used" by the advisors.

For perceived "importance" of the strategy areas, "Clarifying" received the highest mean score and is viewed as the most important strategy area. "Diagnosing" received the second highest mean score and is also viewed as one of the more important strategy areas. "Theory interpretation and practical application" and "In-classroom involvement" again received the lower rankings and were in tenth and eleventh place respectively. The data suggest that these two areas are not perceived as important in the advisor's role.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Areas (USAGE)</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Building on Teachers' Strengths and Interests</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking and Actions</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Practical Application</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Areas (IMPORTANCE)</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Building on Teachers' Strengths and Interests</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking and Actions</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Practical Application</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For a more in-depth view of respondents' rankings of the strategy areas, Tables 5 and 6 present the frequencies of first and last place rankings for "usage" and for "importance."

The following procedure was used to determine respondents' rankings of strategy areas. Eleven strategy areas identified from the literature were each illustrated by five separate strategy statements, yielding fifty-five strategy statements in all. Respondents placed each of the fifty-five statements in one of the five response categories for "usage" and in one of the five response categories for "importance." The response categories were each assigned a score ranging from one for "Least important" or "Seldomly used" to five for "Most important" or "Used very often." A respondent's placement of each strategy statement determined a score for that particular statement.

A respondent's scale score for each strategy area was determined by adding the scores of the five strategy statements related to the particular strategy area. Consequently, each respondent had eleven scale scores for "usage" and eleven scale scores for "importance." The scale scores for each respondent were arranged in rank order for "usage" and for "importance" of the strategy areas. Possible scores ranged from five to twenty-five. The frequencies of first through eleventh place rankings for each strategy area were
then tallied. A table presenting each respondent's ranking of the eleven strategy areas for "usage" and for "importance" can be found in Appendix E.

The data in Table 5 indicate "Sharing resources" as the strategy area with the highest number of first place rankings. "Communicating" and "Problem solving" received the second highest number of first place rankings. It is interesting to note that although "Problem solving" ranked fifth place in the mean scores, it did receive a relatively high number of first place rankings.

Eleventh place rankings for "usage" are fairly consistent with the mean score rankings. "In-classroom involvement" was ranked as the least used strategy by 18 or 60 percent of the respondents; "Theory interpretation and practical application" received 30 percent of the last place rankings. The data certainly indicate that these two areas are perceived as the least used of the eleven strategy areas.

Table 6 shows "Clarifying" with the highest number of first place rankings. Thirty-six percent of the respondents ranked this strategy as "Most important." "Communicating," "Sharing resources" and "Identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests" all received the next highest number of first place rankings.

In eleventh or last place ranking, "In-classroom involvement" is again viewed as the least important strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Area</th>
<th>First Place Rankings</th>
<th>Eleventh Place Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Building on Teachers' Strengths and Interests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Practical Application</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking and Actions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Area</td>
<td>First Place Rankings</td>
<td>Eleventh Place Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Building on Teachers' Strengths and Interests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking and Actions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Practical Application</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with eighteen of the thirty respondents ranking it last. "Theory interpretation and practical application" had the second highest number of last place rankings. These two strategy areas have consistently been rated as least important.

How do Charlotte-Mecklenburg Advisors' Perceptions of their own "Usage" of the Strategy Areas Compare with their Perceptions of the "Importance" of the Strategy Areas?

Table 7 shows the comparison of the eleven strategy areas' rankings for "usage" and for "importance" as derived from the mean scores. The absolute difference between the rankings of each strategy area in "usage" and "importance" is also presented.

Spearman's Rho was used to determine the overall rank order correlation between the perceived "usage" and "importance" of the strategy areas. The coefficient was found to be +0.72 (p < .05). This indicates a high positive correlation between perceived "usage" and "importance." In general, there was a great deal of similarity between the respondents' perceptions of their own "usage" of the strategy areas and their perceptions of the "importance" of the strategy areas.

In examining the comparative rankings of each of the eleven strategy areas in "usage" and "importance," six of the areas are either the same as or within one place of each other, plus or minus. The other five strategy areas show a rank discrepancy between "usage" and "importance" of two to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Areas</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Absolute Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Strengths</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Application</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five places, plus or minus.

Table 8 shows the grouping of strategy areas that were ranked higher in "usage" than in "importance," the strategy areas that were ranked higher in "importance" than in "usage," and the strategy areas that were ranked the same in both "usage" and "importance."

Four strategy areas (Sharing resources, Communicating, Developing curriculum and Extending teachers' thinking) were ranked higher in "usage" than in "importance." "Sharing resources" was the area with the greatest difference between rankings for "usage" and "importance." It shared a position of first place ranking for "usage" and was in seventh place ranking for "importance," a five place difference. This suggests that while respondents use this strategy area very often, they do not feel it is one of the most important areas for an advisor's role. "Communicating" was another area where the ranking for "usage" was somewhat higher than the ranking for "importance." On this instance, however, there was a two place difference. Although this difference is smaller, the data imply that while "Communicating" is used very often it is not perceived with quite as high a degree of importance.

Five strategy areas (Clarifying, Diagnosing, Problem solving, Goal setting and Identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests) were ranked higher in "importance"
### TABLE 8

GROUPING OF STRATEGY AREAS ACCORDING TO RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Areas</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Areas Ranked Higher for &quot;Usage&quot; than for &quot;Importance&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teachers</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Areas Ranked Higher for &quot;Importance&quot; than for &quot;Usage&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Teachers' Strengths</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Areas Ranked the Same for &quot;Usage&quot; and &quot;Importance&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Interpretation and Application</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than in "usage." "Diagnosing" had the largest discrepancy in this direction with a second place ranking in "importance" and a fifth place ranking in "usage," a three place difference. "Goal setting" was ranked sixth or in the middle position for "importance" and ninth or within the lower ranking area for "usage," also a three place difference. This indicates that although "Goal setting" is perceived as being somewhat important, it is not often used. Those items with higher rankings in "importance" may have implications for areas of training for advisors. Another possibility for understanding the discrepancies may involve the organizational structure of the program or institution within which an advisor works.

Two strategy areas that received the same ranking for "usage" and for "importance" were "Theory interpretation and practical application" and "In-classroom involvement." They were ranked in tenth and eleventh place and have consistently been perceived as being the least used and least important strategy areas.

The following section presents data collected through two open-ended questions. The responses to the questions suggest areas of development for the advisor's role in Charlotte-Mecklenburg as well as for areas of inservice for people functioning as advisors. The first of the two open-ended questions was, "What would you like to be doing as an
advisor but cannot find enough time for?" This question was asked to determine the areas in which advisors would like to invest more of their time. Their responses lend insight into how they perceive their own roles as advisors. The data have been grouped into five categories with the number of responses in each category indicated.

**TABLE 9**

**WHAT CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ADVISORS WOULD DO IF THEY HAD MORE TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More in-class involvement and support of teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More one-to-one contact time with teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing a resource bank of teacher talents or of materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuing own inservice personal growth experiences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses indicate that 50 percent of the respondents would like to spend more time working directly in the classroom with teachers. An additional 26 percent reported that they wanted more time to work on a one-to-one basis with teachers to follow-up on suggestions or to pursue particular interests and needs indicated by the teacher. Overall,
three-fourths of the group wanted more direct time with teachers either during school hours or before or after school. This preference is quite interesting in relation to the ranking of strategy areas, particularly "In-classroom involvement" which consistently received a low ranking in both "usage" and "importance." Further implications of this will be discussed in the last chapter.

The second open-ended question was, "What three areas of professional development or inservice training would you recommend for advisors?" The responses were grouped into twelve categories. Table 9 presents the categories and the number and percentage of respondents within each category.

Fourteen or 46 percent of the respondents suggested professional development in the area of Human relations. While some respondents actually stated, "Human relations skills," others referred to it as, "How to help without threatening" or "Developing interpersonal skills." The data indicate that the respondents felt that training in human relations could have significant bearing on the advisor's role. Communications, an area closely related to Human relations, received the second highest number of references. This result supports the notion that advisors' effectiveness is often closely tied to their ability to relate to other people and to communicate effectively.

Workshop planning and design and Observation .
TABLE 10

AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR INSERVICE TRAINING RECOMMENDED BY CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG ADVISORS FOR ADVISORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Planning and Design</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Techniques</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development Trends</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline and Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies and Techniques of Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Growth and Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Up-date on School Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Problem Solving and Sharing Sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
techniques were two of the three areas to receive the third highest number of responses. Since most of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors developed skills in these areas mainly from on-the-job experiences, there seemed to be a strong interest in more formal training to complement the informal learning that had been acquired during their practical experiences. A discussion of the suggested areas for professional development and inservice training and their relationship to the other results of the questionnaire will be included in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study explored the role of the advisor who works directly with teachers to support and foster their professional growth and development. An examination of relevant literature in the areas of inservice, helping relationships and supervision indicated a strong need for an advisor role which provides on-site, practical, non-evaluative and meaningful support for classroom teachers. Literature on advising and related areas was reviewed to identify guidelines of selected characteristics and strategies for the advisor's role.

In an effort to examine how one group of advisors views its role in relation to the guidelines identified in the literature, an Advisor Role Questionnaire was designed and administered to advisors in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools, Charlotte, North Carolina (May 1978). The questionnaire, based on the identified characteristics and strategies, was administered to determine the degree to which the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' perceptions of their role were consistent with the identified guidelines of
characteristics and strategies from the literature.

This chapter addresses research questions four and five: "What are the implications and recommendations for the advisor's role in a public school setting?" and "What recommendations for further research can be suggested in relation to the advisor's role?" Implications for the advisor's role will be drawn from the data presented in Chapter IV and will focus on advisor characteristics, advisor strategies, how advisors would use additional time and suggested areas of professional development and inservice for advisors. Conclusions and recommendations will be made from the implications of the study.

Implications for the Advisor's Role

Characteristics. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' listing of important characteristics emphasized two characteristics: "Ability to work well with others" and "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area." The high number of references to "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area" reflects the specialist orientation from which the majority of advisors operate and indicates that the advisors perceive a major part of their job as being related to their specific curriculum area. This emphasis on curriculum has, at times, dominated their attention to the exclusion of other classroom related areas, such as discipline, management and
classroom organization. However, because of the recently announced change from centrally-based curriculum area advisors to school-based generalist advisors, one can speculate that generalist skills will be given increasing attention. A hint of this can be seen in the advisors' suggestions for areas of professional development. Generalist areas such as Observation, Curriculum development trends and Discipline and management were mentioned as important areas for advisors' professional development.

The other characteristic viewed as highly important by the advisors was "Ability to work well with others." This quality relates to and supports the human relations aspect of the advisor's role. Additional characteristics frequently listed by advisors also emphasized human relations qualities. Affective characteristics such as "Effective communicator" and "Understanding" support the notion that an advisor's ability to relate well to a variety of people is essential in establishing meaningful working relationships with teachers. Two of the seven characteristics from the literature, "Enjoys being involved in other people's learning and growth" and "Respects teachers' individuality," also support the need for qualities related to human relations.

In addition to the two characteristics emphasized by the advisors which were explicitly related to the literature
"Ability to work well with others" and "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area"") several other characteristics frequently listed by advisors were implicitly related to characteristics identified in the literature. For example, advisor identified characteristics such as "Effective communicator," "Flexible" and "Credibility" are implicit aspects of characteristics identified in the literature such as "Leadership ability in working with adults" and "Respects teachers' individuality." A few characteristics listed by the advisors were related to both the characteristics and the strategy areas identified in the literature. "Effective communicator," "Able to assess needs and problem solve" and "Broad awareness of resources" were characteristics listed by the advisors which closely parallel the identified strategy areas "Communicating," "Diagnosing," "Problem solving" and "Sharing resources." These results may indicate the advisors' view of these items as qualities as opposed to strategies or processes.

Overall, the advisors' choices of important characteristics suggest the need for a balance of affective and cognitive qualities. This balance is also evident in the characteristics identified from the literature and implies that advisors must have skills beyond their expertise in a specific curriculum area.

In reviewing all the items frequently referred to on
the advisors' lists, it is evident that they focused on the practical day-to-day functions of their job and selected related characteristics. However, characteristics from the literature which focused more on the advisor's own growth and individual development ("Positive self-concept" and "Actively involved in own learning and growth") and less on the advisors' relationship and interaction with teachers were not referred to frequently. Consequently, self-enhancing and personal growth characteristics cited in the literature were not supported by the advisors. "Theory interpretation and application" was another characteristic referred to in the literature which was not evident in the advisors' choices of important characteristics. This may be another area which they view as being not directly related to the everyday classroom situation and their relationships with teachers.

In examining the distinction between the advisors' listing of characteristics and those identified in the literature, a partial difference in role definition emerges. The advisors' choices of characteristics define the advisor's role in terms of responding to teachers' needs by getting along well with people, having a strong background in a curriculum area, being an effective communicator and being aware of resources. These areas are all strongly supported in the literature and, therefore, the advisors' view of important characteristics and those referred to in the
literature overlap one another. However, the advisors' emphasis is on responding to teachers' daily needs, requests and problems. There is less emphasis on extending immediate interests or needs or serving as a role model for long-term growth. The idea of the advisor's role as one that responds to the immediate needs and interests of teachers while at the same time maintains a perspective on long-term, self-directed growth is emphasized in the literature as crucial in promoting teachers' professional development. This long-term perspective and view of the advisor's role as a model for continuing growth are the main areas that are neglected in the respondents' perceptions of their role.

Strategy areas. The ranking of strategy areas lends further insight into the advisors' perceptions of their role and the ways in which they support teachers. In examining the rank order of the eleven strategy areas (derived from the mean scores) for both usage and importance, there is a high correlation between advisor's perceptions of the strategy areas they use often and the strategy areas they view as important. However, three strategy areas are ranked with a discrepancy of three to five points between usage and importance.

The discussion below will look at the three strategy areas in which there were relatively large discrepancies between usage and importance rankings and then examine the
eleven strategy areas in relation to the overall rankings. The strategy area with the largest discrepancy between usage and importance was "Sharing resources," with a first place ranking in usage and a seventh place ranking in importance. These results have several interpretations. Sharing resources is often a safe, non-threatening and helpful strategy for beginning a relationship with a teacher. It can be initiated or requested by the teachers or, if the advisor thinks a certain book or material is appropriate for a teacher's class, he/she can offer it as a resource. Sharing resources does not usually involve a long-term commitment from either party and yet it often provides the opportunity for interaction between teacher and advisor. Most advisors have or know of a wide range of resources and therefore find sharing them an effective vehicle through which to establish credibility.

The advisors' discrepancy in rankings for usage and importance for this strategy area reflects a concern referred to indirectly in the literature. While the sharing of resources is often a logical starting point from which an advisor and teacher can start working together, it can be overused to the exclusion of other more challenging ways of working together.

For example, an advisor can be in the position of regularly responding to requests for resources without moving
to the point of exploring how the resources are being used or adapted. In this instance, much of the responsibility is with the advisor. How often and in what ways the advisor initiates interaction that extends a teacher's initial request plays a critical role in many aspects of the advisor's work.

The fact that "Sharing resources" is an easy strategy to use may account for its high rank in the area of usage. Its lower rank in importance may be due to its overuse and its potential for limiting other areas in which the advisor and teacher can work together. In the literature, the issue of "overuse" of resources focuses on the teacher becoming too "consumer oriented" in relation to resources.

"Goal setting" and "Diagnosing" were the other two strategy areas with a substantial discrepancy between usage and importance rankings. Both of these areas were ranked higher in importance than in usage.

"Goal setting" had a middle ranking for importance and a low ranking for usage. The low ranking in usage may be due to teachers not requesting help in this area and to advisors not feeling as confident with this strategy. In addition, "Goal setting" definitely requires more of an investment on the teacher's part and more initiative on the advisor's part than does a strategy area such as "Communicating." However, an advisor's background and skills in "Goal setting" can often help to establish a situation where
both the teacher and the advisor gain direction and a sense of accomplishment as a result of setting goals together. The fact that advisors ranked this strategy area higher in importance than in usage indicates a need for goal setting to be included as an area for professional development, not as an isolated skill, but as a strategy to be used within the context of advising.

"Diagnosing" ranked in a shared second place for importance which implies that advisors value it as a meaningful strategy to use with teachers. However, in usage, it ranked in sixth place. Two explanations for the lower usage rankings may be time restrictions and less experience in methods of diagnosing. A third explanation is that diagnosis is more closely related to evaluative issues than any of the other strategies. Advisors may perceive teachers as being threatened by diagnosing and therefore they may avoid using it on a regular basis. It seems that a useful area for professional development for advisors would be cooperative approaches to diagnosing. Because diagnosing often establishes the groundwork for areas such as goal setting, problem solving and developing curriculum, it is an essential and valuable skill and strategy for advisors.

In the overall ranking of the eleven strategy areas several groupings emerged. These vary in relation to usage and importance rankings, but generally they are related to
the degree of initiative and investment required of both the teacher and advisor. Mai (1976) and Spodek (1972) refer to stages or levels of development through which the teacher-advisor relationship moves. The groupings of strategy areas from the results of the questionnaire are closely related to these progressive stages described in the literature. The first grouping of strategy areas, viewed as the most used and most important by advisors, correlates to Mai's (1976) "entry" and "resource person" stages of the teacher-advisor relationship. These strategy areas include "Communicating," "Clarifying," "Identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests," "Sharing resources" (usage only) and "Diagnosing" (importance only). With the exception of "Diagnosing" these strategy areas are the least threatening and usually require a lower degree of investment by the teacher. Several areas such as "Identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests" and "Sharing resources" require more initiative from the advisor. Basically, few changes need to occur within a classroom while these strategies are being used. Although the teacher is by no means passive while involved with the advisor during this time, often the teacher is not closely examining or altering aspects of the teaching environment. In this period both the teacher and the advisor are developing a working relationship. The sharing of resources is the advisor's way of establishing credibility and relating in a
concrete way to the teacher's class, curriculum and interests.

"Diagnosing" is one strategy area that, although ranked high in importance by advisors, only partially fits into this first grouping. As discussed previously it may involve more of a risk or threat to the teacher and consequently more of an investment. Still, "Diagnosing" has the potential to establish a basis for a second group of strategy areas which relate to influencing teachers' growth. "Diagnosing" is also an effective way of developing a collaborative relationship.

"Problem solving," "Goal setting" and "Developing curriculum" comprise the second grouping of strategy areas, which were the next highest ranked by the advisors. In the area of usage only "Sharing resources" was also ranked with these strategies. As a group, these strategy areas involve investment for both the teacher and the advisor and relate to the next stage or level of involvement and commitment as described in the literature. The strategies influence teacher growth more significantly than those in the first grouping. The teacher makes a commitment, verbally or non-verbally, and the process of working together becomes more collaborative. Each of these strategy areas is related to the advisor's understanding of the teacher's classroom situation. A high level of trust between teacher and advisor is also required since at this point the relationship begins
to move beyond general support, listening and technical assistance into more cooperative problem solving and in-depth planning. Generalist skills become imperative and the advisor needs to make a conscious effort to work in a way that encourages self-direction on the part of the teacher. As a group these strategy areas were given a middle ranking and were viewed by the advisors as less used and less important than those in the first grouping.

"Extending teachers' thinking and actions" and "Theory interpretation and practical application" constitute the third grouping of strategy areas which were ranked as least used and least important. "Extending teachers' thinking and actions" involves issues that Spodek (1972) referred to as coming "closer to the core of the teacher." It requires skill in analyzing the teacher's present situation and in envisioning possible extensions beyond that which exists without threatening the teacher. "Theory interpretation and application" requires both background knowledge and the ability to apply and relate theory to practice. This area is one in which an advisor can foster a teacher's growth and understanding. It is also an area which has the potential to promote a collegial dialogue. Both strategy areas in this group present more of a challenge to the teacher and advisor. They were both perceived as the least immediately related to the daily classroom situation. Since
the advisors' overall responses emphasized attention to the practical needs and requests of teachers, it would follow that these strategies would be ranked low.

The one strategy area ranking that is separate from the above groupings is "In-classroom involvement." In much of the literature this strategy is used as a starting point with teachers and as a way of establishing credibility and understanding the students and classroom environment. Nevertheless, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors ranked "In-classroom involvement" as seldomly used and relatively unimportant. In talking with some advisors about this result, several explanations became apparent. Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors work with a large number of teachers. In some cases their contacts include one hundred or more teachers each year. Consequently some advisors feel they do not have enough time to both work in the classroom and meet teachers' other needs and requests. The issue of limited time for in-classroom involvement is also reflected in the advisors' responses to the open-ended question: "What would you like to be doing as an advisor but cannot find enough time for?" Fifty percent of the group said given additional time they would work in the classroom with teachers.

Other advisors felt burdened by additional responsibilities outside their direct work with teachers and did not think in-classroom involvement was the best use of their
time given other responsibilities. Some advisors felt in-classroom contacts were at times threatening to teachers and they preferred to offer after or before-school support instead.

The advisors' responses to the open-ended question which indicated half the group would like to be involved in the classroom with teachers may be an indication of how they would operate if they were not burdened by other responsibilities. However, it is apparent that when the questionnaire was administered the majority of advisors were not using in-classroom involvement as a strategy to support teachers, nor did they view it as important in their current circumstances. Without further research and questioning of the advisors, it is difficult to know for certain why this inconsistency in responses occurred.

The advisors' overall rankings imply that they view strategy areas which establish a non-threatening rapport with teachers, build on teachers' strengths, and provide resources as the most used and important vehicles for providing support. These strategy areas involve skill in human relations, communicating and an awareness of resources. They are related to the two characteristics most frequently listed by the advisors, "Ability to work well with others" and "In-depth knowledge of a curriculum area." Consistent with these results, "Human relations" and "Communications" were
the two areas that were most frequently suggested for professional development and inservice for advisors.

How advisors would use additional time. The advisors' responses to the question: "What would you like to be doing as an advisor but cannot find enough time for?" adds an additional perspective to the information thus far presented. As stated previously, half the respondents indicated they would like to spend more time in the classroom providing support for teachers. The type of in-classroom support described by the advisors varied from focusing on curriculum materials and follow-up ideas from workshops to providing an "extra pair of hands." Several of the other responses emphasized the need for more long-term and in-depth support.

These results imply that although the advisors ranked the strategy area "In-classroom involvement" low in relation to other areas, they do feel in some ways it is a needed aspect of their role. The dilemma appears to revolve around the issues of time and the number of teachers with whom an advisor works. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors work with large numbers of teachers; and although they are not in contact with all of them at a given time, it seems that facets of their role are superceded by the need to respond to the immediate requests of teachers. This is evident in the ranking of strategy areas by usage. "Sharing resources" and "Communicating" are the activities in which they are
most frequently engaged; and while both of these areas can be extended into more collaborative ways of looking at the classroom and teachers' interests and needs, it seems the advisors have not had the opportunity to go too far beyond them.

Strategies such as "Problem solving," "Goal setting" and "Extending teachers' thinking and actions" require systematic contacts over a period of time. Currently, the advisor role in Charlotte-Mecklenburg involves contacts with large numbers of teachers and does not foster long-term, in-depth planning and working together. In addition to 50 percent of the advisors who want more in-classroom involvement with teachers, an additional 26 percent said they want more one-to-one contact time with teachers. This implies that some advisors do not feel they have enough time to work with teachers on an individual basis.

It is apparent that one way to alter the present situation for advisors in Charlotte-Mecklenburg would be to redefine the advisor role so that advisors worked with fewer teachers on an extended basis. This would support the advisors in meeting teachers' immediate needs and also in moving toward more invested collaborative relationships.

Areas of professional development suggested by advisors. The advisors' perceptions of important areas for professional development clarifies what they view as important in their
role. The respondents listed three areas of professional development or inservice training they would recommend for advisors.

Forty-six percent of the group recommended professional development in the area of "Human relations." This result is interesting in light of their choices of important characteristics. While their listing of characteristics emphasized a balance of curriculum expertise and human relations skills, their choices of areas for professional development focused more on the affective domain. Human relations and communications skills provide the foundation from which advisors work. In many cases, an advisor is chosen because of skills in these areas as well as for background in teaching and expertise as a generalist or specialist. Many advisors, however, have not had formal training in human relations areas and this may be a further explanation for the large number of recommendations for training in "Human relations" and "Communications."

Other recommended areas for professional development reflect the advisors' changing perspective from operating as specialists to acquiring more generalist skills. Recommended areas such as "Observation techniques," "Curriculum development trends," "Discipline and management" and "Consultation skills" all support the generalist aspects of the advisor's role. The advisors' suggestion for training in
"Workshop planning and design" is, in part, related to the characteristic identified in the literature as "Leadership ability in working with adults." In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the recommended area of "Workshop planning and design" represents another example of an area in which advisors have primarily developed on-the-job skills.

The advisors' suggestions for professional development support the need for advisors to have a broad range of skills beyond curricular expertise. While the recommended areas show insight into important facets of an advisor's role, they focus predominately on skills in establishing a rapport with teachers and in relating to the immediate classroom situation. There is less evidence indicating the need for training in skills which promote and support long-term teacher growth and development such as problem solving, goal setting and extending teachers' thinking and actions.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Advisors

Several conclusions can be drawn in relation to the way Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors perceive their role. These conclusions are based on the results of the Advisor Role Questionnaire:

- The advisors perceive their relationship with teachers as supportive and non-evaluative.
- The advisors' primary emphasis is on providing practical
and emotional support for teachers by using such strategies as sharing resources, communicating with teachers and identifying and building on teachers' strengths and interests.

- The advisors' main focus involves teachers' immediate needs and interests.

- The advisors place less emphasis on extending teachers' requests and on influencing teachers' long-term growth.

- Although the advisors have functioned predominately as specialists, they have an increased awareness of the need for more generalist skills.

- The primary areas in which the advisors would like to spend additional time are working with teachers in the classroom and relating to teachers on a more in-depth, individual basis.

- The large number of teachers with whom each advisor works and additional advisor responsibilities prevent in-classroom and in-depth contacts from occurring on a regular basis.

- The advisors perceive the need for professional development in the areas of human relations and communications.

- In listing important advisor characteristics, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors emphasized qualities which focused on their relationships with teachers; they did not emphasize qualities which focused on their
own growth or self-concept.

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg advisors' strengths include skills in establishing a supportive relationship with teachers and responding to teachers' immediate and practical requests and needs. Keeping these strengths in mind and with a view of how the literature defines the role of an advisor, the following recommendations are made:

- A smaller number of teachers per advisor would allow the advisors to establish more in-depth collaborative relationships. While Katz (1975) recommends an optimum number of six to ten teachers per advisor, fifteen to twenty teachers per advisor would probably be a feasible number for a system the size of Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

- The role of the advisor in Charlotte-Mecklenburg could be developed and broadened by exposing the Charlotte advisors to work carried out by advisors in selected sites such as the Mountain View Center for Environmental Education in Boulder, Colorado and the Workshop Center for Open Education at City College in New York City as cited by Thomas (1979) where there are emphases on promoting and influencing teacher growth and on responding to teachers' practical and immediate needs.

- Advisors should be supported and encouraged to view their own professional growth and development as an
integral part of their role and as a way of modeling an interest in on-going learning for teachers.
- Advisors should be encouraged to stay abreast of current literature on the advisor's role and related issues.
- Additional professional development is needed for advisors in the areas of diagnosing, problem solving, goal setting and ways of providing opportunities for extending teachers' growth. This would give advisors a richer background of resources to draw from when working with teachers.

These recommendations support a broader definition of the advisor's role than currently exists in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system. By increasing the advisors' understanding of the potential of their role, advisors would be more likely to work with teachers in ways that not only respond to the teachers' immediate needs, but also encourage the teachers' on-going self-directed professional growth and development.

As a teacher-advisor relationship develops, the focus in working together often moves from ideas and resources to students' needs, behavior or interests and eventually to the teachers' own interests and growth. Emotional support from the advisor is needed throughout this development. If the advisor's role is viewed with this context, then inservice and professional development for advisors must include
specific techniques and skills that apply to these progres-
sive levels of involvement and also promote collaborative
relationships. Advisors need to view their role as more than
offering resources and ideas; they must also see their role
as one that provides an opportunity to work together with
teachers to problem solve and to foster self-directed growth.
Therefore, skills in areas such as problem solving, diagnosing,
goal setting, questioning and observation need to be developed
within the advisory context and not as isolated techniques.

In addition, advisors need time to explore their own
interests and needs and time to work together to problem
solve, explore advisor-related issues and assess their own
development. Advisors can shadow one another for a day to
gain additional insight into their approaches and styles of
working with teachers. In doing this, advisors model an
interest in their own continuing growth that directly
parallels the teachers' development. Another avenue for
advisors' professional growth is a study group in which the
advisors can examine selected topics in depth over an
extended period of time. A resource person may be brought
in to stimulate and work with the advisors in their explora-
tion and examination of the topic. For these and other
inservice experiences, time allowance for the advisors' pro-
essional development should be incorporated into the
definition of the advisor's role and responsibilities.
The advisor's role is an invaluable vehicle for promoting teachers' continuing growth as professionals. It has the potential to respond to teachers' strengths and perceived needs and interests in ways that have not previously been given adequate support. By developing collaborative relationships with teachers and fostering self-directed growth the advisory approach enhances teachers' professional development and consequently the quality of education.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was undertaken in an effort to better understand the role of an advisor and to examine how one group of advisors perceive their role in relation to important characteristics and strategy areas identified from the literature. In the process of conducting this study additional areas of research arose as possible avenues of exploration that would increase understanding of the implementation and development of the advisory role.

The following areas of study relate to the advisor's role in supporting teacher growth and development and are suggested for further research:

- An investigation of advisors' and teachers' perceptions of important and helpful advisor characteristics and strategies to increase the present understanding of an advisor's effectiveness, specifically from the teacher's
perspective.
- An exploration of appropriate advisor strategies for supporting teachers who are at different stages of professional development. Using previous research, such as the "Concerns-Based Adoption Model" developed at the University of Texas and Field's (1979) article from the Brookline Center on "Teacher Development," this study would identify the most effective advisor strategies in relation to teachers' needs at different stages of teachers' professional development.

- A case study of the advisory process which focuses on one long-term teacher-advisor relationship. This study would document the development of a teacher-advisor relationship from both the teacher's and the advisor's personal perspectives. Specific issues and stages of the relationship's development would add to the current understanding of the advisor's effectiveness when working with a teacher over a long period of time.

- An examination of critical issues and problems affecting the advisor's role in supporting teacher growth. In-depth interviews with teams of teachers and advisors could be used as a vehicle for identifying important issues and problems. While a variety of issues are referred to in the literature on advising, there has
not been a systematic assessment of the specific problems involved in the advisory process. This study could identify these problems and recommend possible solutions or ways of dealing with them in order to enhance the advisor's support of teachers' professional growth.

- A study of advisors' effectiveness in fostering teacher development which compares advisors from a school-setting, university-setting and teachers' center-setting. This study would identify the assets and liabilities of the various contexts and settings in which the advisors work. It could also examine how advisor strategies are used in the different settings.

- An examination of professional development and inservice programs for advisors. As the shift from supervisors to advisors continues, effective training programs will be increasingly needed. What are the most effective aspects of current pre- and inservice programs for advisors?

- An examination of how the advisory process influences teacher growth. A pre and post study of teachers' perceptions of how their involvement with advisors has contributed to their professional development.

These areas of study would add to the current literature and understanding of the advisor's role and the advising
process. Since the advisor's role is relatively new, there is a need for more documentation and exploration of how advisors function and the ways in which they influence and support teachers' professional growth and development.
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APPENDIX B
THE ROLE OF THE HELPING TEACHER

Improving classroom instruction is the overriding goal of all helping teachers. In general, they work through directors to achieve this goal. The following are some specific ways helping teachers work to improve teaching and learning in classrooms:

1. Serve as links between teachers and directors and between principals and directors
2. Preview new materials, ideas, and current trends and make these available to classroom teachers
3. Assist teachers in the selection and evaluation of materials
4. Assist teachers in making instructional materials for individual needs
5. Consult with principals on specific curriculum areas
6. Provide in-service training for teachers and principals in specific curriculum areas
7. Work with staffs to encourage parental participation
8. Assist teachers in the locating of resources outside the school
9. Visit new teachers early in the school year
10. Aid teachers in implementing new approaches

It should be clarified that there are two roles helping teachers do not fill. They never evaluate teachers nor are they substitute teachers.

Helping teachers are assigned to the following curriculum areas:

1. Elementary curriculum areas
2. Secondary curriculum areas
3. Early childhood education
4. Career exploration
5. Federal programs
6. Special areas (Human Relations, Instructional Television, and In-service Education)

Although helping teachers are assigned to these specific areas, they also work, at the principal's request, with any teacher whom he identifies as having problems in general classroom instruction and management.
APPENDIX C
ILLUSTRATIONS OF STRATEGY AREAS

Communicating

Listening to teachers' concerns and feelings; acting as a sounding board.

Acting as a liaison between teachers; referring one teacher to another for a specific purpose.

Encouraging teachers to get together to talk about and share common problems.

Talking with teachers about their professional interests.

Providing encouragement for teachers.

Clarifying

Helping teachers clarify their needs and priorities.

Helping teachers identify a problem that is not clearly perceived by them.

Helping teachers sort out their purposes for using particular teaching materials and/or activities.

Rephrasing a teacher's concern so it is clear to both teacher and advisor.

Asking questions to gain more understanding of the teacher's situation and perceptions.

Diagnosing

Observing in the classroom with a specific mutually decided upon purpose.

Cooperatively analyzing information collected from an observation.

1 The following illustrations of strategy areas have been drawn from the writer's practical experiences and from the following sources: Alberty and Dropkin (1975), Devaney (1974), Bussis et al. (1976), Mai (1978), Katz (1974), Spodek (1972), Manolakes (1975), Thomas (1979), Morpurgo (1977) and Nelson (1977).
Providing feedback to teachers based on observations (of the classroom, students or teachers' methods).

Carrying out informal needs assessments through conversations with the teacher.

Identifying teachers' needs based on the teachers' perceptions of the situation.

**Identifying and Building on Teachers' Strengths and Interests**

Identifying teachers' strengths.

Helping teachers assess their own progress.

Relating information about successful practices developed by one teacher to another teacher.

Identifying effective methods a teacher is using and pointing them out to the teacher.

Asking one teacher to help another teacher for a specific purpose.

**Problem Solving**

Suggesting specific alternatives for the classroom in response to an identified problem.

Brainstorming possible solutions to problems.

Cooperatively diagnosing a problem before exploring solutions.

Using a problem solving method to work on identified problems.

Thinking through and discussing problems relating to individual students.

**Goal Setting**

Setting goals for the areas in which teacher and advisor will work together.

Assisting teachers in setting goals that might result in more effective classroom organization and management.
Mutually developing action plans in response to teacher-set goals.

Helping teachers set goals for their own professional development.

Helping teachers make commitments to accomplishing self-defined tasks.

Awareness and Sharing of Resources

Bringing teachers a variety of current resource materials.
Locating community resources.
Sharing alternative approaches to teaching with teachers.
Talking with teachers and other advisors about new and/or successful resources.
Reading books, journals and ERIC documents to identify useful teaching resources.

In-Classroom Involvement

Showing teachers how to use a particular material by demonstrating with students.
Modeling different ways of working with students.
Team-teaching with the teacher.
Talking with students about their work in order to make follow-up suggestions to the teacher.
Acting as a resource person with part of the class while the teacher tries a new approach with the other students.

Theory Interpretation and Practical Application

Interpreting educational theory for teachers.
Discussing learning theories with teachers in relation to their classroom situation.
Drawing on theory when planning with teachers.
Sharing practical research findings relevant to the classroom.

Providing literature on a specific theory of teaching and discussing it with the teacher.

**Developing Curriculum**

Developing new curriculum with teachers based on teachers' interests and needs.

Helping teachers develop curriculum based on their students' interests.

Helping teachers extend their regular on-going curriculum materials.

Working with teachers to evaluate and modify the curriculum in relation to their students' abilities.

Exploring ways of integrating two or more curriculum areas.

**Extending Teachers' Thinking and Actions**

Suggesting ideas for extending students' work on a given topic.

Initiating in-depth discussions that lead to new ideas and insights.

Asking probing questions; challenging an approach or an idea when it seems appropriate.

Encouraging teachers to reflect on and examine their classroom practices, environment and materials.

Helping teachers to thoughtfully analyze ways of extending their staff development experiences.
APPENDIX D
RESOURCE PERSON ROLE QUESTIONNAIRE

(The following materials were included in an envelope. The instructions on this page were printed on the outside of the envelope.)

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

STEP 1:
Remove cover letter and attached Resource Person Role Questionnaire Part I. Please read the cover letter and answer the questions on the one-page questionnaire.

STEP 2:
Remove brown envelope marked USAGE and follow the instructions in the envelope.

STEP 3:
Remove brown envelope marked IMPORTANCE and follow the instructions in the envelope.
Dear Resource Teacher,

The enclosed questionnaire is part of my doctoral study on the role of resource teachers and their perceptions of their work with teachers. You and other Charlotte-Mecklenburg resource teachers have been chosen as individuals who understand, through your own direct experiences, what the resource teacher’s role involves. Because of this, I am interested in your personal perceptions and feelings about the role and what you think is important.

This questionnaire is divided into three parts and will take approximately 45 minutes to complete. Your answers to all of the questions will be anonymous. The information will be compiled by a computer and analyzed in terms of overall responses, thereby insuring confidentiality. If you are interested in some of the results of the study, I will be happy to share them with you. They will be available by September 1979.

Since the purpose of the questionnaire is to understand how resource teachers perceive their role, I want to stress how important it is for you to indicate your own personal views in answering these questions.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study and for making time in your busy schedule. I appreciate your help.

Very sincerely yours,

Carol Newman
**RESOURCE TEACHER ROLE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Part I:**

1. Years of classroom teaching  
   - 1-5  
   - 6-10  
   - 11-15  
   - 16-20  
   - 20 or more

2. Grade level(s) taught

3. Subjects taught

4. Highest college degree  
   - Year
   - Area of Concentration

5. Years as a Resource Teacher  
   - 1-2  
   - 3-4  
   - 5-6  
   - 7-8

6. What specific aspects of your role as a resource teacher are most rewarding?
   1.
   2.
   3.

7. What aspects of your role do you think teachers find most helpful?
   1.
   2.
   3.

8. What types of assistance do teachers request your help in most often?
   1.
   2.
   3.

9. What do you feel are the six most important characteristics for a resource teacher?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.
   6.

10. What would you like to be doing as a resource teacher, but cannot find enough time for?

11. What three areas of professional development or inservice training would you recommend for resource teachers?
   1.
   2.
   3.
FIFTY-FIVE STRATEGY STATEMENTS

Parts II and III of the Questionnaire included fifty-five strategy statements which were illustrations of the eleven strategy areas. Each of the following statements was listed separately on an individual card. There were two identical sets of cards, one for Usage and one for Importance.

1. Listening to teachers' concerns and feelings.
2. Acting as a liaison between teachers; referring one teacher to another for a specific purpose.
3. Observing in the classroom with a specific mutually decided upon purpose.
4. Identifying teachers' strengths.
5. Suggesting specific alternatives for the classroom in response to an identified problem.
6. Helping teachers set specific goals for themselves or for their classes.
7. Bringing teachers a variety of current resource materials.
8. Demonstrating a particular approach or lesson.
10. Developing new curriculum with teachers based on teachers' interests and needs.
11. Suggesting ideas for ways of extending the present classroom situation.
12. Helping teachers clarify their needs.
13. Helping teachers identify a problem that is not clearly perceived by them.
14. Cooperatively analyzing information collected from an observation.
15. Helping teachers assess their own progress.
16. Brainstorming possible solutions to problems.
17. Assisting teachers in setting goals that might result in more effective classroom management and organization.
18. Locating community resources.
19. Modeling different ways of working with students.
20. Discussing learning theories with teachers in relation to their classroom situations.
21. Helping teachers develop curriculum based on their students' interests.
22. Initiating in-depth discussions that lead to new ideas and insights.
23. Encouraging teachers to get together to talk about and share common problems.
24. Helping teachers sort out their purposes for using particular teaching materials and/or activities.
25. Providing feedback to teachers based on observations (of the classroom, students or teachers' methods).
26. Relating information about successful practices developed by one teacher to another teacher.
27. Cooperatively diagnosing a problem before exploring solutions.
28. Mutually developing action plans in response to teacher-set goals.
29. Sharing alternative approaches to teaching teachers.
30. Team-teaching with the teacher.
31. Drawing on theory when planning with teachers.
32. Helping teachers extend their regular on-going curriculum materials.
33. Asking probing questions; challenging an approach or an idea when it seems appropriate.
34. Talking with teachers about their professional interests.
35. Rephrasing a teacher's concern so it is clear to both teacher and advisor.
36. Carrying out informal needs assessments through conversations with the teacher.
37. Identifying effective methods a teacher is using and pointing them out to the teacher.
38. Using a problem solving method to work on identified problems.
39. Helping teachers set goals for their own professional development.
40. Talking with teachers and other advisors about new and/or successful resources.
41. Talking with students about their work in order to make follow-up suggestions to the teacher.
42. Sharing practical research findings relevant to the classroom.
43. Working with teachers to evaluate and modify the curriculum in relation to their students' abilities.
44. Encouraging teachers to reflect on and examine their classroom practices, environment and materials.
45. Providing encouragement for teachers.
46. Asking questions to gain more understanding of the teacher's situation and perceptions.
47. Helping teachers thoughtfully analyze ways of extending their staff development experiences.
48. Asking one teacher to help another teacher for a specific purpose.
49. Thinking through and discussing problems relating to individual students.
50. Helping teachers make commitments to accomplishing self-defined tasks.
51. Reading books, journals and ERIC documents to identify useful teaching resources.
52. Acting as a resource person with part of the class while the teacher tries a new approach with the other students.

53. Providing literature on a specific theory of teaching and discussing it with the teacher.

54. Exploring ways of integrating two or more curriculum areas.

55. Identifying teachers' needs based on the teachers' perceptions of the situation.
Part II: Usage

Instructions:

1. Enclosed you will find a pack of cards and five envelopes.

2. The statement on each card describes an activity that resource teachers might use in working with teachers. Please consider each activity in terms of how often you actually use that activity in your work with teachers.

   Very Often  Often  Sometimes  Seldom  Very Seldom

3. Place each card in the pile that most closely indicates your use of each activity. Please note that you will be limited in how many cards you can place in each pile. Put the same number of cards in each pile as the number shown on the front of the envelope. Each card should be placed in one of the five piles.

4. When you are finished sorting the cards into piles, count each pile to make sure you have only the same number of cards as shown on each envelope.

5. Insert the cards into each envelope.

6. Put the rubberband around all the envelopes together and place them back in the brown envelope marked USAGE.
RESOURCE TEACHER ROLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Part III: Importance

Instructions:

1. Enclosed you will find a pack of cards and five envelopes.

2. Shuffle the cards.

3. The statement on each card describes an activity that resource teachers might use in working with teachers. This time, please consider the degree to which you feel each activity is important for an effective resource teacher.

   Most Important  Important  Somewhat Important  Not Very Important  Least Important

4. Place each card in the pile that indicates your feeling about how important each activity is for an effective resource teacher. Place only the same number of cards in each pile as the number shown on each envelope. Each card should be placed in one of the five piles.

5. When you are finished sorting the cards into piles, count each pile to make sure you have only the same number of cards as shown on each envelope.

6. Insert the cards into each envelope.

7. Put the rubberband around all the envelopes together and place them back in the brown envelope marked IMPORTANCE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Communicating</th>
<th>Clarifying</th>
<th>Diagnosing</th>
<th>Identifying Strengths</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Sharing Resources</th>
<th>In-classroom Involvement</th>
<th>Theory Interpretation &amp; Application</th>
<th>Developing Curriculum</th>
<th>Extending Teachers, Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>Identifying Strengths</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>In-Classroom Involvement</td>
<td>Theory Interpretation &amp; Application</td>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>Extending, Teachers, Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5 6.5</td>
<td>2.0 1.0</td>
<td>5.0 6.5</td>
<td>9.0 9.0</td>
<td>5.0 3.5</td>
<td>7.5 2.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.5</td>
<td>5.0 10.0</td>
<td>10.0 11.0</td>
<td>11.0 6.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0 1.5</td>
<td>7.0 8.0</td>
<td>7.0 8.0</td>
<td>10.5 4.0</td>
<td>5.0 8.0</td>
<td>9.0 1.5</td>
<td>1.0 11.0</td>
<td>5.0 10.5</td>
<td>10.0 11.0</td>
<td>11.0 11.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5 4.0</td>
<td>5.0 4.0</td>
<td>2.5 9.0</td>
<td>8.0 6.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0</td>
<td>8.0 8.0</td>
<td>5.0 11.0</td>
<td>10.0 10.0</td>
<td>10.0 11.0</td>
<td>10.0 11.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0 2.0</td>
<td>3.0 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 1.0</td>
<td>4.0 6.0</td>
<td>5.0 6.0</td>
<td>7.0 3.0</td>
<td>2.0 11.0</td>
<td>10.0 10.0</td>
<td>10.0 11.0</td>
<td>11.0 11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5 8.5</td>
<td>2.0 8.5</td>
<td>8.0 8.5</td>
<td>6.0 4.0</td>
<td>8.0 8.5</td>
<td>10.5 2.0</td>
<td>1.0 8.0</td>
<td>10.0 8.5</td>
<td>10.5 11.0</td>
<td>8.5 11.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0 2.5</td>
<td>7.5 9.0</td>
<td>6.0 6.5</td>
<td>9.5 6.5</td>
<td>7.5 4.5</td>
<td>2.0 1.0</td>
<td>7.5 11.0</td>
<td>9.5 11.0</td>
<td>9.5 11.0</td>
<td>8.5 6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5 4.5</td>
<td>4.0 4.5</td>
<td>1.0 2.5</td>
<td>6.0 7.5</td>
<td>6.0 7.5</td>
<td>2.5 7.5</td>
<td>7.5 11.0</td>
<td>9.5 11.0</td>
<td>9.5 8.5</td>
<td>11.0 9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>Identifying Strengths</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>Theory Interpretation &amp; Application</td>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>Extending Teachers' Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Diagnosing</td>
<td>Identifying Strengths</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Sharing Resources</td>
<td>In-classroom Involvement</td>
<td>Theory Interpretation &amp; Application</td>
<td>Developing Curriculum</td>
<td>Extending, Teachers, Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Communicating</th>
<th>Clarifying</th>
<th>Diagnosing</th>
<th>Identifying Strengths</th>
<th>Problem Solving</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Sharing Resources</th>
<th>In-Classroom Involvement</th>
<th>Theory Interpretation &amp; Application</th>
<th>Developing Curriculum</th>
<th>Extending Teachers, Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each set of rankings is listed as follows: Usage Importance*