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ABSTRACT
The study was aimed at investigating the level of principals and teachers’ satisfaction with the delivery of school psychological services by Educational Psychologists (EPs) in Zimbabwe. This investigation was prompted by observations of trends in international school psychology surveys that indicated that EPs wished to diversify their professional functioning by reducing the amount of time they spent in assessment activities and increasing the amount of time they spend in alternative roles. Currently there is little or no public empirical data in Zimbabwe on teachers and principals satisfaction with the services they are getting from EPs. This lack of adequate research on school psychological services may be preventing EPs from providing an equitable and efficient service. Eighty (80) school principals and 160 teachers were randomly selected from a list provided by the educational psychologists working with schools in four of the country’s ten administrative provinces. Two researcher-constructed questionnaires and a semi-structured interview schedule were administered to the stakeholders.

The theory that steered this study was the gap model of service quality. The study employed a two group mixed exploratory design. Both the self-administered questionnaires and face-to-face interviews were used as a means of data collection. Interviews were conducted by the researcher from 5 to 10 January 2012. The quantitative data processing was done electronically by computer using the IBM SPSS statistics 22. Chi-Square statistics, produced results from which discussions were derived. The Chi-Square tests done between the identified groups produced results showed statistical significant differences in satisfaction between male and female educators, qualifications and teaching experience of stakeholders. The results show that generally, teachers and principals are not satisfied with the provision of the psychological services. The prevalence of dissatisfaction seems also to be fairly randomly widespread among the stakeholders. The study concludes by making some recommendations for further research and structural changes to Schools Psychological Services and Special Needs Education (SPS & SNE) Department to improve school psychological service delivery to all stakeholders.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACSI</td>
<td>American Customer satisfaction Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>Assistant Educational Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHPC</td>
<td>Allied Health Practitioners Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAM</td>
<td>Basic Education Assistance Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Educational Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPs</td>
<td>Educational Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoESAC</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Sports, Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Sc.</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Orphaned and Vulnerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>Principal Educational Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVQUAL</td>
<td>Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>School Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In Zimbabwe, Educational Psychologists (EPs) are mainly employed by the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture (MoESAC) in the Department of School Psychological Services and Special Needs Education (SPS & SNE). The Department’s primary responsibility is supporting schools in their inclusive education practices (Mpofu, Mutepfa, Chireshe, & Kasayira, 2007). The EPs provide in-service training and support in the application of applied behaviour analysis and teaching of students with disabilities (Mpofu, Zindi, Oakland, & Peresuh, 1997). The SPS and SNE department also provides a wide range of counselling services (Nyanungo, 2000). Other institutions that employ EPs are universities. The EPs are employed to teach psychology and in some cases to work as counsellors in the student support service unit.

Although the responsibilities of EPs are stipulated, there is a lack of investigation into stakeholders’ satisfaction with the services they are receiving from Educational Psychologists. To date, research done in the area of school psychology in Zimbabwe has focused on perceptions of teachers on the school psychologist’s input in schools (Kent, 1997); evaluation of school guidance and counselling services (Chireshe, 2008); perceptions of the benefits of school guidance and counselling services (Chireshe, 2011); and school guidance and counselling needs assessment (Chireshe, 2012).

What emerges from the examination of the perceptions on the role of EPs is that their work might substantially be affected by the way in which other school personnel perceive their role, and particularly how educators perceive the psychologist’s role (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004). The implication of this is that “the importance of the professional relationship between the teacher and the school
psychologist cannot be overstated” (Thielking & Jimerson, 2006, p.211). Teachers are often the primary source of student referrals for psychological services (ibid). Pressures on the role of the school psychologist may include perceptions of consumer groups, the power and influence of the school principal and special education legislation.

1.2 Background to the study

A review of available research assessing teachers and principals’ perceptions in Zimbabwe reveal that the majority of studies looked at education professionals’ attitude on inclusive education focusing on whether they have positive or negative attitudes (Chireshe, 2011; Chitiyo & Wheeler, 2004, Mushoriwa, 2001; Chimedza, 1998). This trend might have been driven by the belief that the attitude of the educator has direct influence on the successful inclusion of children with disabilities or disorders (Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992).

The majority of studies that have examined the attitudes of special education educators toward inclusion have referred to the Theory of Reasoned Action or the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). According to these theories, teacher’s beliefs and attitudes towards something are expected to provide insight about actual behaviours (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The Theory of Planned Behaviour which measures individuals’ intentions to perform behaviour has been utilized in several studies investigating issues surrounding inclusion of children with special needs into class. What is less evident is the extent to which teachers and principals’ behaviour is affected by their satisfaction with the support services they get from psychologists. The results of Guo, Xiao, and Tang (2009) study on consumer retention revealed that consumers attitudes are directly and indirectly influenced by consumer satisfaction. It is therefore vital that stakeholder satisfaction with the delivery of school psychological services be investigated.
The preceding section has discussed the background of the problem and its setting. The subsequent sections will outline the theoretical framework, present the problem statement, research questions, hypotheses, aims and objectives of the study, the significance of the study, delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, definitions of terms, and finally an outline of the thesis structure is given at the end of the chapter.

1.3 Theoretical framework for the study
This study was informed by the gap model to measure the level of stakeholders’ satisfaction with school psychological services provision in their schools. According to Strong, Ringer, and Taylor (2001), at present the gap model is the dominant view of satisfaction in marketing literature. To determine satisfaction levels using the gap analysis, an organization must determine customer satisfaction, and then assess its performance against those expectations. A gap between expectations and performance will result in dissatisfaction. Although, this gap model of satisfaction was developed primarily to explain customer satisfaction in profit making organizations, it is likely that the tenets apply to other consumer groups (Strong et al., 2001). Stakeholder satisfaction is defined as the degree to which the stakeholder perceives the expectations regarding a specific product or service to be met.

1.4 Statement of the problem
Many perception surveys done in the USA have asked school psychologists to identify both their preferred and actual service roles (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002; Curtis, Hunley, & Grier, 2002; Watkins, Crosby, & Pearson, 2001). Most of these surveys have indicated that school psychologists wish to diversify their professional functioning by reducing the amount of time they spend in assessment activities and increasing the amount of time they spend in alternative roles. There is a knowledge vacuum in that educational psychologists want to expand their scope of service provision when they do not know whether stakeholders like teachers and principals are satisfied with what they are currently getting from EPs.
Teachers and principals who are dissatisfied with the role of the school psychologist might develop negative attitudes that hinder their consumption of the beneficial services of educational psychologists. Currently there is little or no public empirical data in Zimbabwe on teachers and principals’ satisfaction with the services they are getting from educational psychologists. This lack of adequate research on school psychological services may prevent EPs from providing an equitable and efficient service. According to Turel and Serenko (2006), customer/stakeholder satisfaction measurement addresses both users and public interests and such studies can assist in economic and social development. There is therefore need to gain more understanding in the area of stakeholder satisfaction in order to provide them with services that satisfy them.

1.5 Research Questions
The current empirical study specifically sought to answer the following research questions:

1.5.1 What are the current psychological services that schools receive from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe?

1.5.2 What services are expected by the teachers and principals from the Educational Psychologists?

1.5.3 Are there significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals expect?

1.5.4 What are teachers’ and principals’ level of satisfaction with the school psychological services in Zimbabwe?
### 1.6 Hypotheses

In addition to exploring the aforementioned research questions, the study further tested the following hypotheses:

i. There is no significant difference in the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service between male and female educators.

ii. The level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the qualifications of the stakeholders are independent of each other.

iii. The level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders are independent of each other.

### 1.7 Aim and objectives of study

The aim of the study was to investigate the level of stakeholders’ satisfaction with the school psychological services they were receiving from EPs.

The objectives of the study were to establish:

1.7.1 the psychological services that schools receive from EPs in Zimbabwe.

1.7.2 the expectations of the teachers and principals in respect of the services rendered by EPs.

1.7.3 whether there are significant differences between services rendered and teachers and principals’ expectations.

1.7.4 whether teachers and principals in Zimbabwean schools are satisfied with the services they receive from EPs.

### 1.8 Significance of the study

This study will be helpful to EPs, educators, learners, parents, researchers and the MoESAC. It might serve as an assessment of the quality of service EPs are rendering to stakeholders. The measurement of stakeholder satisfaction is becoming increasingly popular because of its role in quality assurance and
continuous quality improvement systems (Guo et al., 2009). In a way this study will enable the EPs to establish how they are performing against their objectives, and to plan the next steps in development, in order to maintain quality, secure continuous improvement and aspire to excellence. EPs will have a set of criteria to benchmark their school psychological service delivery against. In addition, they will also have the information needed to make a number of decisions related to what school psychological services to provide, how these services should be provided and when to provide them. Such information will enable the EPs to be more effective in the implementation of their duties, thereby extremely benefiting all the stakeholders, particularly the learners.

Educators will receive school psychological services that address their needs. An educator who is satisfied with the services of the school psychologist will seek the psychologist’s services, and thus refer learners and parents for these services.

Learners in schools will ultimately benefit from quality service from both the EPs and educators. School psychologists and teachers will collaborate with the common goal of meeting the needs of all students.

Parents will benefit from this study in that their children will be effectively catered for in an inclusive learning environment. Their children will be catered for in the local schools to their satisfaction.

This study will add to the limited literature in Zimbabwe on the satisfaction of stakeholders with the school psychological service delivery from teachers and principals’ perspective. Furthermore, the study will provide researchers with springboard information that can be useful in future school psychological services studies, especially studies intended to meet the needs of stakeholders and improve the effectiveness of school psychological services.

This study can also be used by the MoESAC to monitor whether high quality standards are achieved and maintained in the provision of school psychological
services in schools. Policy makers and administrators will have the opportunity to base their future policies on school psychological services from the result of this study. Thus, the finding from the present stakeholder satisfaction survey on the provision of school psychological services may help in restructuring the school psychological services in Zimbabwean schools.

1.9 Delimitations of the study

The sample population selected for this study was limited to principals and teachers from schools that received service from the EPs. School principals and teachers were identified as the most prominent variables affecting the role, function and services of the school psychologist. The study was conducted in only four out of the ten administrative provinces of Zimbabwe. The four administrative provinces were Manicaland, Harare, Mashonaland West and Mashonaland East. The sample is similar in nature to the stakeholder population that receives service from EPs in the various other administrative provinces of Zimbabwe and can thus be generalized.

The focus of the study was to establish: the extent to which stakeholders are satisfied with the school psychological services in Zimbabwe; the type of psychological services the schools were receiving from EPs; the services expected from EPs by the stakeholders; and if there are significant differences between services rendered and what the stakeholders expect. The study did not investigate whether stakeholders were impressed by the attitude and personalities of individual EPs.

1.10 Assumptions of the study

The following assumptions were made:

i) Zimbabwean principals and teachers are not satisfied with the schools psychological services they receive;

ii) Stakeholders perceptions on school psychological services, whether satisfied or dissatisfied will help restructure the provision of services;
iii) School psychological services in Zimbabwe are a shadow of international trends;
iv) It is possible to provide an effective school psychological services using stakeholder survey information;
v) The study will reveal the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the stakeholders.

1.11 Definition of terms

1.11.1 Stakeholders

According to Freeman (1984), a stakeholder is an individual or group who has a vested interest in the outcome of an organisation. The group or individual can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organisation’s objectives. Bryson (2011, p. 27) proposed a more comprehensive definition for the term by stating that: “A stakeholder is defined as any person, group, or organization that can place a claim on an organization’s attention, resources, or output or is affected by that output”. In this research, the term stakeholders mean teachers and principals in schools that received services from EPs. The word stakeholder will be used interchangeably with customer and participant.

1.11.2 Educators

The South African Schools Act No. 84 of 1996 defines an educator as “any person, excluding a person who is appointed to exclusively perform extracurricular duties, who teaches, educates or trains other persons or who provides professional educational services, including professional therapy and education psychological services, at a school”.(Government of South Africa, 1996, p.4). In this study, educator is a term that will mean both teachers and school principals. The term principal will be used interchangeably with head teacher.
1.11.3 Satisfaction

Satisfaction is a judgment that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption, including levels of under-or over-fulfilment (Oliver, 1997). In this study satisfaction shall mean the teachers’ and principals’ judgment that the service provided by educational psychologists is at a level that satisfies or fulfils their school psychological service needs.

1.11.4 Dissatisfaction

When products fail to meet customer expectations, they feel discontented. Researchers have tried to conceptualize and operationalise dissatisfaction as either the opposite of satisfaction (e.g. “completely satisfied”/“completely dissatisfied” (Tsiros et al., 2004); “very satisfied”/“very dissatisfied” (Spreng et al., 1996). Dissatisfaction in this study shall mean judgment by teachers and principals that a service provided is dissatisfying or does not fulfil their expected school psychological service needs.

1.11.5 School/Educational Psychologist

The Health Professions Council Act (1974, p.8) of South Africa in the scope of practice for educational psychologists state that, “Educational psychologists are involved in assessment, diagnosis and intervention, in order to optimise functioning in the broad context of learning and development.” The term educational psychologist in this study is used interchangeably with school psychologist to refer to professionals prepared in psychology and education and who are recognized as specialists in the provision of psychological services to children and youth within the contexts of schools, families, and other settings that impact their growth and development. These professionals are employed by the MoESAC and given this title.
1.12 Structure of the research report

This empirical research report is organised into six (6) chapters. Each chapter is focused on a particular stage of the entire research process. Briefly the chapters are organised as follows:

Chapter 1

Chapter 1 discusses the context of the research; provides the statement of the problem, research questions, hypotheses, aim and objectives of the study, key concepts used in the thesis and the structure for the organization of the whole research report. The chapter serves to help the reader get a clear sense of the overall conceptualisation of the research study and purpose.

Chapter 2

Chapter 2 examines the conceptual and theoretical framework relating to stakeholder satisfaction and measuring models.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 reviews related literature and research done in the provision of psychological services in schools. The chapter covers the historical perspectives that have shaped and influenced service profession by educational psychologists in schools. The chapter is very intense and goes on to discuss some of the insights, experiences and recommendations emerging from previous researches. Throughout the literature review process an attempt to locate, justify and develop an argument for conducting this research is made.
Chapter 4

Chapter 4 details the research methodology. Described in this chapter are among other things research design, sample selection and how data were collected, and analysed. The chapter provides very useful information relating to the process of data collection, and management, research ethics and data analysis process.

Chapter 5

Chapter 5 contains the analysis and interpretation of data. The research hypotheses formulated in chapter one are explored in this section.

Chapter 6

Chapter 6 provides the summary, limitations, conclusion and recommendations of the main findings of this study.

1.13 Summary

This introductory chapter was intended to set the scene for the study. The chapter deliberated on the background of the research problem, the aim and objectives of the research, definitions of concepts, delimitations, assumptions and the research plan. The subsequent chapter discusses the conceptual and theoretical framework of this empirical research.
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the conceptualisation of stakeholder (customer) satisfaction is explained and the models used to measure the level of stakeholder satisfaction are examined. Many of the models outlined in this chapter were developed to inform research into satisfaction with private sector services and products. However, according to Osborne and Gaebler (1993, p.22) the application of the stakeholder theory in the public sector literature is in accordance with the wave of “New Public Management.” The application of this theory in public institutions should propel business-based ideas to the public sector.

2.2 Concepts of stakeholder

Jones, Wicks, and Freeman (2002), assert that many contemporary scholars acknowledge that Freeman’s book, Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach publicised the concept of stakeholder. A stakeholder in an organization is any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objective (Freeman, 1999). This definition illustrates the bi-directionality of stakeholders – they can be both affected by – and can affect – an organisation. As far as the organisation is concerned, a stakeholder does not simply exist but makes demands of it. It has been argued that such broad definitions make it possible to include even such groups as terrorists and competitors (Phillips, 1997) who could affect the firm painfully. Giese and Cote (2000), proposed that this dilemma can partly be resolved by tailoring the definition in a particular way to suit the situation.

Bryson (2011) sees, a stakeholder as any person, group, or organization that can place a claim on an organization’s attention, resources or output or is affected by that output. According to Nuseibeh and Easterbrook (2000, p.27) stakeholders are “individuals or organizations that stand to gain or lose from the success or failure of
an organisation.” Post, Preston, and Sachs (2002), define the stakeholders of a company as the “individuals and constituencies that contribute, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to its wealth-creating capacity and activities, and who are therefore its potential beneficiaries and/or risk bearers.”

The above articulated definitions show that an organisation’s stakeholders are those organisations or individuals who supply critical resources, place something of value at risk, and have sufficient power to affect its performance. For example, a company’s competitors are not considered stakeholders when they are competing for resources and markets but may be considered as such when they have common interests and may gain or lose status and wealth as a result of competitors’ action. Phillips (2004) notes that competitors can certainly affect an organization and should therefore be considered legitimate stakeholders, but the organization and its managers have no moral obligation to attend to their well-being. Consequently, people who are impacted by or have an impact on the organisation are stakeholders and their perspectives need to be taken into account in order for an organisation to be successful (Clarkson, 1995).

Stakeholders can be divided into internal claimants and external claimants (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003; Susnienė & Vanagas, 2007). Cheng and Tam (1997), identified both internal and external stakeholders in the quality management process of education. They categorised current students and academic staff as internal constituents in the quality management process whereas employers, government funding bodies, institutional management, prospective students or professional bodies are external claimants. On the other hand, Gomes (2006) states that stakeholders could be classified as primary or secondary. Primary stakeholders are those who have formal and economic relationships with the organization. Secondary stakeholders are those agents not directly related to the organization despite being able to influence and being influenced by its operation and outcomes.

Modern quality management proponents reckon that there are many stakeholders, especially when dealing with service providers such as education institutions
(Lagrosen, Seyed-Hashemi, & Leitner, 2004; Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003). Some studies use the term customer and others prefer the term stakeholder (Lagrosen et al., 2004). Lagrosen et al. (ibid) suggest the use of the term stakeholder instead of customer when discussing quality in higher education as this term is less controversial. In the current research, the term stakeholder is used because it is less controversial and the services from school psychologists in Zimbabwe are in education institutions that are mainly government-funded.

In education, the term stakeholder would usually refer to anyone who has vested interest in the welfare and success of a school and its students, including administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders, and elected officials such as school board members, councillors, and state representatives. Stakeholders may also be collective entities, such as local businesses, organizations, advocacy groups, committees, media outlets, and cultural institutions, in addition to organizations that represent specific groups, such as teachers unions, parent-teacher organizations, and associations representing superintendents, principals, school boards, or teachers in specific academic disciplines (http://edglossary.org/stakeholder/, 2015)

The definitions examined in this chapter concur that stakeholders can be individuals, a group, or organization that affect or are affected by the operations of the establishment. The term stakeholders is, however, employed throughout this thesis to refer to school principals and teachers working in schools that work with school psychologists. The emphasis is on the satisfaction of these stakeholders with the services they receive from the school psychologists.

The teachers and principals are individuals who stand to gain or lose from the success or failure of the provision of psychological services given by educational psychologists. In other words, they have a stake in the provision of psychological services in their schools. The selection of these two from a range of stakeholders stems from Alkhafaji (1989) proposal that only those groups that have a vested interest in the survival of the organisation can be referred to as stakeholders. Chen (2009), indicates that stakeholder theory suggests that, for organizations to be
effective, they need to manage stakeholder relationships that are important. The stakeholders are likely to have different definitions of quality as well as different preferences for how quality is assessed (Cheng & Tam, 1997). Certainly the relationship between school psychologists and teachers and principals is important and should be managed efficiently.

Understanding the theoretical framework of satisfaction is important. The sections that follow, therefore, will focus on the various theories that explain how satisfaction is perceived and handled by stakeholders. The theoretical framework informing this study will also be stated.

2.3  **Stakeholder (Customer) satisfaction theories**

In order to understand customer satisfaction effectively, one need to be familiar with what constitutes customer and satisfaction. Customers are those individuals or organizations who utilize the goods or services provided by companies or organizations (Solomon, Polegato, & Zaichkowsky, 2009). Consequently, a customer is a stakeholder of an organization who might provide payment in exchange for the goods or services provided to him by the organization with the aim of fulfilling a need and to maximize satisfaction. Sometimes the term customer and consumer are confusingly used interchangeably. A customer can be a consumer, but a consumer may not necessarily be a customer. Solomon et al. (2009) explained this difference simply as: A customer is the person who does the buying of the products/services and the consumer being the person who ultimately consumes or utilizes the product/service. This analysis is important in the case of teachers and principals in schools. The teachers and principals refer students to EPs for assessment. The teachers and principals are the customers and students are the consumers of the services.

Praprotnik and Ambroz (2008), propose that stakeholder satisfaction is an organisation’s ability to attract and retain stakeholders and improve stakeholder relationship over time. Angelova and Zekiri (2011), considers satisfaction as an overall stakeholder attitude towards a service provider or an emotional reaction by
stakeholder to an experience with a product or service. Kotler and Keller (2009), assert that a stakeholder is satisfied whenever his or her needs, real or perceived, are met or exceeded. Satisfaction is a person’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment that result from comparing a service or product’s perceived performance or outcome with their expectations (ibid). Stakeholder satisfaction is thus defined as the state of mind that stakeholders have about an institution and its products or services; whether their expectations have been met or exceeded. In other words, when a stakeholder is contented with either the product or services, it is termed satisfaction.

Satisfaction is an overall psychological state that reflects the evaluation of a relationship between the customer/stakeholder and a company-environment-product-service. It involves the following three psychological elements: cognitive (thinking/evaluation), affective (emotional/feeling), and behavioural (Oliver, 1997; Yi & Zeithaml, 1990). The cognitive component refers to a customer’s evaluation of the perceived performance in terms of its adequacy in comparison with some kind of expectation standards. The emotional component consists of various emotions such as happiness, joy, and disappointment (Oliver, 1997; Yi & Zeithaml, 1990). Basically, satisfaction could be the pleasure derived by someone from the consumption of goods or services offered by another person or group of people; or it can be the state of being happy with a situation. Satisfaction varies from one person to another according to its utility.

A positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intention has received significant attention in literature and is well established (Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Oliver, 1997; Yi & Zeithaml, 1990). The logic is underlined in the exit–voice theory (Hirschman, 1970b), which assumes that dissatisfied customers have the option of never use the services of the provider again and seeking the services of another organisation. A satisfied customer’s experience with a service organisation could motivate the customer to patronise the organisation again (Lam, Shankar, Erramilli, & Murthy, 2004). These observations suggest that overall customer satisfaction with a service is strongly associated with the intention to return to the same service provider. This type of behaviour in the provision of school
psychology can mean different things: firstly, stakeholder problem could have been solved. Secondly, the stakeholder might just quit for other reasons. Finally, the stakeholder might indeed have been dissatisfied with the service rendered. It is also regarded that positive teacher attitudes are developed through the availability of appropriate support provisions in inclusive settings. Thus, to know what is exactly affecting the utilization of school psychology satisfaction surveys are appropriate.

After analysing the existing definitions of stakeholder satisfaction, two basic courses of definitions can be recognized: stakeholder satisfaction as an outcome, and stakeholder satisfaction as a process. Some definitions assume that stakeholder satisfaction is simply an outcome resulting from the consumption experience. In this line of opinion, Angelova and Zekiri (2011) explain that it is the summation of the psychological state, resulting when the emotions surrounding disconfirmed expectations are coupled with the stakeholder’s prior feeling on consumption experiences. Advocates of the notion that stakeholder satisfaction is a process state that it is a process linked to the response of stakeholder towards the assessment of the perceived discrepancy between prior expectations and the actual performance of the product/service, as perceived after its consumption.

While the literature contains significant differences in the definition of satisfaction, all the definitions share some common elements (Giese & Cote, 2000). Perusals of the various definitions of satisfaction show three general components: Stakeholder satisfaction is a response (emotional or cognitive); the response pertains to a particular focus (expectations, product/service, consumption experience); and, the response occurs at a particular time (after consumption, after choice, based on accumulated experience) (Khaksar, Nawaser, Mirdamadi, Gashti, & Jahanshahi, 2011).

The fact that stakeholder satisfaction is hardly a universal category (Praprotnik & Ambroz, 2008) has likewise generated several models because its meaning is based on circumstances and different points of view and is the outcome of individual stakeholder judgment (ibid). The few theories discussed in the
subsequent sections foretell the multiplicity of the different views held on stakeholder satisfaction. The ensuing section discusses equity theory.

### 2.4 Equity theory

Equity theory focuses on the motivational and cognitive processes of weighing sacrifices or investments (justice inputs) against rewards (justice outputs), and comparing the result with others experiencing similar situations (Laufer, 2002). According to the equity theory, individuals are concerned not only with the absolute level of outcomes, but also with fairness of outcomes for both parties involved in transactions (Lache & Trifu, 2011). When inequity within an exchange is noted, the parties engage in activities that reduce tension, or the party at a comparatively disadvantaged position may choose to leave the relationship. For example, service users may choose to recover their loss by asking for monetary compensation or they may leave the exchange relationship by not choosing the particular provider for future services or even switching to the provider’s competitors.

Inferring from equity theory, in the case of school psychological services, teachers and principals might evaluate their inputs and outcomes and compare them to the perceived inputs and outcomes of the psychologists in an effort to assess the equity of the transaction. They cannot ask for monetary compensation if they are dissatisfied but might stop referring learners or consulting the psychologist. Hence there is need to establish the types of psychological services the schools are receiving from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe and ascertain whether principals and teachers see equity in their transaction.

### 2.5 Attribution theory

Attribution theory arises in a situation where products or services fail to meet stakeholder expectations and the stakeholder searches for causes of events, which are either buyer-related or seller-related. Buyer and seller may infer different reasons for failure leading to conflict which results in dissatisfaction. Studies of attribution in stakeholder post-purchase behaviour have shown a significant
influence of attribution on complaints, redress-seeking, word of mouth activity, and expectations of change, satisfaction and future intentions (Laufer, 2002).

Proponents of attribution theory (Tsiros, Mittal, & Ross Jr, 2004) utilize three causal dimensions of attribution: stability, locus of control and controllability to explain how a stakeholder attributes satisfaction. The three dimensions are explained below.

2.5.1. Stability

This dimension signals whether the same problem can be expected in future or whether the event was perceived as a coincidence and not likely to recur in the future. This dimension therefore indicates whether the cause of the event is perceived as temporary or permanent. For instance, in the case of the provision of psychological services to the schools, do the principal and teachers see the failure of school psychologists to deliver service to schools, as a perpetual practice of the EPs?

2.5.2. Locus of Control

This dimension attributes outcomes to either something within the person or to some outside agent such as the employer (government) or education administrators in a stakeholder behaviour setting. A number of studies have found that the greater the degree of external attribution the more stakeholders complain. For instance, when a product failure is organisation-related, stakeholders feel that they deserve a refund and an apology (Folkes, 1984). Stakeholders may also experience anger towards the organisation and generate negative word of mouth behaviour (ibid). On the other hand, the greater the number of self-attributions, the more likely stakeholders will do nothing when dissatisfied (Oliver, 1997).

The issue of who or what the principals and teachers blame when the psychologist's work yield dissatisfying results, seem to have received little or no research in Zimbabwe. The current research study looks into the services that are expected by the teachers and principals from the school psychologists and to whom these stakeholders assign blame for not getting satisfying services.
2.5.3. Controllability

This dimension reflects the power available to the stakeholder or other parties such as the government or EP in the situation to alter the result. The issue is whether any of the actors has control over the variables that caused the situation to occur. If stakeholders attribute a disappointing service experience to an external uncontrollable cause, they will probably assign less blame to other entities such as the government or EP. However, when failures are viewed as controllable, blame is targeted to the perceived entity that had control. For instance, Folkes (1984) found that when product failure is under the control of the firm, stakeholders feel angry and a desire to hurt the organisation's business. To some extent, principals and teachers do not have as much choice in the provision of public school psychological service in comparison to most goods and services rendered by the private sector. It is thus important to find out to whom these stakeholders apportion their dissatisfaction if any.

The subsequent sections discuss the theoretical framework that informs this study.

2.6 Theoretical framework

2.6.1 Expectancy disconfirmation model

The contemporary leading view of satisfaction in the marketing literature is referred to as the gap model (Strong et al., 2001) or expectancy disconfirmation theory. According to the disconfirmation theory, the level of satisfaction (and also dissatisfaction) is a function of pre-consumption expectations and disconfirmation of expectations (Kotler & Keller, 2009). Whereas positive disconfirmation of expectations contributes to satisfaction, negative disconfirmation of expectations contributes to dissatisfaction. To determine satisfaction levels using a gap analysis, the organisation must determine customer expectations, and then assess its performance against those expectations. A gap between expectations and performance will result in dissatisfaction (Strong et al., 2001). Stakeholder satisfaction is therefore defined as the difference between the stakeholder's
perceptions of the experience and his or her expectations, which are many times based on past experience.

In general, stakeholder satisfaction is multifaceted and is considered a part of overall stakeholder behaviour model (Johansson, Milne, & Brooks, 2002). Several key factors that greatly influence satisfaction include stakeholder’s expectations, attitudes, and intention about the service provided (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Expectations are the stakeholder’s anticipated beliefs about a product or service prior to the interaction (Rozario & Abdullah, 2009). Attitudes consist of the stakeholder’s evaluations, emotional feelings, and action tendencies toward a product or service that has developed over time (Bolton & Lemon, 1999). Intentions are the decisions the stakeholder makes about future actions toward the organisation producing the product or service. Together, these factors influence the future behaviour or the actual future action taken by the stakeholder. For the most part, these factors are intangible so it is the perceived performance rather than the actual performance that is more critical to stakeholder satisfaction.

A highly satisfied stakeholder will be very likely to provide repeat business and spread the positive experience by word of mouth (advertising), resulting in increased usage/revenues and profitability (Nordman, 2004). Equally, a dissatisfied stakeholder will most likely not provide repeat business and will be more than willing to share his or her bad experience with whoever will listen (demarketing)(ibid).

The constructs defined in the gap model of satisfaction as described in the marketing literature are used in the present research to investigate principals and teachers satisfaction with school psychological services. Strong et al. (2001) are of the view that even though the gap model of satisfaction was developed primarily within marketing to explain stakeholder satisfaction in private enterprise, it is likely that the relationship apply to other stakeholder groups. The gap model provides one important set of measures of organizational performance. It encompasses the experiences and perceptions of groups of stakeholders who have vested interests in the services delivered by the organisation –employees, strategic partners, and special-interest groups (Johansson et al., 2002).
The expectancy-disconfirmation theory which suggests that individuals — when forming judgments about services — already possess a set of expectations with respect to the characteristics or benefits the service will provide formed the basis of measuring stakeholders satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the provision of school psychological services. Expectations are the stakeholders’ predictions or anticipations of the performance of the service rendered by EPs. Upon experiencing the actual performance of the service, the expectations then serve as a comparative reference for the formation of satisfaction judgments (Oliver, 1997). The discrepancy or gap between prior expectations and actual performance has been termed expectancy disconfirmation. This disconfirmation can be either positive or negative. Disconfirmation suggests that when experiences fall short of expectations, the satisfaction will be lower — i.e. a disappointment effect. When experiences exceed expectations, expectations exert a positive influence on satisfaction — i.e. a surprise effect (Strong et al., 2001).

In the case of the current research, teachers and principals’ level of satisfaction is vital to the positive portrayal of school psychologists’ work in schools and the community. The subsequent sections discuss how stakeholder satisfaction is measured.

2.6.2 Measuring stakeholder satisfaction

Stakeholder satisfaction is the state of mind that stakeholders have about a service whether their expectations have been met or exceeded over the lifetime of the service. The achievement of stakeholder satisfaction leads to institutional loyalty and service repurchase (Angelova & Zekiri, 2011). The implications of this definition are that: i) since customer satisfaction is a subjective, non-quantitative state, measurement will not be exact and will require sampling and statistical analysis. ii) Stakeholder satisfaction measurement must be undertaken with an understanding of the gap between customer expectations and attribute performance perceptions.
2.6.3 American customer satisfaction index

There are various instruments that are used to measure customer satisfaction, and the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) is one of them. The ACSI is an economic indicator that measures the satisfaction of consumers across the U.S. economy (Anderson, Cha, Bryant, Fornell, & Johnson, 1996). The ACSI model was established during the mid-1990s by US service marketing researchers. It has served as the basis for other CSI models developed in many countries around the world (Robinson, 1999). The ACSI model is composed of six factors, viz.: perceived quality, customer expectations, perceived value, overall customer satisfaction, customer complaints, and customer loyalty. Each factor is linked to the others through a causal relationship. This is to say, the higher the perceived quality; the higher the customer expectations and the higher the perceived quality, then the higher the perceived value, which finally results in higher customer satisfaction. Likewise, a high level of customer satisfaction tends to reduce customer complaints and increase customer loyalty.

The ACSI is based on the expectancy disconfirmation theory (Tang, 2009). In the model Customer Expectations are a measure of the customer's anticipation of the quality of a company's products or services. These represent both prior consumption experience, such as advertising and word-of-mouth, and a forecast of the company's ability to deliver quality in the future. Perceived Quality is a measure of the customer's evaluation through recent consumption experience of the quality of a company's products or services. Perceived Value is a measure of quality relative to the price paid. Although price is often very important to the customer's first purchase, it usually has a somewhat smaller impact on satisfaction for repeat purchases (Angelova & Zekiri, 2011). Customer Complaints are measured as a percentage of respondents who indicate they have complained to a company directly about a product or service within a specified time frame. Satisfaction has a negative relationship with customer complaints, as the more satisfied the customers, the less likely they are to complain. Customer Loyalty is a combination of the customer's professed likelihood to repurchase from the same supplier in the
future, and the likelihood to purchase a company’s products or services at various price points (Angelova & Zekiri, 2011; Neal, 1999).

The ACSI Index was widely commented after its creation and it was also tested and applied in many empirical studies (Anderson, Bryant, Cha, Fornell, & Johnson, 1996). The ACSI concepts of customer expectations, perceived quality, and customer loyalty were incorporated in the research instrument of this empirical research study.

2.6.4 Kano model

The Kano model is a theory of product development and customer satisfaction developed in the 80's by Professor Noriaki Kano (Hu, Cheng, Chiu, & Hong, 2011). The Kano Model of Customer (Consumer) Satisfaction classifies product/service attributes based on how they are perceived by customers and their effect on customer satisfaction. These classifications are useful for guiding design decisions in that they indicate when good is good enough, and when more is better.

The Kano Model of Customer satisfaction divides product attributes into three categories, namely: dissatisfiers, satisfiers, and exciters.

Dissatisfiers: These are product/service elements that a customer expects to see or experiences with a product/service. They are deemed essential and can be categorised as elements that are barely needed with the product/service. These features, if not present, make a customer dissatisfied.

Satisfiers: These are product/service elements that a customer indicates that they want. They are add ons that the customer knows are possible. These features, if not present, do not necessarily make a customer dissatisfied. However, if present they make a customer satisfied.

Exciters/delighters: These are new product/service elements or features that a customer does not expect.
A competitive product/service meets basic attributes, maximises performance attributes, and includes as many “excitement” attributes as possible at a cost the market can bear.

Many consider meeting customer expectations as the minimum requirement for staying in business (Evans & Lindsay, 2005). However, to create loyal customers one needs to go beyond customer expectations. The Kano model shows us that providing satisfiers enable businesses to stay afloat but providing exciters makes one a trendsetter and a leader. In other words, to succeed in meeting or exceeding customer requirements, one must find out what the dissatisfiers, satisfiers and exciters are of a product or service. In the provision of psychological services to schools, are dissatisfiers, satisfiers and exciters available? This research study digs into whether principals and teachers notice these in the services they are getting from school psychologists.

### 2.6.5 Service quality

Service quality (SERVQUAL) is based on the proposition that service quality can be measured as the gap between what the service stakeholders expect and the performance they perceive to have received, and has been widely adopted for explaining stakeholders’ perception of service quality (Ravichandran, Prabhakaran & Kumar, 2010). Originally 10 dimensions of service quality were proposed (reliability, responsiveness, competence, access, courtesy, communication, credibility, security, understanding the stakeholders, and tangibles). Later these were reduced to five, namely, reliability, responsiveness, empathy, assurances and tangibles (Ravichandran, et al. 2010: Yen-Lun Su, 2001). Reliability refers to an organization’s ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately; responsiveness refers to employees willingness to help stakeholders and to provide prompt services; empathy refers to employees willingness to provide individualized attention to stakeholders; assurance refers to employees knowledge and their ability to convey trust and confidence; and finally, tangibles refers to an organization’s physical environment such as facilities, equipment, and
communication materials. Each dimension is measured with four to five items. The model is a useful management tool since it aims to identify the gaps between stakeholders’ expectations and customers’ perceptions of the services.

The model gives rise to the proposition that the gap (G) for a particular service quality factor is: \( G = P(\text{erceptions}) - E(\text{xpectations}) \). A negative gap implies that customer expectations are not being met and the larger the gap, the larger the gulf between what the stakeholders want and what they actually receive.

Service quality, as perceived by stakeholders, stems from a comparison of what they feel service providers should offer with their perceptions of the performance of service provided by service providers (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Respondents might rate their expectations of service from an excellent organization, and then rate the performance they perceive they received from a specific organization. Service quality is calculated as the difference in the two scores where better service quality results in a smaller gap (Landrum, Prybutok, Kappelman, & Zhang, 2008).

According to Parasuraman et al. (1988), stakeholders’ perceptions of service quality are influenced by five “gaps”: Gap 1 represents the difference between stakeholder expectations and management perceptions of stakeholder expectations. Gap 2 is the difference between management perceptions of stakeholder expectations and the translation of these perceptions into service-quality specifications. Gap 3 is the difference between the service actually delivered by frontline service personnel on a day-to-day basis and the specifications set by management. Gap 4 represents the difference between service delivery and what is promised in external communications to stakeholders. Gap 5 is the difference between stakeholder expectations and perceptions.

Gap 5 is influenced by Gaps 1-4, which are all within the control of an organisation and therefore need to be analysed to identify any changes that should be implemented to reduce or eliminate Gap 5 (Ladhari, 2009). Parasuraman et al. (1988), argue that such gap analyses are vital for identification of discrepancies.
between the provider’s perceptions of service-quality dimensions and the stakeholders’ perceptions of those dimensions.

The SERVQUAL model provides the basis for the measurement of stakeholder satisfaction with a product or service by assessing and comparing both perceptions and expectations across a range of different service characteristics. Therefore, the SERVQUAL model components cannot be avoided from stakeholder satisfaction analysis. The construction of the School Psychology Satisfaction Survey (SPSS) in the present research study though based on what was constructed by Gilman and Gabriel (2004), included elements from the SERVQUAL, ACSI and KANO models. (See Table 3 in Chapter 4, p.61).

Chakraborty and Majumdar (2011), summarized seven benefits of SERVQUAL approach in measuring client satisfaction as follows: It is good at eliciting the views of stakeholders regarding service encounters e.g. stakeholder relative importance, expectations and satisfaction. It is able to alert EPs to consider the perception of both EPs and stakeholders. Addressing the service gaps can serve as a basis for formulating strategies and tactics in order to ensure the fulfilment of expectations. SERVQUAL is able to identify specific areas of excellence and weaknesses. It is able to prioritize areas of service weaknesses. It provides benchmarking analysis for organizations in the same industry. SERVQUAL can trace the trend of customers’ relative importance, expectations and perceptions, if applied periodically (Chakraborty & Majumdar, 2011). Based on the articulated strength of SERVQUAL, it was considered important to include its concepts in the research instrument of the current study.

2.7 Significance of measuring stakeholder satisfaction

Stakeholder satisfaction measure is the leading criterion for determining the quality delivered to stakeholders through the product or service and the accompanying services (Vavra, 1997). Offering high quality service and thereby improving stakeholder satisfaction was identified as the most important challenge facing businesses in the 1990s (Barsky & Labagh, 1992). Rozario and Abdullah (2009),
reported that quality determines a stakeholder’s satisfaction. They further state that “the standards of service are defined by customers who have experienced that service and used their experience and feelings to form a judgment” (p. 185).

Stakeholders’ satisfaction measurement can lead to knowing what stakeholders want, understanding stakeholders’ expectations, designing services to meet stakeholders’ needs, setting service standards, setting performance measurement indicators, empowering staff to meet stakeholders’ needs, and communicating service and quality standards to stakeholders (Dervitsiotis, 2003).

At the broadest level, the current stakeholder research aims to provide educational psychologists with answers to questions such as: How well do the types and quality of services delivered match stakeholder needs and expectations?

The notion of “paying attention to key stakeholder relationships” (Freeman, 1999, p235) is a major theme in the strategic management literature. However, absent from much of the stakeholder management literature is research on stakeholder satisfaction with non-profit organisations such as service institutions like Schools Psychological Services, hence, the significance of this empirical research study.

2.8 Summary

In this chapter it has been noted that the theory of stakeholder satisfaction applicable to the provision of school psychological services is the gap model. Stakeholders can influence organisations because all stakeholders justifiably expect that the organisation will attempt to satisfy their particular demands. A traditional definition of stakeholder satisfaction follows the paradigm that stakeholder satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the result of interaction between the stakeholder’s pre-purchase expectations and post-purchase evaluation. Measuring stakeholder satisfaction is an integral part of the effort to improve a product or service quality, resulting in an institution’s competitive advantages.

The next chapter reviews literature relevant to the current empirical study.
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

The primary aim of this chapter is to review literature relevant to the research problem. The chapter begins by describing who the school psychologist is and the range of activities that make up the school psychologists’ job. Secondly, it explores the stakeholder population of school psychology. Thirdly, it discusses the context of school psychology in Zimbabwe and the global trend in the practice of school psychology. Lastly, studies exploring stakeholder perceptions and satisfaction are discussed with a specific focus on the psychological services schools receive from school psychologists.

3.2 Who is the School Psychologist?

According to the Connecticut State Department of Education (2004), the reform movements involving compulsory schooling, juvenile courts, child labour laws, mental health, vocational guidance, and the growth of institutions serving children were among those forces responsible for the emergence of school psychological services in the USA. Fagan and Wise (2002, p.20) referred to these early years (1890-1969) of school psychology as the "hybrid years", stating that during this time, "school psychology was a blend of many kinds of educational and psychological practitioners loosely mobilized around a dominant role of psycho-educational assessment for special class placement". Many early school psychologists began as teachers and guidance counsellors who added specialties to their certification.

Accordingly, a school psychologist is a professional psychological practitioner whose general purpose is to bring a psychological perspective to bear on the problems of educators and the clients educators serve in schools (Bardon & Bennett, 1974 ; Fagan & Wise, 1994). Fagan and Wise (2002) further state that a
professional psychological practitioner has a broad base of training in educational and psychological foundations as well as specialty preparation, in the provision of comprehensive psychological services of a direct and indirect nature.

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 2002), defines school psychologists in terms of its policies and standards. According to NASP,

A School Psychologist is a professional psychologist who has met all requirements for credentialing as stipulated in the appropriate NASP standards. The credential is based upon the completion of a school psychology training program which meets the criteria specified in the Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology (NASP, 2002, p.33).

In summary, the definitions presented in this section imply that school psychologists are trained to provide a range of psychological services that meet the criteria of their national associations. The issue that is undetermined is whether after going through such training school psychologists in Zimbabwe execute these psychological services to the satisfaction of the stakeholders.

The subsequent section presents the functions of the school psychologist.

### 3.2.1 Functions of the School Psychologist

According to Thielking and Jimerson (2006), “school psychologists have a unique and multifaceted role within schools and must work with a variety of stakeholders.” (p.211). In their Australian study, Thielking and Jimerson (2006) found that the teachers, principals, and school psychologists shared similar perspectives regarding the role of school psychologist in schools. They all believe that school psychologists should: (a) conduct research on issues relevant to the school, (b) be up-to-date on relevant research, (c) conduct psychological assessments, (d) provide counselling to students, (e) organise group programmes for students, (f) organise workshops and provide information to teachers on issues of students welfare and (g) inform primary students’ parents of their child’s participation in
counselling. However, this research did not look at whether the three groups were satisfied with how these roles were being executed.

The National Association of School Psychologists (2010) states that school psychologists provide a range of services to their clients. These consist of direct and indirect services which require the involvement with the entire educational system: (a) the students, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel; (b) the families, surrogate caretakers, and other community and regional agencies, and resources which support the educational process; (c) the organizational, physical, temporal, and curricular variables which play major roles within the system; and (d) a variety of other factors which may be important on an individual basis.

The intent of these services is to promote mental health and facilitate learning. Comprehensive school psychological services consist of diverse activities. These activities complement one another and therefore are most accurately viewed as being integrated and coordinated rather than discrete services. Lacayo, Sherwood, and Morris (1981) developed a school psychologist activity list, which contained the following 13 items: 1. Psychological-educational assessment; 2. Reviewing referrals, writing cases, other office duties; 3. Lunch, inactive, or personal time; 4. Consultation with teachers; 5. Consultation with other school staff; 6. Staff meeting or case conference; 7. Consultation with parents; 8. Driving from one educational facility to another; 9. Individual counselling; 10. Attending workshops or in-service training; 11. Giving workshops or in-service training; 12. Research or programme evaluation; and 13. Group counselling.

Lacayo et al. (1981), presented this activity list in questionnaire form to 750 members of the NASP from 1978-1979. These activities were rank-ordered by school psychologists in terms of frequency.

Lacayo et al. (1981), found that assessment, inclusive of test-giving, protocol-scoring, and report-writing, took 40% of the psychologist's day. Consultation, including contact with parents and teachers, took 33% of the day. One half-hour per day was spent in counselling, with 80% being conducted with individuals instead of
groups. Time engaged in research and programme evaluation was little more than one half-hour per week. In a similar national survey, Smith (1984) revealed that an average of 54% of psychologist’s time was spent in assessment. This same study showed intervention accounted for 23%, consultation for 19%, and research for only 1% of school psychologists’ time. This ranking of activities from assessment, intervention and consultation to research appeared consistent between male and female psychologists and across regions (based on NASP membership regions) of the country.

In view of the continuous changes in the practice of school psychology, the emphasis placed by the previous generation of school psychologists on testing for deficits followed by categorization and placement is slowly fading into obsolescence and evolving into a new paradigm whereby school psychologists apply a comprehensive range of assessment and intervention skills at every level of the system (Jimerson, Skokut, Cardenas, Malone, & Stewart, 2008). Jimerson, Oakland, and Farrell (2006) contend that modern assessment and intervention techniques and the practice of school psychology in general, are characterized by the following: an emphasis on consultation, functional behavioural assessment, curriculum-based measurement and ecological assessment of learner/environment systems applied to the design of instructional, social, emotional and behavioural interventions; a focus on service outcomes, accountability and data-based decision making that links assessment directly to intervention; a data-based problem-solving orientation emphasizing empirically-supported interventions; a focus on wellness and health, prevention, counselling and building competencies with a concomitant de-emphasis on pathology, deficits and labelling; and a systemic orientation characterized by the provision of a comprehensive, integrated programme of school psychological services to all learners, their families and those who serve them.

The specialty of school psychology has been characterized as one that collectively provides individual assessment of children who may display cognitive, emotional, social, or behavioural difficulties; develops and implements primary and secondary intervention programs; consults with teachers, parents and other relevant
professionals; engages in programme development and evaluation; conducts research; and helps prepare and supervise others (Jimerson et al., 2006). Those who provide these services use a variety of titles throughout the world, including counsellor, educational psychologist and professional of educational psychology, psycho-pedagogy, and psychologist in education, psychologist in the schools, or school psychologist (Jimerson et al., 2008).

In the current research study, educational psychologist and school psychologist are used interchangeably even though “the term educational psychologist, not school psychologist, is used in Zimbabwe” (Mpofu et al., 2007, p.437).

3.2.2 The stakeholder population of school psychologists

According to the National Association of School Psychologists (2010) school psychologists provide services and interventions to all students in the school system by following a primary prevention, intervention and post-intervention service-delivery model. School psychologists are there to enhance the ability of all students to have opportunities for success in school, develop the skills to perform well in school, and receive recognition for their efforts (ibid).

The National Association of School Psychologists (1994) considers the school psychologists stakeholders to comprise (a) the students, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel; (b) the families, surrogate caretakers, and other community and regional agencies, and government. In Zimbabwe, according to Mpofu et al. (2007), the stakeholder pool includes students, parents, and educators, other health service providers such as remedial teachers, rehabilitation specialists (physical and occupational therapists), social workers, physicians, audiologists and speech therapists. The stakeholders also include governmental and non-governmental organisations interested in the welfare of children.

This breadth of service-delivery is the key contribution of school psychologists to the various stakeholders. What is not empirically informed is whether these
stakeholders are satisfied with the provision of these services. The following section looks at the context of educational psychology in Zimbabwe.

3.3 The context of school psychology in Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe is located in the south-central region of Africa, and its economy is mostly rural agricultural, although manufacturing and mining are increasingly becoming significant. The country has a population of approximately 13 million, of which 80 percent is rural, black African (Ministry of Education, 2013). Most Zimbabweans (about 80 percent) are Shona-speaking. Minority cultural groups in Zimbabwe include the Ndebele/Nguni, Venda, Tonga, Asian, and Whites (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002; Mpofu et al., 2007).

The Zimbabwean national literacy rate of 90 percent is one of the highest in the world (Mpofu et al., 2007; UNICEF, 2000). About 3.95 million children (90 percent of the total school-age population) attend school in Zimbabwe (Ministry of Education, 2013). Of these, according to MoESAC (ibid), 1.14 million were classified orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC). The OVC are on the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) of the Enhanced Social Protection Programme. The BEAM scheme provides financial support to vulnerable children through a basic education package that covers levies tuition and examination fees for deprived children.

Prior to 1980, the Government of Zimbabwe had no national policy on Special Needs Education (SNE) (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002; Mutepfa, Mpofu, & Chataika, 2007). Since there was no policy then, the MoESAC's involvement in the education of people with disabilities was very minimal. There were some initiatives towards SNE but these initiatives were not always coordinated by government. The systems operated from a moral and religious obligation, churches and other charitable organisations provided for the education of children with disabilities (Mutepfa et al., 2007). There were services for these children at only 20 special schools (Jonsson, 1982). The offerings of most of these schools centred on practical skills training in subjects like domestic sciences (cookery/food and nutrition; and fashion and fabrics/sewing), basketry and carpentry/woodwork (Peresuh & Barcham, 1998). Not
only was there no coordination of special education provision at national level, there was also a shortage of specialist teachers (Peresuh, 2009). According to Peresuh (ibid), the few who were trained had received their training abroad in the West, in places like the University of Manchester. The result was that special education provision was developed on the basis of Western models. This trend still persists through the training models of specialist teachers and educational psychologists who are trained using books written in the West. Psychologists use Western developed psychological tests with little or no adaptations (Peresuh, 2009; Zindi, 2007). At Zimbabwe's independence in 1980, national educational provision was directed towards primary education for all. This initiative was used as a guiding instrument in developing special education. The objective was to secure equal education opportunities for children with disabilities. Enrolments of children with disabilities rose from 2,000 in 1979 to 4,000 in 1980 (Samkange, 1987) and to 10,749 in 1994 (Peresuh, 2000). The resultant increases in the number of children with disabilities in schools surely presented problems to the education system that required school psychologists input.

The structure of psychological services in Zimbabwe is considered in the next section.

### 3.3.1 Service structure of psychological services in Zimbabwe

The SPS and SNE department has the primary responsibility for supporting schools in their inclusive education practices (Mpofu et al., 2007). It provides in-service training and support in the application of applied behaviour analysis and teaching of students with disabilities. The SPS and SNE department also provides a wide range of counselling services (Mpofu & Nyanungo, 1998). The development of school psychology in Zimbabwe is traced to 1971 from when psychology as a profession was regulated by law (Mpofu et al., 2007). At its inception, during the British colonial period, school psychological services catered for White, Asian/Indian, and mixed race (Coloured) students only (Mpofu & Nyanungo, 1998). This changed after national independence from colonial rule in 1980 when school segregation was abolished, and school psychological services were extended to Black students.
According to the service brochure distributed by the Ministry of Education, Sport, Art and Culture (MoESAC) to schools, the Schools Psychological Services and Special Needs Education (SPS and SNE) section is part of MoESAC. The section is represented at Head Office, Regional and District levels of the Ministry. The main purpose of the section is to support school based programmes targeting the pastoral needs of all learners (MoESAC service brochure, undated)

The brochure lists the following as the four main functions of SPS and SNE in Zimbabwe:

- To advise on and support the implementation of policies towards the enhancement of psychological well-being of learners at all levels of the educational system.
- To promote school based programmes for the benefit of all learners including those with special needs.
- To conduct relevant research and disseminate findings for the benefit of the education sector and general public.
- To collaborate with all the other section of the Ministry and other governmental, non-governmental and community organisations/ agencies towards the provision and enhancement of education for all.

The staff composition of the SPS and SNE section is outlined as follows: Educational Psychologists, Speech and Language Therapists, Education Officers for Guidance and Counselling, Educational Audiologists (Hearing Tests and Advice), Education Officers responsible for programmes for learners with special needs related to – hearing impairment, visual impairment, intellectual disabilities, and physical disabilities. Learning support services officers (Remedial tutors) at each District Office. A sketch service structure of the department is presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Service structure of school psychological services in Zimbabwe

The operations of the system are as follows: schools refer learners who need psychological services to the remedial tutors at District offices. The remedial tutors will analyse the referrals and attend to those with academic performance problems by administering academic achievement diagnostic tests. They will only make further referral to the EPs after implementing remedial interventions with the school. Only cases that fail to progress during remedial intervention are referred to EPs at the provincial offices.
3.3.2 Legislation and policy

There is no specific legislation for inclusive education in Zimbabwe (Mpofu, 2004). However, a number of government policy issues are consistent with the intent of inclusive education. For instance, the Zimbabwe Education Act (Government of Zimbabwe, 1996), the Disabled Persons Act (Government of Zimbabwe, 1996) and various Ministry of Education circulars. Secretary Policy Circular No. P36 of 1990 require that all students, regardless of race, religion, gender, creed, and disability, have access to basic or primary education (up to Grade 7).

The Zimbabwe Education Act (Government of Zimbabwe, 1984, revised in 1991, 1994 and 1996) made education a right for all children. Although not specified in this Act, disabled children were presumed to be included in it. The Act states that "new strategies have been formulated as special education has come into line with national policy by attempting to ensure equal educational opportunity for children with handicaps in normal school" (Government of Zimbabwe, 1996, p.20). Whilst special education provision is included, it is vague and non-specific and does not commit the government to inclusive education (Mpofu, 2000). In 1990, the Ministry of Education put in place the Policy Circular Minute P36 (Government of Zimbabwe, 1990) on special education, which outlines placement procedures for special classes, resource units and special education schools.

According to Mpofu (2000) school psychological practices in Zimbabwe fall under the SPS and SNE department, this is a support department under the MoESAC. Placement in any of these three types of educational provision depends on the child's home circumstances and level of disability. For example, a severely physically-challenged child of poor parents who cannot afford transport might still miss out on school where the nearest school to him/her is several kilometres away (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). According to Mnkandla and Mataruse (ibid), assessment and placement was and still is the responsibility of the SPS and SNE. The SPS and SNE are expected to advise teachers about the learning needs of children. In practice, the principal educational psychologist (PEP) in each region, together with her/his assistant educational psychologists (AEPs), still has the major
responsibility for the education of children with special needs. Peresuh and Barcham (1998), noted that the greatest weakness of this is that these PEPs are themselves, sometimes neither trained teachers nor trained in special education. The advice they give “... is therefore often questionable” (ibid, p.72). Lack of effective legislation and policies could be a barrier for the specialist teachers in their work. Peresuh (2009), suggests that those responsible for preparing national budgets do not have anything to force them to allocate adequate funds for children with disabilities. If these sentiments are prevalent among teachers and principals, one wonders whether they are satisfied with the services they are receiving from the educational psychologists.

The definition of a psychologist and the scope of psychological practice lie within psychology's licensing laws (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). In Zimbabwe, the Psychological Practices Act sets the parameters by which psychologists are licensed to practise. The legal parameters currently authorise psychological services to special needs students as well as other education-related programmes. Although psychologists may train in different areas of speciality, for example, clinical, educational and/or academic psychology, they receive generic licences as psychologists. They are then expected to abide by the standards and ethics set by the Allied Health Practitioners Council (AHPC) within the bounds of their areas of expertise. In terms of training, psychologists may enter the service with a BSc honours degree in psychology and then undergo an internship for three years under the supervision of a registered and experienced psychologist before they register with the AHPC.

Currently, each provincial region of the Ministry of Education trains interns recruited in that particular region and either the PEP or a senior psychologist supervises the intern (AEP) for three years, after which he or she supports the AEP's application for registration with the AHPC. Alternatively, they may enter the service with an MSc in educational psychology or a PhD in psychology. A teaching qualification is an added advantage (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). Mnkandla and Mataruse further state that one of the limitations of the system has to do with the fact that some of the training of AEPs is given by people who may have very little knowledge
of the everyday reality of testing in schools, for instance, university lecturers with limited field experience. Meanwhile, the initial training is complemented with short intensive courses that they receive from their PEPs which, whilst good, are done in a relatively short time before they are thrown in the deep end and expected to function as psychologists (ibid).

The SPS and SNE department operates within a milieu of models ranging from special schools, integrated special education units in ordinary schools, and special classes (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). In the schools, psychologists are expected to work a lot in collaboration with remedial tutors.

According to Mnkandla and Mataruse (2002), Zimbabwe has some level of uniformity in control of test administration. Only registered psychologists are allowed by law to administer certain protected tests such as IQ tests for educational placement decisions. The teachers are free to use attainment and performance tests such as school readiness tests and some reading tests, but they are always advised to refer to psychologists any cases that they find difficult to assess. The SPS and SNE department supplies the tests. Teachers are trained to use them in workshops and during other school visits by SPS personnel. Mpofu (2000), asserts that this practice is embedded within a 'translation stage' in the psychological development in Africa. This stage is characterised by an attempt to apply Western theories, concepts and practices with very few or no adaptations.

Mnkandla and Mataruse (2002), observed that the relatively large numbers of pupils per class in ordinary schools can be as high as 40-45 or even more in some cases, sometimes make it difficult for inclusion to benefit all pupils in the schools. Some children, especially in rural settings, are self-integrated in ordinary classes, due to lack of appropriate placement procedures and facilities. This is usually accompanied by lack of qualified experts among the teachers and lack of knowledge on what to do with the children with disabilities (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002).
These schools might have sought the service of school psychologists and if they did, the current study wants to find out if principals and teachers are satisfied with this service. According to Zindi (2007), in Zimbabwe, lack of supervision of special needs education by the Schools Psychological Services (SPS) has made it difficult to coordinate inter-ministerial approach to service provision. These tend to delay the assessment of learners identified by the specialist teacher leading to delayed appropriate intervention programmes (Chimedza, 2008).

Mpofu et al. (1997), observed that the practice of school psychology within most sub-Saharan African countries is marginal, at best. Negative attitudes from the various stakeholders, for example, government officials, parents, teachers and peers, make it difficult to work towards inclusion. Barnartt and Kabzems (1992), found that Zimbabwean teachers in regular education were opposed to integration of students with disabilities in their classrooms. Lack of clear policy and funding makes the theoretical and methodological base very weak and this lowers the quality of service rendered (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002).

Mpofu et al. (1997), surveyed Directors and other leaders within special education in 12 east and southern African countries who indicated that the utilization of school psychological services is higher when school psychology is formally recognized and regulated at a national level and when services are relevant and supportable. An element of dissatisfaction with an irrelevant and unsupportable services is highlighted in this survey, which necessitates the need for constant stakeholder satisfaction survey like the current research.

### 3.3.3 Inclusive education and school psychology in Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe the SPS and SNE coordinates activities to provide services to children with disabilities from pre-school to vocational training, after they leave formal school at 18 years (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). They tackle a range of problems which include those to do with school placement, general school progress, school readiness and study habits, as well as skills for career guidance and clinical counselling (with both parents and children). Counselling is sometimes given to
those with medico-educational problems, for conditions such as epilepsy and asthma which have their impact on learning. Most of the work centres on assisting schools in designing appropriate educational programmes for children with disabilities with both remedial tutoring in mind, giving guidance and counselling, and ensuring related support services.

Circular P36 (Government of Zimbabwe, 1990) mandates SPS and SNE services in schools. In some countries when work increases, as mandated by law, that could result in increased numbers of psychologists being employed in the schools services (Curtis, Hunley, & Grier, 2004; Fagan & Wise, 1994). In Zimbabwe, it does not necessarily result in increased numbers of school psychologists being employed by SPS and other institutions. These numbers always depend on government-prescribed requirements which do not always get revised in recognition of the needs at the time. Sometimes, due to monetary constraints, certain posts are frozen and this results in staff shortages even in departments like the SPS (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002).

In 2007 the number of educational psychologists in Zimbabwe stood at 32, eighteen men and 14 women; 9 of the 32 were in private practice (Mpofu et al., 2007). The 32 EPs are meant to serve a student population of approximately 4 million. According to Curtis et al. (2004) the ratio of students to school psychologists has an association with the delivery of different types of services. They reported that higher ratios were associated with more initial special education evaluations and re-evaluations and a greater percentage of time spent overall in special education-related activities. Lower ratios were associated with more students served through individual counselling and through student groups. Curtis et al. (2004), concluded that the higher ratios are associated with services considered less desirable by much of the field while lower ratios are associated with more desirable activities. They reckon that it is because of the relationship between ratio and types of services delivered that the NASP has advocated for lower ratios and recommended an overall ratio of 1,000:1 through official association policy. Zimbabwe with a total school-age population of approximately 4 million would require 4000 psychologists to be able to provide desirable services.
The core functions of educational psychologists aim to empower all stakeholders, parents, teachers, school heads, NGOs and their personnel, with knowledge and skills to deal with people in an inclusive environment where inclusion is considered the “involvement of individuals with disability in age-appropriate and culturally valid activities in the family, school and community” (Mpofu, 2000, p.3). In the Zimbabwean context, where there is no clear policy on inclusion and where central government fails to reduce students to school psychologists ratio, increase finance for special education programmes, it is not surprising that the SPS and SNE, might not be coping with the multiple demands of inclusion. This might be frustrating to school principals and teachers who require support services from SPS and SNE. The current empirical study attempted to find out the level of satisfaction of stakeholders in such a context.

Mnkandla and Mataruse (2002), remarked that under the supervision of PEPs, Zimbabwe is encouraging the participation of every child in ordinary school life to the optimum, while retaining the services special education can provide and welcoming every student into the regular classroom. This kind of inclusion model sees special education teachers and related services personnel such as psychologists serving as consultants to regular educators who have been assigned special education classes. This expands the psychologists' role beyond just diagnostic assessment and placement. This might present big problems for SPS which has the responsibility for SNE. Psychologists have to contend with the difficulty of concentrating on inclusion issues when other models of service provision, for example, special schools and resource units, are running parallel or competing with the inclusion idea.

The Zimbabwean model attempts to include all children without attempting to deconstruct special education as a concept, as well as in terms of its organisation and structure. In the school, it has not meant the end of labelling, special education and special classes and necessary support and services, but moving students with disabilities into general classrooms with appropriate support (Mnkandla & Mataruse, 2002). Where such parallel systems are running and there is a shortage of
educational psychologists the marriage between psychological services and inclusive education is bound to bore dissatisfaction. This could be the case now. However, speculation is dangerous hence, the significance of this empirical research study.

3.3.4 New Global trends in the practice of school psychology

Unlike in countries like the USA, where some states, limit testing to registered psychologists only, whilst others allow guidance counsellors who complete at least three courses in assessment, including intelligence testing to assess (Peresuh & Barcham, 1998), in Zimbabwe, test administration is uniformly controlled. Only registered psychologists are allowed by law to administer certain protected tests such as IQ tests for educational placement decisions.

The American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Association of School Psychology (NASP)(2003) contend that the practice of school psychology, although rooted in the traditional broad foundations of assessment, prevention, counselling and consultation, evolves over time as new challenges arise and new methodologies are developed to meet those challenges. The two associations further assert that now and for the foreseeable future, school psychology will continue to emphasize improved academic competence for all children; improved social-emotional functioning for all children; enhanced family-school partnerships and parental involvement in schools; more effective education and instruction for all learners; and increased child and family services in schools that promote health and mental health that is integrated with community services.

Curtis et al. (2004), note that school psychologists are spending considerably more time in special education–related activities overall compared with 1989–1990 but that the number of initial special education evaluations and re-evaluations has declined and there are fewer in-service programmes, and fewer student groups. Merrell, Ervin, and Gimpel (2006) note that a struggle continues within the profession between the many things school psychologists are able to do and the few things that they are expected to do. Cole and Siegel (2003), assert that the
profession of school psychology has been transforming, with a move away from the 1970s traditional “refer, test, and place” model to broader service delivery model. Sheridan and Gutkin (2000), echoes similar sentiments that this “school psychology paradigm shift” has made way for an expanded role for school psychologists, including the delivery of services such as consultation, counselling, intervention, prevention, and in-servicing, as well as traditional assessment role. Thus, Corkum, French, and Dorey (2007) proclaim that over the past decades there has been substantial change in the time dedicated to psychoeducational assessment by school psychologists.

It is APA and NASP (2003) prophecy that school psychologists will increasingly incorporate into everyday practice, a focus on evidence-based approaches to assessment, intervention and practice; a reduced emphasis on traditional individual assessment and increased emphasis on linking assessment directly to intervention and accountability; increased focus on families and improving academic, social and emotional functioning of students through family-school collaboration; incorporation of public health models into school practice, basing prevention strategies on systemic assessments of risk and protective factors; increased collaboration among professions (counselling, social work) and across specialties of psychology (school, counselling, clinical); and increased incorporation of cross-cultural competency in all aspects of practice.

Changing the norms that exist within a school is difficult to achieve, particularly within a context that is faced with so many competing pressures and where practitioners tend to work alone in addressing the problems they face (Fullan, 2001). The likely result is frustration and dissatisfaction among stakeholders.

3.4 Teachers' perceptions of school psychologists

Although research on the attitudes of regular education and special education teachers about the field of school psychology and the helpfulness of services to
teachers and students dates back to the 1970s (Dean, 1980; Medway, 1977), there was a gap in the literature on this subject until the late 1990s and early 2000s. Research has now resumed in this area (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004; Gilman & Medway, 2007).

Gilman and Medway (2007)’s study found that there was no significant relationship between frequency of contact and perception of helpfulness for either children or teachers. There was no significant relationship between frequency of contact and overall satisfaction with school psychological services. Special education teachers do not have more frequent contact with school psychologists than regular education teachers. Ratings of helpfulness of school psychological services to teachers and children were lower than those of previous studies. In contrast, Banga (2009) study showed an increase in overall satisfaction of regular education teachers with school psychological services, yet a decrease in satisfaction for special education teachers.

The study by Gilman and Medway indicates that frequent contact with school psychological services as a variable has no significant positive effect on satisfaction. Teacher specialisation has an effect on satisfaction with school psychological services. These results are important to the current research in that among the issues that stakeholders might raise could touch on these variables.

3.4.1 Previous research examining teachers and principals’ satisfaction

According to Watkins et al. (2001), the reason why there has been little or no progress on the school psychologists’ consensus call to deliver more diverse services could be consumer resistance. They state that the consumers of the school psychologists service “may wish to maintain the status quo” (p.65). These observations prompted Cheramie and Sutter (1993) to investigate special education directors’ attitudes toward school psychologists’ involvement. They (Cheramie & Sutter) found that the administrators were satisfied with school psychologists’ work in assessment activities, desired more counselling and consultation services and
wanted school psychologists to reduce their involvement in administrative and regular education activities.

Watkins et al. (2001) were doubtful of the significance of these 1980s to 1990s findings due to age, geographical restriction and low response rate. On the basis of these observations Watkins et al., distributed 1,220 questionnaires and 522 were returned by 419 regular education teachers, 18 administrators, 52 special education teachers and 33 support staff. Their results confirmed previous findings that teachers and administrators want school psychologists to continue assessment activities at their current intensity as well as provide a wide range of additional services.

The calls for change to the practise of school psychology and the role of the educational psychologist extend over more than 50 years (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000). There has been a submission of consistent ideas for change, generally to expand the role beyond that of assessment of special education to include more emphasis on prevention and intervention, among other services (ibid).

Dramatic events have happened since the 1970's and early 1980's when research showed that principals identified assessment as the primary activity of the educational psychologist and were satisfied with the services, albeit they desired additional services to be conducted. Schools might now require new ways to address student needs, and the providers of school psychological services should come up with the best satisfying methods and delivery structures.

In their pilot study of over 1,600 teachers and administrators from school districts in four American States, Gilman and Gabriel (2004) found significant between-group differences with respect to knowledge, satisfaction, and perceived helpfulness of school psychological services, as well as how serious a problem should be before referral. In addition, substantial differences regarding the roles and functions that school psychologists are expected to perform existed across groups.
Unlike Watkins and colleagues who investigated perceptions from one school district, Gilman and Gabriel (2004) in their pilot study involved 1,600 teachers and administrators from school districts from four states. They investigated (a) knowledge of school psychology, (b) satisfaction with school psychological services, (c) helpfulness of school psychological services, and (d) future desired roles and functions of school psychologists. Their findings are consistent with previous reports (Anthun, 1999; Landau & Gerken, 1979) where teachers reported significantly lower satisfaction ratings with school psychological services than school administrators.

In a nutshell, their findings revealed that what is being practised in many schools is less satisfying for many school psychologists; at least one-third of the teachers and administrators wanted school psychologists to participate in more assessment activities; both teachers and administrators wanted school psychologists to be involved in teacher consultation than the school psychologists; school psychologists and teachers want school psychologists to be involved in more group counselling activities, and the school psychologists and the teachers want school psychologists to be more involved with children in regular education.

MacKay and Boyle (2007), made a follow-up cross-sectional survey of the involvement of educational psychologists in pupil support in mainstream primary and secondary schools in the UK. Their findings revealed significantly higher levels of satisfaction with the current contributions of educational psychologists. These research findings seem to imply that satisfaction oscillates among stakeholders.

### 3.4.2 School psychologists perceptions

The perceptions of the role and function of school psychologists by school psychologists have been examined throughout the past few decades. School psychologists have been surveyed to ascertain the amount of time spent in various roles and desired roles or activities. School psychologists report that a majority of their time is spent in psychoeducational evaluations for the purposes of special
education and that the other services provided in the remaining time are consultation, intervention, prevention, crisis response, counselling, supervision, training and research (Bramlett et al., 2002; Curtis et al., 2002; Reschly, 2000).

School psychologists report a discrepancy between actual and desired roles in schools and they wish for a change in job roles and functions. They report wanting to decrease time spent in assessment activities and increase their involvement in counselling, consultation, prevention, training, parent education and direct intervention/treatment (Curtis et al., 2002; Watkins et al., 2001). The findings of these studies suggest no major shifts in the actual or desired professional roles in the past, up to the present. Bramlett et al. (2002), also found no changes in the activities of school psychologists and that time spent in assessment activities has been consistent. Could similar results be found among the Zimbabwean school psychological services stakeholders? This empirical study intended to find out their aspirations.

3.5 Summary

The foregoing literature analyses revealed that Zimbabwe’s school psychological service is a shadow of American and European school psychology. This makes it interesting to find out the level of satisfaction of Zimbabwean teachers and principals with these services. Geographical and sophistication of the provision of school psychological services between America, Europe and Zimbabwe are far apart hence the study might produce interesting results. Literature has also shown that collaboration with stakeholders is important for school psychology reform and therefore, there is a need to seek their perspectives on service delivery to facilitate such reform.

The subsequent chapter will discuss the research method that was used in the current study.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

According to Kazdin (2003, p.4) research methodology “refers to the diverse principles, procedures, and practices that govern research.” Research methodology is simply a system of explicit rules and procedures upon which research is based; against which claims for knowledge are evaluated (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996).

This thesis is premised on the proposition that empirical research on the stakeholders’ satisfaction with the school psychological services they get from EPs in Zimbabwe is scarce. The lack of such research might be causing EPs to provide services that do not satisfy their stakeholders. As such, understanding the level of satisfaction of stakeholders like teachers and principals with the school psychological services is fundamental to meeting their needs. Thus, this thesis surveys the level of teachers and principals’ satisfaction with the school psychological services in Zimbabwe.

The survey was designed to achieve four objectives, namely, to establish:

a) the psychological services that schools receive from EPs in Zimbabwe.

b) the expectations of the teachers and principals in respect of the services rendered by EPs.

c) whether there are significant differences between services rendered and teachers and principals’ expectations.

d) whether teachers and principals in Zimbabwean schools are satisfied with the services they receive from EPs.

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology and process of the survey. It discusses the research design, sampling procedure, participants, training of research assistant, pilot study, and instrumentation and data collection procedures.
that were used to explore the school principals and teachers’ level of satisfaction with the services provided by educational psychologists.

4.2 Research design

Keeves and Sowden (1997), note that a research design provides a framework for the collection and analysis of data. A research design is a plan of study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2000; Oppenheim, 1996) that guides the researcher as he/she collects and analyses data.

The study employed a mixed methods design, whereby, both exploratory qualitative and quantitative methods were used. In this study, triangulation is used with a view to double check the results. This is also called cross examination (Neuman, 2005). The goal of exploratory research is to become familiar with basic facts, people and concerns. In order to develop a well-grounded mental picture of what is occurring an exploratory research is appropriate (Neuman, 2005). The issue of teachers and principals’ satisfaction with the services they receive from educational psychologists has had little or no research in Zimbabwe; hence, an exploratory survey was ideal.

Qualitative research methods are inductive and do not require a hypothesis in order to start the research process. The qualitative research gathered information that is not in numerical form through open-ended questionnaires, unstructured interviews and unstructured observations. The researcher preferred the face-to-face interview design because it has the natural setting as the source of information and the sole purpose of the researcher is to collect information. Qualitative methods are used in studies whose purpose is to describe events, processes and situations of theoretical significance (Neuman, 2005). The qualitative methods allow for a deeper exploration of key conceptual issues and matters of practice in relation to the phenomenon being studied, in this case, stakeholder satisfaction with school psychological services. The qualitative approach allows for the collection of rich data that can explore the “why” and “how” of the problem and not just the “what”. The qualitative methods were included in the study primarily as a confirmatory
technique, to triangulate findings from the earlier phases of data collection, to qualify and deepen descriptions.

Quantitative research is deductive and hinges on the presence of a hypothesis, which is identified before research begins. Quantitative research methods use numbers to describe phenomena (McBurney, 1994). The quantitative approach was incorporated into this study because it essentially serves the purpose of triangulation to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings and the study as a whole. The quantitative methods allow for some aspects of the study to be inferred to the population of school psychological services stakeholders in Zimbabwe, but specifically to those from the four administrative provinces of Government, namely, Harare, Manicaland, Mashonaland West and Mashonaland East.

In this study, the quantitative approach was appropriate because the data could be easily summarised, which facilitates communication of findings. Quantitative methods enabled comparison. A researcher is able to gather data from numerous respondents, settings and times and then compare the findings (Neuman, 2005).

Although quantitative research uses numbers to describe phenomena and is considered objective, it does not bring out data on participants’ experiences, their feelings and emotions using flexible language; hence, an attempt to even the disadvantages by combining qualitative and quantitative methods.

The mixed methods research is expansive, creative, inclusive and delimiting as it encourages researchers to employ an eclectic approach when conducting research (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2005). Accordingly, Mertens (2005) stated that mixed methods enhances the ability of the researcher to not only gather data in varied ways, but through this, to draw deeper and possibly more meaningful conclusions about the problem being investigated. Employing a mixed methods design allowed
the researcher to triangulate data which was produced by varied methods and from varied sources.

The subsequent section discusses the population and the sample that was surveyed in the study.

4.3 Research Context and Population

Zimbabwe is divided into 8 provinces and 2 cities with provincial status as shown in the map (see Annexure K: Map of Zimbabwe). The ten provinces are Bulawayo, Harare, Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West, Masvingo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South and Midlands. The participants in this research came from four of these provinces, and these are: Harare, Manicaland, Mashonaland East and Mashonaland West.

A population refers to the aggregate of units form which the individuals or units of the study are chosen from. Thus, the population is all the individuals or objects that have one or more attributes in common that are of interest to the researcher (Best & Khan, 1993). Sometimes, it may be geographical areas such as all cities with populations of 100,000 or the researcher may be interested in all schools in a particular area. According to Cardwell (1996), the population is “a group of people who are the focus of a research study and to which results would apply.” (p.179). Therefore, a population is a group of individuals/objects to which the researcher would like to make inferences.

The population for this study consisted of 140 schools which had received school psychological services from EPs.

4.4 Sample and Sampling Method

A sample is the subset of the population involved in a study. The process of selecting the sample is called sampling (De Vos, 1998). The idea of sampling is to select part of the population that represents the entire population. There are two
types of sampling - probability and non-probability. A probability sample is one in which each individual in the population has a known, non-zero chance of being selected in the sample. A nonprobability sample is one in which each individual in the population does not have a known chance of selection in the sample.

When compared to a complete collection, sampling is advantageous in that it saves time, money and effort (Sax, 1979). It is often not practical to identify all the members of a population of interest due to time and cost constrains (De Vos, 1998). Moreover, the study of an entire population would produce a massive amount of data, which would be difficult to process, analyse and interpret. In contrast, sampling allows for greater focus and often permits greater accuracy than a complete collection.

In this study sampling was done in two stages. The first stage was simple random sampling of schools from a target population of 140 schools that received services from school psychologists from a list provided by educational psychologists in the respective provinces. Finally, the simple random sampling sampled 80 schools. Each province had 20 schools selected to participate in the study. 168 teachers and 80 principals who received services from educational psychologists in four of the country’s ten provinces were then purposively sampled.

According to Neuman (2005), purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling in which decision concerning the individuals to be included in the sample is taken by the researcher. It involves selecting participants with a specific purpose in mind. This entails the researcher using expert discretion in the selection of participants in the study based on their ability to be informative about the issues under investigation. In the present study, the selection decision was based upon the school having received services from the educational psychologist and willingness to participate in the research. Purposive sampling was preferred because its results are usually expected to be more accurate as the data comes from the wealthy experiences of the participants than those achieved from an alternative form of
sampling (De Vos, 1998). Nevertheless, this approach might have produced two types of sampling error, namely, bias in selection and non-responsive error. The bias in selection might have happened during the listing of schools by the EPs. Simple random sampling of schools was meant to moderate this bias. The reason for the non-responsive error may include unavailability of the identified participant, unavailability of time, and reluctance to cooperate and participate in the research process.

4.5 Participants

The participants were drawn from schools from four government administrative provinces, namely, Manicaland, Harare, Mashonaland East and Mashonaland West (see Annexure K: Map of Zimbabwe).

According to the MoESAC (2012) the four administrative provinces had the following registered schools in 2012 respectively: Harare, 218 primary schools and 84 secondary schools; Manicaland, 793 primary schools and 268 secondary schools; Mashonaland West, 499 primary schools and 170 secondary schools; and Mashonaland East, 604 primary schools and 248 secondary schools. It was from these schools that the EPs picked 80 schools that received psychological services from them.

The selection of the four provinces was convenient given the fact that the researcher new most of the EPs in these provinces, and once worked in Mashonaland East and West as an EP. However, the more important factor that justifies the selection of these provinces as the research context is the varying numbers of schools in each province as well as the varying geographical area (km$^2$) and the number of districts in each province. (See Annexure L). The EPs in all the provinces are based in the capital city at the provincial offices. The EPs operate an itinerary school visiting programme to the districts. Given the varying contexts of the provinces it is arguably more meaningful to investigate school psychological services in a context where resource provisions and services vary in terms of geographical space.
The biographical variables of the participants are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

### Table 1: Biographical variables of school principals (n=52)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical variables</th>
<th>Variable description</th>
<th>Frequency (Freq.)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>1-10 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 yrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 yrs.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal experience</td>
<td>1-10 yrs.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with EPs</td>
<td>1-10 yrs.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 yrs.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents the biographical variables of school principals according to the respondent’s gender, teaching experience, duration as principals, experience working with educational psychologists, professional qualifications and the provinces they were selected from. The sample surveyed for this study consisted of 80 principals and 52 were valid participants in the survey (48 postal survey and 4 interviewees) from the four administrative provinces of Zimbabwe. The gender distribution of the principals was 30 males and 22 females.
Table 2: Biographical variables of school teachers (n=108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical variables</th>
<th>Variable description</th>
<th>Frequency (Freq.)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>1-10yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 yrs.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 yrs.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working</td>
<td>1-10 yrs.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with EPs</td>
<td>11-20 yrs.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the biographical variables of school teachers according the respondent’s gender, teaching experience, experience working with educational psychologists, professional qualifications and the provinces they were selected from. The sample surveyed for this study consisted of 168 teachers and 108 were valid participants in the survey (102 postal survey and 6 interviewees). The gender distribution of teachers was 34 males and 74 females.

4.6 Training of research assistant

One research assistant who had research experience as well as experience in working for the Ministry of Education, Sport, Art and Culture’s Schools Psychological Services department was hired. The research assistant was
conveniently selected by the researcher. The training of the research assistant was meant to develop the reliability of the research process and the result of the study. The training involved explaining to the research assistant, the purpose of the research, and the research assistant’s ethical obligations to the research participants. The ethical guidelines discussed during the training included informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, causing harm to respondents and privacy. The research assistant was also trained on how the sample was going to be selected, how to mail the questionnaires for the study and how to make phone call follow up without pestering and coercing the participants. After the training, the research assistant participated in the pilot study to establish whether she had mastered the required research skills. The specifics of the pilot study are explained in the following section.

4.7 Pilot study

In addition to information derived from literature, the content and face validity of the questionnaire were established by carrying out a pilot study during 8-18 March 2011. Seidman (2012), recommend including a pilot of the study, with a small number of participants, as part of the research design when using researcher constructed data gathering instruments. The information obtained from the pilot study was used to determine if items (a) were understandable to readers of each profession, (b) could be readily rated via the rating options, (c) whether the roles listed with respect to school psychologists, accurately represented those services that potentially could be practised in school systems. The purpose of the pilot study also included: establishing if there were problems in administering the questionnaire; eliminating some ambiguous items; establishing the feasibility of the study; testing clarity of data collection instructions; and enabling a preliminary data analysis to ascertain whether there would be difficulties in the main data analysis and to ensure that collected data answered the research questions (McBurney, 1994; Neuman, 2005).

The pilot study assisted to refine the research instruments so that participants in the main study encounter minimum difficulties in completing it (Currier, 1984). This task was achieved by asking the pilot study respondents to evaluate and report on the
clarity of instructions, as well as the ambiguity and relevancy of research items. They were tasked to suggest improvements to the questionnaire. This process helped establish reliability, validity and the practicality of the instruments. The split-half reliability of the questionnaires was 0.85 as determined by the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Split-half reliability measures error from instrument construction. A low split-half reliability (typically under 0.70) indicates that the instrument is poorly developed and needs to be revised. In the revision, focus on writing items that are directly related to the construct and operational definition of the variable. In the case of the research instruments used in this study 0.85 coefficients is high, and it means the questionnaires were well developed.

Pilot testing was done with a group similar to the final sample (Oppenheim, 1996) except for the educational psychologists. Three (3) practicing school psychologists; five (5) teachers (2 regular education teachers and 3 special education teachers); and five (5) principals who were not included in the main research sample participated in the pilot study.

Based on the feedback from these groups changes were made where necessary. After modifying the items the questionnaire was sent to three school psychologists, three teachers, and two principals who were not part of the research sample to once again confirm whether items were understandable and an accurate presentation of the roles of EPs.

In the following section, the research design used in the main empirical study is highlighted.

4.8 Research instruments

The questionnaire and the interview are the generally used research instruments for data collection in survey research (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Both the questionnaire and interview were utilised in this study.
4.8.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a research tool through which respondents are asked to respond to similar questions in a predetermined order (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Gray, 2013). The questionnaire enables the researcher to collect information without having actually to be present. There were two researcher-constructed questionnaires used in the pilot study and the main study. The researcher used a questionnaire because it is comparatively inexpensive, has standardised items, can ensure anonymity, and questions were written for particular purposes (McMillan & Schumacher, 2000; Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). Moreover, a questionnaire reduces bias that might arise from the personal characteristics of the interviewer.

The questionnaires consisted of three parts (see Annexure H and I). The first part dealt with the general information regarding the biographical data of the respondents. The second part was composed of predetermined responses (closed-items). The closed form questions enabled the gathering of standardized data, which could be generalised to the population (Bourque & Fielder, 2003; Denscombe, 2000). The final part was open-ended questions that allowed the respondents to express their own feelings to the questions. This enabled the respondents to give those variables not foreseen by the researcher in the predetermined response section.

Construction of the School Psychology Satisfaction Survey (SPSS) was based on what was constructed by Gilman and Gabriel (2004). The Gilman and Gabriel instrument was modified to assimilate some elements from literature and the three measuring models, namely, the SERVQUAL, ACSI and KANO (See Table 3). Two questionnaires were constructed, one for each group, although each form contained identical item content, the biographical data wording was slightly modified to reflect each profession appropriately.
Table 3: A grid of ideas/items obtained from the literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Gilman &amp; Gabriel, 2004)</td>
<td>Provision and satisfaction with the following services: Assessment for placement in special education, Individual Counselling, Group Counselling, Working with children in regular education, Crisis intervention, Consulting with teachers, Consulting with parents, In-service training, Parent workshops, and Curriculum development. How helpful are school psychological services to teachers, administrators, and student support personnel? In the past year, how satisfied were you with the overall performance of your school psychologist(s)? Given your understanding of school psychological services at your school, in what areas would you like to see more or less of their involvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVQUAL</td>
<td>Rating what an ideal or excellent service should have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSI</td>
<td>The six factors that compose ACSI model: perceived quality, customer expectations, perceived value, overall customer satisfaction, customer complaints, and customer loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANO</td>
<td>Kano Model of Customer satisfaction’s three product/service attributes: dissatisfiers, satisfiers, and exciters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kotler &amp; Keller, 2009)</td>
<td>According to disconfirmation theory, the level of satisfaction (and also dissatisfaction) is a function of pre-consumption expectations and disconfirmation of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oliver, 1997; Yi, 1990)</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction can be defined as a cognitive and affective response to the service encounter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Khaksar et al., 2011)</td>
<td>Stakeholder satisfaction is a response (emotional or cognitive); the response pertains to a particular focus (expectations, product/service, consumption experience); and, the response occurs at a particular time (after consumption, after choice, based on accumulated experience)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The merger of these models and ideas attempted to come up with a questionnaire that incorporated five main questioning approaches, measuring: expectations of a number of service factors; perceptions of the service experiences on these factors; level of importance attached to each of a number of service elements; level of satisfaction with these elements; and, respondents’ own priorities for improvement.

The postal questionnaire survey had two sample-related advantages over other kinds of surveys. It allowed for wider geographical coverage, and a larger sample. A survey questionnaire was also suitable because the population was adequately literate. The survey questionnaire was much easier to administer than other kinds of surveys. The possibility of anonymity and privacy might have helped increase the number of responses. Bourque and Fielder (2003) believe that people are more likely to give complete and truthful information on sensitive topics in a self-administered survey questionnaire than in an interview.

4.8.2 Interview schedule

Data were collected using semi-structured interview. A semi-structured interview provided greater depth of data than structured interviews (Fontana & Frey, 1994). It was flexible and allowed in-depth coverage of the phenomenon from the participant’s perspective. Probing for more information and clarifications was possible. The interview guide that was used gathered data concerning the open-ended items from the survey questionnaire. The aspects that were of major concern were those issues raised by respondents in the postal survey. (See Annexure J).

To ensure trustworthiness, the interview schedule was pilot-tested with two principals and two teachers who did not take part in the main study. Lincoln and Guba (1994) criteria were implemented through the four strategies of credibility, dependability, conformability and transferability. The four stages were implemented through prolonged engagement with mixed methods in data collection, dense description of results and giving a chain of evidence of the entire research process.
The individual interview is considered to be one of the most essential tools of qualitative data collection (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). Interviewing “provides access to the context of people’s behaviour, thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behaviour” (Seidman, 2012: p.6). It is a means by which to gain subjective insight into the participants through an understanding of the experiences of the individuals (ibid).

The open-ended interviews are recommended as a source of data collection for phenomenological studies, in order to obtain perceptions of the participants at face value (Cohen & Manion, 1996). The open-ended interviews allowed the researcher to explore the areas in which the participant perceived gaps or contradictions that may not have been captured by a closed-ended questionnaire (Neuman, 2005).

Using the open-ended interviews allowed the interviewer to probe interesting areas and granted for a greater flexibility of coverage (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007; Smith & Osborn, 2003). In particular, open-ended interviews are recommended for studies, such as the current one, in which the services of a professional group were explored because the researcher could further probe areas of interest (Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor, & Tindall, 1994). Open-ended interviews were useful for identifying a range of possible responses where no previous data exist. Open-ended interviews also gave the respondents an opportunity to state their own views about EPs. The main disadvantage of open-ended interviews is that they took longer to complete, particularly for less articulate respondents. It was also more difficult to code the responses for analysis than closed questions.
4.9 Procedure

Data were collected in four phases. The phases of data collection and the sources from where data were drawn from are illustrated in Figure 2. Comprehension of the sequence of the phases and the way in which these relate into each other is vital, particularly in relation to the mixed methods approach that was employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE ONE</th>
<th>PHASE TWO</th>
<th>PHASE THREE</th>
<th>PHASE FOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting permission from MoESAC</td>
<td>Personally headed in a written request for permission to research to MoESAC head office in Harare</td>
<td>Phoning the randomly selected schools</td>
<td>The researcher or the research assistant phoned the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mailing or handing questionnaires to stakeholders</td>
<td>Questionnaire were mailed or handed to principals and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewing of 6 teachers and 4 principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Phases of data collection

Phase one involved getting permission from MoESAC to carry out the research. (See Annexures D, E and F).

Phase two involved the researcher or the research assistant personally phoning the randomly selected schools to seek their informed consent before sending them the questionnaires. This was done for ethical reasons as well as for enhancing the cooperation of the principals and educators when they received the questionnaires.
The third phase involved mailing or handing questionnaires to principals and teachers with return postage paid for by the researcher. A written request for help to fill the questionnaire and consent accompanied the questionnaire. The postal questionnaire survey had two sample-related advantages over other kinds of surveys. It allowed for wider geographical coverage, and a larger sample. A survey questionnaire was also suitable because the population was adequately literate. The survey questionnaire was much easier to administer than other kinds of surveys. The possibility of anonymity and privacy might have increased the number of responses. Bourque and Fielder (2003) believe that people are more likely to give complete and truthful information on sensitive topics in a self-administered survey questionnaire than in an interview as questionnaire preclude the effect of personal contact with the researcher.

4.10 Interview process overview
The final phase involved interviewing 6 teachers and 4 principals. The personal interview was conducted by the researcher asking questions to one respondent at a time in a face-to-face situation from 5 to 10 January 2012. The researcher’s role was to get in touch with the respondents, ask the desired questions, and record the answers obtained. The researcher ensured that the content of the answers were clear, unambiguous and that information was recorded correctly. While it is significantly more expensive on a per-completed-interview basis, the personal interview, as a collection medium, had several advantages relative to telephone interviews and mail questionnaires. It provided the opportunity to obtain a better sample, since virtually all the sample units could be reached and nonresponse to the survey or to individual questions was held to a minimum. It also gave the opportunity to obtain more information, as a face-to-to interview was of substantially greater length than a telephone interview. Finally, it permitted greater flexibility. More freedom was provided for adapting and interpreting questions as the situation required, especially in the case of this semi-structured personal interview.
4.11 Data analysis

The empirical data were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The Chi Square test at 0.05 was used to examine the relationship between gender and level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service; between the level of satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the qualifications of the stakeholders; and the level of satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders.

Stakeholders’ levels of satisfaction were compared using frequency means and percentages. Qualitative data from open-ended questions and interviews was thematically analysed under the following themes:

- Visits to the EPs offices and reasons for visiting.
- The roles of EPs in the School.
- The positive aspects of the services.
- The problems encountered with EPs.
- Reasons for evaluating the services as good or excellent.
- Reason for recommending psychological services to other people.
- What is lacking in the psychological services.
- Suggestions to improve service delivery.

It was predicted that this form of analysis would yield information that could be used to generate a sound model for the provision of school psychological services that takes stakeholders’ needs into consideration.

4.12 Ethical considerations

Ethics in research are meant to give researchers guidelines on how they should perform research. The ethical guidelines ensure that research is carried out in a way that is in the best interests of the participants (Cardwell, 1996). The researcher is obliged to act in an ethical manner (Kazdin, 2003). The following sections dwell
on the following ethical guidelines as they were adhered to in this research: informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity, privacy and safety of respondents.

4.12.1 Informed consent

Informed consent according to Kazdin (2003) is a crucial ethical issue in research. The right to privacy mandates that direct consent for participation in a research must be obtained from competent individuals (Higson-Smith & Bless, 1995). Further, the consent must be informed in the sense that the respondent must be aware of the positive and negative aspects or consequences of participation (ibid). The participant is free to refuse to participate or withdraw from the research at any time (Cardwell, 1996)

In this study, a consent form was provided to convey information about the study that the participants required to know to make an informed decision. Over and above providing a consent form to those respondents who were interviewed, the researcher informed them about the purpose of the study before interviewing them. The participants were granted the liberty to choose to participate or not to participate in the study. Some selected teachers and principals did not return the posted questionnaires and others when phoned to remind them to send the completed questionnaire they reported time constrains or losing it.

4.12.2 Confidentiality and anonymity

Confidentiality and anonymity are two conditions designed to protect the participant’s right to privacy in research (Kazdin, 2003). Confidentiality means that the information will not be disclosed to a third party without the knowledge and consent of the respondent (ibid). It is the researcher’s ethical responsibility to make sure that once the information is obtained, participants are guaranteed that their performance is confidential. The information may have names attached to it, but the researcher holds it in confidence or keeps it secret to the public (Neuman, 2005).
Anonymity means that participants remain anonymous. To protect anonymity, names or addresses of subjects were discarded as soon as possible and referred to subjects by a code number only (Neuman, 2005).

In this study, confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed by not asking participants to write their names on the questionnaires. Additionally, respondents in the study had their addresses discarded immediately and were identified by serial numbers instead of names. Anonymity was also confirmed through aggregating data rather than presenting individual responses.

4.12.3 Protection of harm to respondents

Researchers should ensure that their research does not harm respondents (Neuman, 2005). Harm to respondents range from physical harm, psychological abuse, to legal jeopardy (ibid).

Respondents in this study were not exposed to any of the above. The study did not expose respondents to physical danger, nor did it seek private and sensitive information from them. The employer (MoESAC) clearance was obtained to avoid putting the respondents into legal jeopardy. The respondents’ responses were taken as given and one could not identify a particular respondent’s response.

4.12.4 Safeguarding privacy

According to Neuman (2005), social researchers must take precautions to protect respondents’ privacy. In this study, privacy was warranted through requesting respondents not to write their names on the questionnaires. Privacy was also enhanced through blending the respondents’ responses. The individual respondent’s performance could not be identified in the grouped data.
4.13 Summary

In this chapter, the research methodology was discussed. The ethical considerations, the training of research assistant, the pilot study, the research design, population, sample, research instruments and data collection were all discussed.

The next chapter is going to present the data and analyse the results from the empirical research.
CHAPTER 5: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyse data gathered from stakeholders using the Survey Questionnaire and open-ended interviews. The survey investigated the school psychological services that principals and teachers in Zimbabwe receive, as well as those services they wish to receive. It also assessed their level of satisfaction with these psychological services.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were used. The Chi square test was applied to close-ended response items in the survey questionnaire. Thematic content analysis was used for the qualitative responses from the interviews and open-ended responses from the survey questionnaires. Data triangulation involved cross checking the consistency of data from quantitative and qualitative responses.

The data presentations are sub-divided into three sections. Section A presents the Demographic data; Section B provides the quantitative report which covers the findings of the three hypotheses and research questions formulated in Chapter 1.

Section C presents the qualitative report on the survey information that was obtained from open-ended questions and interviews. The following themes emerged from the interviews and open-ended survey responses:

- Visits to the EPs offices and reasons for visiting
- The roles of EPs in the School
- The positive aspects of the services
- The problems encountered with EPs
- Reasons for evaluating the services as good or excellent
- Reason for recommending psychological services to other people
• What is lacking in the psychological services
• How EPs can improve service delivery

5.2 Section A: Biographical data

A total of 248 questionnaires were sent out to the participating schools in four administrative provinces of Zimbabwe. Eighty (80) questionnaires were sent to the principals and 168 to the teachers. A total of 160 questionnaires were returned. Of the returned questionnaires, 48 were from principals and 102 were from teachers.

The returned questionnaires represent a 58% return rate for the total response rate. The respective return rates were 60% for the principals and 61% for the teachers. In addition to the returned responses, 10 participants (4 principals and 6 teachers) were interviewed by the researcher. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the biographical data of the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical variable</th>
<th>Variable description</th>
<th>Frequency (Freq.)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal experience</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with educational psychologists</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (see Chapter 3) illustrates the biographical variables of school principals according to sex, teaching experience, duration (experience) as principals, duration (experience) working with educational psychologists, professional qualifications and the provinces they were selected from.
Table 2: Biographical variables of school teachers (N=108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographical variable</th>
<th>Variable description</th>
<th>Frequency (Freq.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience working with educational</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychologists</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (see Chapter 4) presents the biographical variables of school teachers according to the respondent’s sex, teaching experience, experience working with educational psychologists, professional qualifications and the provinces they were selected from.

5.3  Section B: Presentation and analysis of quantitative data

The data in Tables 4 to 6 present results on the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders as hypothesised in Chapter 1, specifically:

i. There is no significant difference in the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service between male and female educators.
ii. The level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the qualifications of the stakeholders are independent of each other.

iii. The level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders are independent of each other.

The items on psychological services on assessment and intervention focused on psycho-educational assessment, curriculum development and adaptation, individual counselling, crisis intervention, working with children in regular education, and group counselling.

The results for hypothesis (i) are presented in Table 4.
Table 4: Male and female educators’ level of satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Chi-square test (X²)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with school professionals</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21(13.13)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>22(13.75)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>X²=4.600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .204</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38(23.75)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>40(25)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of services provided</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30(18.75)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>X²=12.561</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .006</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>42(25.26)</td>
<td>19(11.88)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with parents</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35(21.86)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>63(39)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>X²=4.238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .237</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42(25.26)</td>
<td>31(19.38)</td>
<td>19(11.88)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with school personnel</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30(18.75)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>X²=9.439</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .024</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33(20.63)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>36(22.5)</td>
<td>9(5.63)</td>
<td>94(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>1(0.625)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>X²=3.053</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .384</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48(30)</td>
<td>21(13.73)</td>
<td>27(16.88)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26(16.25)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>60(38)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>X²=3.952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .267</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36(22.5)</td>
<td>35(21.86)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>92(58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for learning</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>23(14.38)</td>
<td>1(0.625)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>X²=5.795</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .122</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30(18.75)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>50(31.25)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>19(11.88)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>X²=1.278</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt; .734</td>
<td>(n sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>35(21.86)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training for school personnel</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25(15.63)</td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>X²=2.169</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt; .538</td>
<td>(n sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35(21.88)</td>
<td>26(16.25)</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>93(58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents workshops</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41(25.63)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>1(0.625)</td>
<td>60(38)</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>X²=8.543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .036</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65(40.63)</td>
<td>21(13.13)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>94(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for placement in special education</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>X²=2.915</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .405</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41(25.63)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>25(15.63)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31(19.38)</td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>X²=5.001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .172</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43(26.88)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>94(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30(18.75)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>62(39)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>X²=10.410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .015</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>19(11.88)</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>64(40)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>X²=3.332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .343</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30(18.75)</td>
<td>26(16.25)</td>
<td>29(18.13)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>95(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37(23.13)</td>
<td>9(5.63)</td>
<td>14(8.75)</td>
<td>1(0.625)</td>
<td>61(38)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>X²=10.878</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt; .012</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57(35.63)</td>
<td>26(16.25)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>92(58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35(21.86)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>62(39)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>X²=4.717</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .194</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39(24.38)</td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>96(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43(26.88)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>9(5.63)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60(38)</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>X²=5.159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; .010</td>
<td>(.sig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55(34.38)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>25(15.63)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>95(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The computed Chi-Square test for stakeholders in Table 4 reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of stakeholders' satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services between female and male educators. Therefore, the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) that there is no significant difference in the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service between male and female educators is rejected and the alternate hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the level of stakeholders’ satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services is accepted. This tells us that there is a statistically significant association between Gender and the level of satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services; that is, Male and Female educators are not equally satisfied or dissatisfied with the provision of school psychological services.

The results for hypothesis (ii) are presented in Table 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service provided</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-square test (X²)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with school professionals</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>39(24.4)</td>
<td>15(9.4)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>7(4.4)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of services provided</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>25(15.8)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>30(18.9)</td>
<td>22(13.9)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
<td>19(12)</td>
<td>11(6.9)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with parents</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>37(23.2)</td>
<td>35(21.9)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>29(18.1)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with school personnel</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>32(2)</td>
<td>26(16.3)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
<td>19(12)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>7(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>39(24.4)</td>
<td>34(21.3)</td>
<td>7(4.4)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>26(16.3)</td>
<td>30(18.8)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>34(21.3)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>7(4.4)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for learning</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>28(17.5)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>42(26.3)</td>
<td>29(18.1)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>29(18.1)</td>
<td>22(13.9)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>13(8.1)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>27(16.9)</td>
<td>23(14.4)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training for school personnel</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>23(14.4)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>24(16.0)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>21(13.1)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents workshops</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>59(36.9)</td>
<td>38(23.8)</td>
<td>9(5.6)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>13(8.1)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for placement in special education</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>39(24.4)</td>
<td>26(16.3)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>7(4.4)</td>
<td>11(6.9)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>22(13.9)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>45(28.1)</td>
<td>23(14.4)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>13(8.1)</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
<td>18(11.3)</td>
<td>15(9.4)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>47(29.4)</td>
<td>23(14.4)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>9(5.6)</td>
<td>20(12.5)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
<td>21(13.1)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>6(3.8)</td>
<td>21(13.1)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>27(16.9)</td>
<td>23(14.4)</td>
<td>3(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>47(29.4)</td>
<td>39(24.4)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>9(5.6)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>5(3.2)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>35(21.9)</td>
<td>31(19.4)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>11(6.9)</td>
<td>16(10)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>29(18.1)</td>
<td>14(8.8)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Diploma Masters</td>
<td>46(28.8)</td>
<td>43(26.9)</td>
<td>9(5.6)</td>
<td>10(6.3)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>2(1.3)</td>
<td>22(13.9)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chi-Square test result in Table 5 indicates that there is a significant difference in the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service between those stakeholders with diploma qualification and those with degree qualification. In this case the null hypothesis that the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the qualifications of the stakeholders are independent of each other is rejected. The alternate hypothesis that say the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the qualifications of the stakeholders are not independent of each other is accepted: that is, both diploma holders and degree holders have equal level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the provision of school psychological service in Zimbabwe.

The results for hypothesis (iii) are presented in Table 6.
Table 6: The association between teaching experience and the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Some what satisfied Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Satisfied Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Very satisfied Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Freq.</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Chi-square test (X^2)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with school professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>X^2 = 16.759</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of services provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>58.81</td>
<td>X^2 = 49.264</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>17(10.63)</td>
<td>2(1.25)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25(15.6)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>X^2 = 18.281</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>44(27.5)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>X^2 = 12.411</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>12(7.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>X^2 = 19.798</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>X^2 = 24.438</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>2(1.25)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>X^2 = 6.98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>4(2.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>72(45)</td>
<td>42(26.25)</td>
<td>14(8.75)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>X^2 = 5.841</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training for school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
<td>2(1.25)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>X^2 = 16.480</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
<td>23(14.38)</td>
<td>42(26.25)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>X^2 = 12.153</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for placement in special education</td>
<td></td>
<td>18(11.25)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>15(9.38)</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>X^2 = 29.144</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>6(3.75)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(0.63)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>74(46.25)</td>
<td>46(28.75)</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>X^2 = 12.779</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>X^2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group counselling</strong></td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>41(25.63)</td>
<td>21(13.13)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>12.689</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working with children in regular education</strong></td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>41(25.63)</td>
<td>21(13.13)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10.233</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis intervention</strong></td>
<td>11(6.88)</td>
<td>45(28.13)</td>
<td>31(19.38)</td>
<td>7(4.38)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.088</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&lt; .343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum development</strong></td>
<td>10(6.25)</td>
<td>32(20)</td>
<td>24(15)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.661</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&gt; .569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>36(22.5)</td>
<td>40(25)</td>
<td>9(5.63)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.661</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&gt; .569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi-Square results presented in Table 6 show that the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders are not independent of each other. Thus the null hypothesis that the level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders are independent of each other is rejected. The alternate hypothesis that there is a statistically significant association between level of stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological service and the teaching experience of the stakeholders is accepted: that is, both stakeholders with less than 10 years teaching experience and those with more than 10 years have equal level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the provision of school psychological.

Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 presents descriptive findings that answer the research questions 1.4.1 up to 1.4.3 presented in Chapter 1, viz.:

1.4.1 What are the current psychological services that schools receive from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe?

1.4.2 What services are expected by the teachers and principals from the Educational Psychologists?
1.4.3 Are there significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals expect?

Table 7 presents results on assessments and intervention services schools are receiving and those they wish to receive from EPs.

**Table 7: Assessments and intervention services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Service being received</th>
<th>Service received</th>
<th>Service Wish to receive</th>
<th>Total Observed Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>25(48.1)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18(16.8)</td>
<td>33(30.8)</td>
<td>56(52.3)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development/adaptation</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4(7.8)</td>
<td>19(37.3)</td>
<td>28(54.9)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8(7.5)</td>
<td>20(18.7)</td>
<td>79(73.8)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>10(19.2)</td>
<td>28(53.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9(8.7)</td>
<td>14(13.7)</td>
<td>80(77.7)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>9(18)</td>
<td>9(18)</td>
<td>32(64)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11(10.7)</td>
<td>15(14.6)</td>
<td>77(74.8)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>20(20)</td>
<td>6(11.5)</td>
<td>26(50)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>29(27.6)</td>
<td>36(34.3)</td>
<td>40(38.1)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>12(23.5)</td>
<td>8(15.7)</td>
<td>31(60.8)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>29(27.6)</td>
<td>36(34.3)</td>
<td>40(38.1)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>177(18.44)</td>
<td>219(22.81)</td>
<td>542(56.46)</td>
<td>938/960 (97.71) Miss.data (2.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals that both teachers and principals expect to get more assessment and intervention services in schools. The result shows that 41.25% of the stakeholders received or are receiving assessment and intervention services but there are 56.46% who would appreciate receiving more of these services. The implication of this result is
that these stakeholders might be dissatisfied if this is consistent with the disconfirmation theory which states that the level of satisfaction is a function of pre-consumption expectations and disconfirmation of expectations (Kotler & Keller, 2009). This observation is in agreement with Watkins et al. (2001)’s findings that teachers and administrators want school psychologists to continue assessment activities. EPs should therefore focus on meeting teachers and principals’ expectations of assessments and intervention services to create higher satisfaction. However, following this prevalent demand means EPs will be stagnant in these traditional activities and thus defeating the call for expanding into other areas.

Results in Table 8, illustrate the consultation services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs.

Table 8: Consultation services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Service being received</th>
<th>Service received</th>
<th>Service Wish to receive</th>
<th>Total Observed-Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with teachers</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>17(33.3)</td>
<td>5(9.8)</td>
<td>29(56.9)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>41(39)</td>
<td>23(21.9)</td>
<td>41(39)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending staff meetings</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>9(17.6)</td>
<td>13(25.5)</td>
<td>29(56.9)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>9(8.5)</td>
<td>48(45.3)</td>
<td>49(46.2)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding case conferences</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4(7.8)</td>
<td>8(15.7)</td>
<td>39(76.5)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11(10.7)</td>
<td>21(20.4)</td>
<td>71(68.9)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>10(19.6)</td>
<td>11(21.6)</td>
<td>30(58.8)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12(11.2)</td>
<td>31(29)</td>
<td>64(59.8)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>113(17.66)</td>
<td>160(25)</td>
<td>352(55)</td>
<td>625/640 (97.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result in Table 8 reveals that consultation activities being received and those received (42.66%) are surpassed by stakeholders’ expectations (55%). This finding shows that stakeholders expect more consultation activities form EPs. Thus, educational psychologists need to provide routine consultation that is aligned with other school psychological services attributes like holding case conferences to maximise meeting stakeholder expectations. This result may probably be due to the fact that consultation service in the form of case conference is not held because EPs are office based. The EPs do not visit schools but instead operate from provincial offices. Hagemeier, Bischoff, Jacobs, and Osmon (1998), found that most school staff members regarded consultation with parents and teachers, and intervention as an important role of school psychologists, hence educational psychologists should priorities consultation.

Table 9 presents results on research services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Service being received</th>
<th>Service received</th>
<th>Service Wish to receive</th>
<th>Total Observed</th>
<th>Total Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on school needs</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>34(65.4)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12(11.7)</td>
<td>16(15.5)</td>
<td>75(72.8)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluations</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4(7.7)</td>
<td>10(19.2)</td>
<td>38(73.1)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>9(8.9)</td>
<td>21(20.8)</td>
<td>71(70.3)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on best practices</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
<td>1(1.9)</td>
<td>46(88.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>13(12.7)</td>
<td>8(7.8)</td>
<td>81(79.4)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>52(10.83)</td>
<td>64(13.33)</td>
<td>345(71.88)</td>
<td>461/480(96.04)</td>
<td>Miss.data (3.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result in Table 9 on the delivery of research services to schools by EPs indicates that, although stakeholders received or are receiving research services (24.16%) they yearn to receive more of this service (71.88%). This result could probable be due to the fact that research services might not be involving some schools in the current study. It may also mean that stakeholders are keen to implement research-based instructional strategies that meet the needs of all the learners. Nevertheless, there is need for routine research to investigate stakeholders’ expectations if the EPs want to be in line with the modern practice of school psychology as stated by Jimerson et al. (2006).

Results in Table 10 illustrate the information and advocacy services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs.

Table 10: Information and advocacy services schools receive and wish to receive from EPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Service being received</th>
<th>Service received</th>
<th>Service Wish to receive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>8(15.4)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>35(67.3)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>23(21.5)</td>
<td>10(9.3)</td>
<td>74(69.2)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>12(9.1)</td>
<td>11(15)</td>
<td>28(53.8)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>16(14.8)</td>
<td>35(32.4)</td>
<td>57(52.8)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach programmes through the school</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4(7.7)</td>
<td>6(11.5)</td>
<td>41(78.8)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>11(10.3)</td>
<td>17(15.9)</td>
<td>79(73.8)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing of procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
<td>6(11.5)</td>
<td>41(78.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3(2.8)</td>
<td>18(16.7)</td>
<td>87(80.6)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing of procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1(1.9)</td>
<td>6(11.5)</td>
<td>45(86.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>19(17.9)</td>
<td>12(11.3)</td>
<td>75(70.8)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing of procedures for learning</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>32(61.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>14(13)</td>
<td>26(24.1)</td>
<td>68(63)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing of procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>11(21.5)</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>33(63.5)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>21(19.4)</td>
<td>16(14.8)</td>
<td>71(65.7)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155(13.84)</td>
<td>192(17.14)</td>
<td>766(68.39)</td>
<td>1113/1120 (99.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result in Table 10 indicates that teachers and principals expect more information and advocacy services (68.39%) from EPs as compared to what they are receiving or have received (30.98%). The implication of this result is that all information and advocacy activities delivered do not meet stakeholders’ expectations. Like the other results, this result might as well be due to the fact that the school psychological services are still growing and there is need for routine investigation of stakeholders’ expectations so that service delivery is aligned to stakeholders’ expectations.

Tables 11, 12 and 13 present results on the research question 1.4.4: i.e. what are teachers’ and principals’ levels of satisfaction with the school psychological services in Zimbabwe?
Table 11: Level of satisfaction with the overall performance of educational psychologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the school</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>17(32.7)</td>
<td>13(25)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4 (3.7)</td>
<td>49(45.4)</td>
<td>9(8.3)</td>
<td>46(42.6)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the psychologist</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4(7.7)</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>19(36.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>10(9.3)</td>
<td>21(19.4)</td>
<td>38(35.2)</td>
<td>39(36.1)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with parents at the school</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1(2 )</td>
<td>4(7.8)</td>
<td>13(25.5)</td>
<td>33(64.7)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8(7.4)</td>
<td>25(23.1)</td>
<td>31(28.7)</td>
<td>44(40.7)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with School personnel</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>23(44.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>16(15.1)</td>
<td>38(35.8)</td>
<td>12(11.3)</td>
<td>40(37.7)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12(23.1)</td>
<td>16(30.8)</td>
<td>24(46.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1(0.9)</td>
<td>28(52.9)</td>
<td>23(43.1)</td>
<td>56(51.9)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2(4.3)</td>
<td>10(21.3)</td>
<td>13(27.7)</td>
<td>22(46.8)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12(11.4)</td>
<td>16(15.2)</td>
<td>37(35.2)</td>
<td>40(38.1)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for learning</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2(3.8)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>21(40.4)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2(1.9)</td>
<td>58(53.7)</td>
<td>15(13.9)</td>
<td>33(30.8)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3(5.8)</td>
<td>16(30.8)</td>
<td>17(32.7)</td>
<td>16(30.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>14(13)</td>
<td>38(35.2)</td>
<td>16(14.8)</td>
<td>40(37)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training for school personnel</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3(5.8)</td>
<td>11(21.2)</td>
<td>16(30.8)</td>
<td>22(42.3)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7(6.7)</td>
<td>32(30.5)</td>
<td>28(26.7)</td>
<td>38(36.2)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents workshops</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1(1.9)</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
<td>12(23.1)</td>
<td>34(65.4)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4(3.9)</td>
<td>9(8.8)</td>
<td>17(16.7)</td>
<td>72(70.6)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for placement in special education</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>10(19.2)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>18(34.6)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>23(21.3)</td>
<td>27(25)</td>
<td>7(6.5)</td>
<td>51(47.2)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2(3.9)</td>
<td>11(21.6)</td>
<td>13(25.5)</td>
<td>25(49)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5(4.7)</td>
<td>24(22.4)</td>
<td>29(27.1)</td>
<td>49(45.8)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2(3.8)</td>
<td>19(36.5)</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>24(46.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>11(10.4)</td>
<td>19(17.9)</td>
<td>24(22.6)</td>
<td>52(49.1)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>10(19.2)</td>
<td>11(21.2)</td>
<td>24(46.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>16(15.5)</td>
<td>23(22.3)</td>
<td>63(61.2)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3(5.8)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>11(21.2)</td>
<td>29(55.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8(7.5)</td>
<td>35(33)</td>
<td>18(17)</td>
<td>45(42)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>2(3.9)</td>
<td>12(23.5)</td>
<td>36(70.6)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2(1.9)</td>
<td>32(30.8)</td>
<td>8(7.7)</td>
<td>62(59.6)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>184(7.19)</td>
<td>637(24.88)</td>
<td>550(21.48)</td>
<td>1153(45)</td>
<td>2524/2560(98.59) Miss.data (1.41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in Table 11 demonstrate the diverse levels of satisfaction that stakeholders have on the overall performance of educational psychologists. The percentage of those who are satisfied and very satisfied is 32.07%. Those who are somewhat satisfied is 21.48%. Forty five (45) percent of the stakeholders are not satisfied with the provision of school psychological services.

The result of the current study could probable be due to the different expectations and different definitions of quality as well as different preferences of how quality is assessed (Cheng & Tam, 1997). Secondly, the EPs might be failing to cope with stakeholders demand for school psychological services. Lastly, EPs might be lacking the resources and skills to be able to meet stakeholder service requirements. Thus, EPs should focus on improving school psychological services delivery in all its domains to heighten stakeholder satisfaction.

These mixed results seems to concur with Farrell, Jimerson, Kalambouka, and Benoit (2005) finding that in most countries, the teachers would like school psychologists to spend time working with parents, as well as training and advising them on the development of new curriculum materials and less time working with individual children. Watkins et al. (2001), found that school staff gave very high rating to six services, i.e. assessment, special education input, consultation, counselling, intervention, and behaviour management. Hagemeier et al. (1998), also found that most school staff members regarded consultation with parents and teachers, and intervention as an important role of school psychologists. Failure to meet this array of expectations could have led to mixed results of the current study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Appealing &amp; satisfactory</th>
<th>Appealing but unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not appealing but satisfactory</th>
<th>Neither appealing nor satisfactory</th>
<th>Total Observed Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoeducational assessment</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>24(47.1)</td>
<td>15(29.4)</td>
<td>5(9.8)</td>
<td>7(13.7)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>38(37.3)</td>
<td>20(19.6)</td>
<td>11(10.8)</td>
<td>31(30.4)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>12(23.5)</td>
<td>21(41.2)</td>
<td>6(11.8)</td>
<td>10(19.6)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>29(27.9)</td>
<td>22(21.2)</td>
<td>20(19.2)</td>
<td>33(31.7)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>17(33.3)</td>
<td>17(33.3)</td>
<td>7(13.7)</td>
<td>10(19.6)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>12(11.4)</td>
<td>30(28.6)</td>
<td>12(11.4)</td>
<td>51(48.6)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with teachers</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>13(25.5)</td>
<td>21(41.2)</td>
<td>8(15.7)</td>
<td>9(17.6)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>26(25)</td>
<td>32(30.8)</td>
<td>12(11.5)</td>
<td>34(32.7)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>11(2.6)</td>
<td>17(33.3)</td>
<td>11(21.6)</td>
<td>12(23.5)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>25(23.8)</td>
<td>29(27.6)</td>
<td>16(15.2)</td>
<td>35(33.3)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on inclusive education</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>18(34.6)</td>
<td>16(30.8)</td>
<td>3(5.8)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>26(25)</td>
<td>36(34.6)</td>
<td>12(11.6)</td>
<td>30(28.8)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>14(27.5)</td>
<td>17(33.3)</td>
<td>5(9.8)</td>
<td>15(29.4)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>34(31.8)</td>
<td>26(24.3)</td>
<td>13(12.1)</td>
<td>34(31.8)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution.</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19(36.5)</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>8(15.4)</td>
<td>11(21.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>17(15.9)</td>
<td>30(28)</td>
<td>22(20.6)</td>
<td>38(35.5)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>11(22)</td>
<td>26(52)</td>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>9(18)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>23(21.3)</td>
<td>20(18.5)</td>
<td>34(31.5)</td>
<td>31(28.7)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>11(21.2)</td>
<td>26(50)</td>
<td>6(11.5)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>35(32.4)</td>
<td>31(28.7)</td>
<td>13(12)</td>
<td>29(26.9)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>14(26.9)</td>
<td>22(42.3)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20(19.8)</td>
<td>30(29.7)</td>
<td>18(17.8)</td>
<td>33(32.7)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or program evaluation</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>12(23.1)</td>
<td>24(46.2)</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>7(13.5)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16(15)</td>
<td>26(24.3)</td>
<td>22(20.6)</td>
<td>43(40.2)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>11(22.4)</td>
<td>19(38.8)</td>
<td>9(18.5)</td>
<td>10(20.4)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8(8)</td>
<td>26(26)</td>
<td>30(30)</td>
<td>36(36)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total                                                        |             | 496(23.85)    | 613(29.47)      | 325(15.63)     | 582(27.98)      | 2027/2080 (97.45)
|                                                              |             |               |                 |                 |                   | Miss.data (2.55)        |
The results in Table 12 reveals that combining stakeholder perception of the most appealing and satisfactory school psychological services stakeholders receive also produced mixed sentiments. 23.85% of the stakeholders find the school psychological services to be appealing and satisfactory. 29.47% feel the services are appealing but their delivery is unsatisfactory. 15.63% perceive the school psychological services to be not appealing but satisfactory. 27.98% do not see any of the two attributes in the school psychological services. These results could be because the EPs have not established a particular balance of support for stakeholders as determined by negotiation between the service provider and the concerned stakeholders. What is necessary is to make stakeholders feel heard by following up on their feedback. This appeal to the EPs to put stakeholders’ feedback to use in support of learning and driving systemic change to address root causes of dissatisfaction.

Results in Table 13 show the level of satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services on a continuum of being bad, good and excellent.
Table 13: Frequency distribution according to the satisfaction level of services, principals and teachers find bad, good and excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychoeducational assessment</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with teachers</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on inclusive education</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution.</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research or program evaluation</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>991</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>2080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Miss. Data (3.49)
The results in Table 13 indicate that 47.64% feel that the delivery of school psychological services is bad. Altogether, 48.76% (Good and Excellent) of the stakeholders perceive the services to be good.

The fact that the almost half of the stakeholders feel that the school psychological services are bad has significant implications on the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders since satisfaction is emotional or cognitive. Based on Hirschman’s theory (Hirschman, 1970a), dissatisfied stakeholders may react in two ways – they may either voice or exit.

Stakeholders exit is the worse consequence of stakeholder evaluation of service offering. In such situation, the EPs lose stakeholders, which result in declining patronage and clientele for the EPs. Moreover, such stakeholder will most probably express his or her dissatisfaction through word of mouth to other potential stakeholders.

Therefore, it is extremely crucial for the EPs to establish effective complaint management system which will ensure, that two actions happen: a) listening to complaints and b) reaction to the complaints.

Findings in Table 14 provide the overall rating of school psychological services on a continuum from terrible, bad, average, good and excellent.
Table 14: The overall rating of school psychological services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Miss.data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>9(17.3)</td>
<td>12(23.1)</td>
<td>18(34.6)</td>
<td>8(15.4)</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>17(15.7)</td>
<td>38(35.2)</td>
<td>28(25.9)</td>
<td>11(10.2)</td>
<td>12(11.1)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26(16.3)</td>
<td>50(31.3)</td>
<td>46(28.8)</td>
<td>19(11.9)</td>
<td>17(10.6)</td>
<td>158/160(98.75)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 14 the results on the overall rating of the psychological services reveal a significant difference to the results presented in table 13. The combined positive rating (i.e. average, good and excellent) has a total of 76.4% for all the stakeholders and the grouped negative rating (terrible and bad) for all the stakeholders is 22.5%. Although 47.64% of the stakeholders in Table 13 identified services as bad, in the overall evaluation the positive rating is high (76.4%).

The meaning of this could be that although stakeholders are not satisfied with the various services received, they still perceive school psychological services in high esteem.

Responses in Table 15 illustrate whether the stakeholders visit the offices of the EPs.

Table 15: Visits to the educational psychologists’ offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>25(48.1%)</td>
<td>27(51.9%)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>37(35.2%)</td>
<td>68(64.8%)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62(38.75)</td>
<td>95(59.38)</td>
<td>157/160(98.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding visiting the EPs offices, the result in Table 15 indicates that 38.75% of the stakeholders visit the offices and 59.38% do not. This result could be because of the location of most of the EPs offices. The EPs offices are located at regional offices and stakeholders tend to pass through them whenever they visit regional offices for other business. Another reason could be that EPs rarely visit schools and thus, stakeholders have to search for them to get their services. If this is the case, the Zimbabwean EPs are not implementing the current best practice guidelines that recommend school psychologists to conduct context-specific assessments that are directly linked with data-based decision-making models such as problem-solving or response to intervention (RTI) (Reschly, 2000).

Findings in Table 16 present the frequency of the stakeholders’ visits to EPs’ offices.

**Table 16: Frequency of use of the educational psychologist’s services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Once per term</th>
<th>More than once per term</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>When need arises</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Total Observed Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(3.8%)</td>
<td>3(5.8%)</td>
<td>5(9.6%)</td>
<td>27(51.9%)</td>
<td>15(28.8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3(2.8%)</td>
<td>11(10.2%)</td>
<td>2(1.9%)</td>
<td>3(2.8%)</td>
<td>36(33%)</td>
<td>45(41.7%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3(1.88)</td>
<td>13(8.13)</td>
<td>5(3.13)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
<td>63(39.38)</td>
<td>60(37.5)</td>
<td>152/160(95) Miss.data (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result in Table 16 shows that the prominent responses indicate that most of the stakeholders visit the psychologists’ offices when the need arises (39.385), and others rarely visit (37.5%) the offices. The implication of this result is that when the EPs do not go out to the schools, consultation with stakeholders is cut. To avoid this, EPs should establish a consultation mechanism that is more regular.

The results in Table 17 present data on whether the stakeholders will recommend psychological services to another person.
Table 17: Would you recommend psychological services to another person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160(93.75)</td>
<td>Miss.data(6.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result in Table 17 reveals that the majority (67.5%) of the stakeholders will recommend psychological services to another person. The result is positive in the sense that despite the bulk (45%) of the stakeholders being not satisfied at all (see Table 11) they will still refer another person to an EP.

The implication of this result is that despite being dissatisfied with service deliveries most stakeholders still have faith with EPs’ input on school psychological services.

Results in Table 18 show the perceptions of the stakeholders on the usefulness of the recommendations made by EPs.

Table 18: Usefulness of the recommendations provided by the educational psychologist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of the recommendations provided by the EP.</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>8(15.4%)</td>
<td>22(42.3%)</td>
<td>22(42.3%)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>43(39.8%)</td>
<td>45(41.7%)</td>
<td>17(15.7%)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist’s service meeting requirements.</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23(44.2%)</td>
<td>29(55.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>40(37%)</td>
<td>66(61.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>114(35.6)</td>
<td>162(50.63)</td>
<td>39(12.19)</td>
<td>315/320(98.4)</td>
<td>Miss.data(1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result in Table 18 shows that about 35.6% of the stakeholders perceive the recommendations provided by the educational psychologist to be useful. However, 50.63% of the stakeholders feel that the recommendations provided by the educational psychologist for use in the classroom are not useful and thus their service is not meeting the classroom requirements.

The implication of this result is that in order to provide an equitable and efficient service, EPs should undertake visits to schools on a planned, regular basis. Time should be allocated to each school on the basis of an analysis of school characteristics. In addition to school visits, some of the EPs’ time should be spent with teachers and principals, for example, in relation to pupils who are of concern to the school. Research projects, learning and teaching initiatives, and contributions to in-service training should also be important parts of the service. The particular balance of support for the schools should be determined by negotiation between the EPs and the schools concerned.

5.4  Section C: Presentation and analysis of qualitative data – interview and open-ended questions

In the following sections, data obtained from the face-to-face interviews held with the 10 participants and the open-ended questions on the questionnaire are presented. A number of themes emerged during the process of analysing the qualitative data. These themes which are not discrete and independent from each other are the bases for the following presentations. A close relationship exists between all the themes and the open-ended questions. The fact that they are discussed separately is merely for convenience as this helps in guiding and giving coherence to the discussion. The themes identified were the following:

- Visits to the EPs offices and reasons for visiting.
- The roles of EPs in the School.
- The positive aspects of the services.
- The problems encountered with EPs.
• Reasons for evaluating the services as good or excellent.
• Reason for recommending psychological services to other people.
• What is lacking in the psychological services.
• Suggestions to improve service delivery.

The subsequent sections sequentially discuss each of these themes.

5.4.1 Visits to the EPs offices and reasons for visiting

The question and discussion solicited information from the participants on whether they ever visited the educational psychologists’ offices as well as the reasons thereof.

Both principals and teachers visit the EPs’ offices for almost similar reasons but the teachers had more reasons for visiting the offices as the following excerpts demonstrate these observations. The excerpts will be cited by their numbers only, to avoid revealing the respondents’ personal identity.

Principal 10 reported that he

\[ Visited \text{ the offices to seek professional advice concerning learners with special needs. } \]

Principal 51 said she

\[ Was \text{ at the offices to collect and submit assessment results. } \]

When probed to explain what these results were, the Principal said the EP had given the school a test to administer to grade four and five pupils. The EP was going to analyse these and select pupils who qualified for special class remedial programme.

Principal 20 declared that

\[ I \text{ visited the EP’s offices to consult on placements of pupils with special needs. } \]
In addition to what was stated by the principals, teachers visited the offices for the following other reasons.

Teacher 106 pronounced that

*I went to the EPs offices to learn how to remedy grade four pupils with specific problems.*

Teacher 60 affirmed that

*I went to the office accompanying a parent with her child who needed an assessment.*

Teacher 36 proclaimed that he

*Went to the office to discuss suspected wrong placement of pupils in special class and seek professional assistance.*

Teacher 48 said

*I went to the office to seek teaching and learning aids.*

**Implication**

Both principals and teachers who visited the EP offices had something to do with special education support, indicating their emphasis on assessment-related activities to greater involvement in roles such as designing and implementing academic and behavioural interventions. The implication of this is that once the stakeholders fail to get much of this, they are likely to be dissatisfied with the provision of this service. Sentiments expressed here are consistent with the questionnaire responses.

**5.4.2 The roles of EPs in the Schools**

Participants were requested to make general comments on school psychological services in their schools. The comments varied.

Principal 52 commented that

*EPs have a good role to play in schools but lack financial resources to be mobile and organise workshops regularly.*

Principal 28 felt that
EPs should be present in schools to in-service both teachers and parents on the programmes/services available.

Teachers’ sentiments were similar to the principals.

Teacher 13 noted that

Their services are good but the lack of human and financial resources leads to poor services.

Teacher 104 reckons that

The personnel are too few and are limited to office work instead of being in schools.

Teacher 42 asserted that

They have minimal interaction with schools and pupils.

Teacher 11 contended that

They are out of touch with headmasters, teachers, parents and pupils.

Implication

Responses indicated that Educational Psychologists have a role to play in schools and positive outcomes for children are more likely to be achieved when they work alongside stakeholders like principals, teachers, parents, pupils and other professionals. The stakeholders lamented the limited contact time Educational Psychologists have with schools - particularly the staff in schools and especially in respect of therapeutic interventions. The barring factors of lack of human and financial resources were noted by the stakeholders. The implication of the result is that stakeholders have an external attribution approach to the dissatisfaction they have. We thus find the sentiments that they will still recommend a person for school psychological services even though they see the service to be bad.

5.4.3 The positive aspects of the services?

The participants were asked if there were any services they find appealing and satisfying. The most common services found appealing and satisfying were
assessments of pupils, in-service training for teachers, counselling of abused pupils and placement of needy children. The following excerpts bear testimony to the participants’ appreciation of these services:

Principal 52 stressed that

*I find psychological assessment of children with autism, hydrocephalus and those sexually abused most challenging and helpful.*

Principal 28 acknowledged that

*The in-service training/meeting with teachers and awareness campaigns help promote inclusion.*

Teacher 105 conceded that

*The planning and designing of the Individual Education Plan (IEP) is good as it helps in focusing on what helps the pupils to achieve progress.*

Teacher 77 recognised that

*Provision of audiology services to schools help pupils with hearing problems get tested and receive help.*

Teacher 36 accredited the BEAM to EPs,

*Enforcing Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) programme for children with learning disabilities and those in resource units help retain these pupils in school.*

**Implication**

The majority of stakeholders reported educational psychology work contributing to meeting the health and learning needs of learners particularly those with special needs. An interesting observation was that the respondents in their appreciation of the educational psychologist’s work grouped it with services rendered by other professionals like audiologists, remedial tutors and social welfare recommendations. The bottom line is that stakeholders appreciate the input of educational psychologists in the welfare of the child.
5.4.4 Problems encountered when working with EPs

Participants were required to provide reasons for gauging psychological services as bad, good or excellent. Some participants indicated that they evaluated the services as bad because the EPS are failing in most critical areas. The following extracts are indicative of the participants' concerns.

Principal 51 reasoned that

*The EPs rarely visit schools. They are not stationed in the district but are at the provincial office which makes them inaccessible to schools, particularly students, teachers and parents. There is need for a paradigm shift.*

Principal 3 declared that

*Their services seem non-existent. They never visit schools.*

Principal 10 summed up the concerns of the disgruntled principals as

*Psychologists have taken an inactive involvement in psychological services in the schools. They should go beyond IEP designing and programme evaluation.*

There are those participants who are expecting more services from the EPs as is stated by Principal 40

*More is needed in crisis intervention and information on inclusive education management.*

Teacher 106 aired views similar to Principal 10 above. The duo is unhappy with the routine of the EPs as stipulated. Teacher 106 had a mouthful of comments during the interview. His observations are

*There is no change in what EPs are offering. What existed ten years ago is what is still applied despite technological advancement to assist teaching and learning of children with disabilities.*

*EPs are not regularly offering services to teachers and pupils in need of their services except assessing learners for placement in special classes. There is little or no consultation done with teachers, yet teachers need clarity and information to be able to assist students.*
There is need for researching or programme evaluation in schools. This is currently not happening. The psychological services rarely visit the school to monitor progress of the programmes implemented at the school.

Implication

The inconspicuousness of EPs in schools is the prominent reason for perceiving the EPs services as bad. The stakeholders are calling for EPs visibility in schools. They would like to see EPs being in schools working along all stakeholders, providing consultation and research services.

5.4.5 Reasons for evaluating the services as good or excellent

Sentiments for evaluating the services as good or excellent also varied among the participants. The following excerpts attest to the reasons why the participants evaluated the services as good or excellent.

Principal 27 wrote

Their services are very helpful to students struggling in their school performance.

Principal 34 felt

EPs carry out assessments using formal instruments that give unbiased results.

Principal 12 declared that

They are really helping children with learning disabilities.

Teachers’ comments for evaluating the services as good or excellent also premised on the benefits of the services to teaching and learning

Teacher 16 stated that

I have always received useful information from the EPs that I have used to teach struggling pupils.

Teacher 91 reported that
Assessments done by EPs facilitates learner placement in appropriate learning programmes.

Implication

The positive sentiments were a results of the benefits attained from the services rendered. Conspicuous benefits were helping students in their learning, use of unbiased assessment tools, provision of helpful information and the development of appropriate learning programmes. The implication of these sentiments is that in response to individual requests for an Educational Psychology Service, Educational Psychologists should clarify the specific nature of the work required and the psychological contribution that they can offer, and, where appropriate, clarify whether an alternative provider is available who may carry out the work with the same impact. Doing so will enable them to sustain the momentum of positive perceptions of the stakeholders.

5.4.6 Recommending psychological services to other people

Participants were asked whether they would recommend psychological services to another person. The extracts from the participants are presented below.

Eighty three percent of the principals reported that they would recommend psychological services to another person. The reasons included the importance of the service, positive results, placement of need pupils and to get expert help. This is illustrated by the following excerpts.

Principal 20 reported that he will refer another person to EPs because “EPs are important although not readily available in schools”.

Principal 51 said “To get proper intervention or programme placement of needy pupils I will refer a child or parent to a psychologist.”

Principal 33 stated that “Their programmes are good however, the planning and execution aspects leaves a lot to be desired.”

Fourteen percent of the principals indicated that they would not recommend psychological services to another person. Their justification was incompetence and
that EPs should just improve on their service delivery. The following extracts are indicative of the principals’ reservations for recommending another person to an EP:

Principal 5 wrote “They are ineffective in responding to referrals made several times and do not inform schools as to when they will attend to them.”

Principal 13 felt “The EPs are not rendering any service in the district, last heard about them in 2008.”

Sixty one percent (61%) of the teachers indicated that they would recommend psychological services to another person to use their expertise and knowledge in helping people with problems. The following extracts allude to the participants’ explanations for recommending a person for EPs services:

Teacher 6 “Parents require the guidance and counselling of psychologists.”

Teacher 69 “The EPs are the only ones who can provide psycho-educational assessment in the schools.”

Teacher 81 “They will get help for children with specific disabilities and various learning problems.”

Thirty two percent of the teachers (32%) indicated that they would not recommend psychological services to another person. The following statements support their rationalizations:

Teacher 57 “Teachers are not being empowered to handle problem learners thus they are referring all the time.”

Teacher 70 “The school psychological services are an essential department but psychologists should not be stuck in their offices.”

**Implication**

The reasons for recommending EPs provide evidence of them making an effective contribution in the various contexts of the stakeholders. Once again the distinctive contribution that EPs make in special education is highlighted. It is important however, to take note of Principal 33’s observation that the “programmes are good”
but,” the planning and execution aspects leaves a lot to be desired.” These are issues that EPs should address.

Those respondents who would not refer other people to EPs were concerned by their inability to empower stakeholders like teachers. The issue of not visiting schools was also raised. These concerns require EPs attention because discontented stakeholders can tarnish the reputation of the profession.

5.4.7 What is lacking in the psychological services

The participants summarised the following as the things that are affecting the operations of EPs:

- There is brain drainage and shortage of man power in the department of School Psychological Services. This has made the provision of services by the department poor.
- They are not making follow ups of pupils placed on various intervention programmes.
- Back up services such as the provision of teaching and learning materials is lacking.
- There is no one on one consultation with teachers so that they understand how to implement some of the recommendation they make.
- The EPs are not attached to schools and communication between schools and EPs is not good. There is no focused vision on the programmes taking place in schools.

5.4.8 Suggested areas for improvement

The participants made the following recommendations to help improve on the service provision by EPs.

- The government should give adequate funding and legislate to fully address the requirements of pupils with special needs.
• EPs should establish frequent interaction with grassroots stakeholders.
• The department of School Psychological Services should increase the number of workshops to allow the sharing of ideas with stakeholders.
• They should increase psychological service personnel to cater for increased enrolment figures in schools.
• There should be regular school visits by the psychologists.

**Implication**

The respondents value the contribution Educational Psychologists make to assessments. They felt too much Educational Psychologist time was taken up with office activity. Their recommendations indicate that Educational Psychologists should continue to have a key role in the assessment of children with the most complex needs. Educational Psychologists should also expand and develop educational psychology activities in areas where their skills and knowledge can have greater effect - group and individual therapy, staff training, consultation and systems work.

The general feeling is that Educational Psychologists should locate their services close to the stakeholders where they can be accessed easily. The Educational Psychology Services should increase Educational Psychologist posts.

**5.5 Summary**

In this chapter, the views of the participants as expressed through survey questionnaires and face-to-face interviews were presented. The analysed data revealed the following:

• The psychological services schools receive from Educational Psychologists
• Teachers and principals expectations from school psychologists
• Whether there are significant differences or none between services rendered and what the teachers and principals are expecting
• The level of satisfaction of teachers and principals with the psychological services is unsatisfactory
• Visits made to the EPs offices and reasons thereof
• The roles of EPs in the School
• The positive aspects of the services
• The problems encountered with EPs
• Reasons for evaluating the services as bad, good or excellent
• Reason for recommending psychological services to other people
• What is lacking in the psychological services
• Suggestions for improving EPs services

The next chapter presents the Summary, Limitations, Conclusions and Recommendations.
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary

This study was aimed at investigating the level of stakeholders’ (teachers and principals) satisfaction with the school psychological services they were receiving from EPs in Zimbabwe. The study also sought to know the current types of psychological services schools were receiving from Educational Psychologists. The research intended to establish the services teachers and principals expected to get from the Educational Psychologists. Lastly, the study wanted to ascertain whether there were significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals expected.

The general research literature on this subject has indicated that school psychologists wish to diversify their professional functioning by reducing the amount of time they spend in assessment activities and increasing the amount of time they spend in alternative roles yet little is known about whether stakeholders are satisfied with the traditional services they get. This is specifically important in the context of Africa where school psychological services is in its infant stage and resources are scarce. The study sought to answer four of these questions:

- What are the current psychological services that schools receive from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe?
- What services are expected by the teachers and principals from the Educational Psychologists?
- Are there significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals expect?
- What are teachers and principals’ level of satisfaction with the psychological services in Zimbabwe?

This empirical study, as previously stated in the preceding chapters, was accomplished using mixed research methods. The integration of research methods
occurred at four points, namely during the design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

Quantitative data were collected using two sets of questionnaires, one for principals and the other for teachers who had received services from EPs. Qualitative data were obtained by means of open ended questions from the questionnaire and face-to-face interview conducted with principals and teachers who had received services from EPs. The findings from both the quantitative and qualitative survey were analysed and presented in Chapter 5.

The subsequent sections summarise the results of the research study.

6.2 The psychological services schools receive from Educational Psychologists

The research question that steered the gathering of data on this topic was “What are the current types of psychological services schools receive from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe?” The objective was to establish the current psychological services that schools receive from EPs. A list of activities constituting the accepted services of school psychologists were listed into a questionnaire from Lacayo et al. (1981); the National Association of School Psychologists (2010); and Thielking and Jimerson (2006). The result indicated an array of services teachers and principals were receiving from EPs. Some of the services they were receiving concurred to a range of the services listed by Lacayo et al. (1981); the National Association of School Psychologists (2010); and Thielking and Jimerson (2006). The stakeholders had certain activities from the list they wished to receive. This result could be because EPs services are given to clients according to the request on the referral letter and/or form. If most school referrals are about assessing learning difficulties then the EPs’ work will be burdened with assessment task at the expense of other services. The onus of changing this is with EPs. The EPs should empower educators to do the general activities that promote inclusive teaching and
learning like assessing for remedial purpose. This will release them from concentrating on special education placements.

6.3 Teachers and principals expectations from school psychologists

Watkins et al. (2001) found that teachers and administrators want school psychologists to continue assessment activities at their current intensity as well as provide a wide range of additional services. In the current study, similar sentiments were expressed by both teachers and principals. The stakeholders wished for more of the traditional services. In the interviews they called for a paradigm shift and suggested that the services should move with time and be in line with technological advances. Assessment is more than just testing, especially when testing for special education eligibility. The primary purpose of assessment should be to support intervention planning and to ensure what is implemented is working and progress is timely monitored.

The implication of the result is that the negative disconfirmation of expectations might lead to dissatisfaction. It was previously stated in Chapter 2 that according to disconfirmation theory, the level of satisfaction (and also dissatisfaction) is a function of pre-consumption expectations and disconfirmation of expectations (Kotler & Keller, 2009) where positive disconfirmation of expectations contributes to satisfaction and negative disconfirmation of expectations contributes to dissatisfaction. The consequence of the gap between expectations and performance in this study is dissatisfaction (Taylor, Ringer, & Strong, 2001). EPs should therefore continuously evaluate stakeholder satisfaction and strive to provide services that excel the highest satisfaction.
6.4 Are there significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals are expecting?

There was a significant difference between the assessments and intervention services being rendered to schools and what the stakeholders expect. The stakeholders felt that they needed more assessments and intervention services. The result suggest that principals and teachers still expect EPs to render the traditional services of being get keepers to the access of special education support. This contradicts the current trend where school psychology paradigm shift is making way for an expanded role for school psychologists that include the delivery of services such as consultation, counselling, intervention, prevention, and inservicing, as well as traditional assessment role (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). EPs services now require being holistic so that they meet the goals of servicing diverse stakeholders.

On the consultation activities the result indicated a significant difference on what the stakeholders expect to have and what they were receiving or had received. This is very important because consultation meetings will clear the interpretation of the recommendations made by the EPs. Sheridian and Gutkin (2000)’s assertion that for school psychologist to be effective, they must maintain a positive relationship with other educators is vital to this finding. The EPs should try by all means to talk to the teachers about a child’s report so that they are able to air their understanding of what is recommended. This idea of consultation encourages the EP to work with the professionals involved and not necessarily directly with the learner. Using this approach is meant to improve the efficiency of consultation as the clients are best treated by those who work more directly with them.

There were significant differences on the research services the stakeholders were receiving or had received and what they wish to get. This finding is calling upon EPs to research on their work so that their work is evidence based. This is a role that extends well beyond that of the traditional, passive consumer of research findings.
Research provides educators with clear direction for instruction and curriculum design to support student learning, whether it is learning language, reading, or other basic skills or mastering content knowledge such as science or social studies. Although EPs may not be teachers, they need to know what works to improve pedagogy, to support teachers, and improve student achievement. NASP (2010) state that research and programme evaluation forms the foundations of school psychologists’ service delivery. EPs can only provide data based decisions when research services are done to the satisfaction of stakeholders.

There will always be differences of perceptions on services received by stakeholders because from the services menu not all clients would want to take everything that is offered. Based on this observation it means that when researching service satisfaction with EP performance there is need to consider this factor. Many issues need to be considered when enhancing links between the provision of school psychological services and satisfaction. These issues can be divided along the organizational levels, ranging from government policy on school psychological services and institutional policies to psychological services and implementation by individual EPs.

### 6.5 Stakeholders’ level of satisfaction with the psychological services

An evaluation of the level of satisfaction with the various services they get from the EPs on a four point Likert scale (very satisfied; satisfied; somewhat satisfied; not satisfied at all) indicated that teachers and principals had mixed feelings ranging from very satisfied to not satisfied at all. Most of the participants’ sentiments hovered around not satisfied at all (45%). A comparative analysis, of grouped sentiments of very satisfaction and satisfied, indicates that teachers are satisfied with most of the services than the principals. These findings contradict Gilman and Gabriel (2004) findings and other previous reports (Anthun, 1999; Landau & Gerken, 1979) where teachers reported significantly lower satisfaction ratings with school psychological services than school administrators. The level of satisfaction is
also different between male and female stakeholders. However, the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is not affected by the qualifications of the stakeholders or the years of teaching experience.

It was asserted in Chapter 2 that stakeholder satisfaction is multifaceted and is considered a part of overall stakeholder behaviour model (Johansson et al., 2002). Several key factors that greatly influence satisfaction include stakeholder’s expectations, attitudes, and intention about the service provided (Parasuraman et al., 1988). The difference of sentiments between teachers and principals in this study could be reflecting the different expectations, attitudes, and intention about the service provided to the respondents.

Table 11 items combined likeableness (appealing) and satisfactoriness of the psychological services. The results still advanced the varied sentiments held by principals and teachers about the services they get from the EPs. These observations suggest that these differences require EPs to have strategies on how to handle the dispositions of their various stakeholders.

A further attempt was made to consolidate the sentiments of teachers and principals by requesting them to state whether they see the services as bad, good, or excellent. This removed those who responded “somewhat satisfied”. This group could either choose bad or good. The very satisfied could also chose excellent. The results indicated no significant differences between those who felt that its bad and those who felt they were good and excellent (48.85%). Previous studies show that principals and teachers appreciate the role played by school psychologists in schools and this is supported by results of this study. In the current study, many of the stakeholders noted that the service delivery was bad due to lack of time spent by school psychologists with stakeholders. They accepted the crucial role of school psychologists.
6.6 Visits to the EPs offices and reasons for visiting

The survey questionnaire and interview solicited information from the participants on whether they ever visited the EPs offices and reason for visiting the offices.

Both principals and teachers visit the EPs offices for almost similar reasons. Their reasons ranged from seeking professional advice concerning learners with special needs, collecting and submitting assessment results, to consulting on placements of pupils with special needs, to learning how to remedy grade four pupils with specific problems, to accompanying a parent with her child who needed an assessment, to discussing suspected wrong placement of pupils in special class and seeking professional assistance, teaching and learning aids. If Lam et al.’s (2004) views are applied to this case, it might mean that those teachers and principals were motivated to patronise the organisation after experiencing satisfying services. Nevertheless, more principals (51.9%) and teachers (64.8%) never visited the EPs offices. This might confirm the exit–voice theory (Hirschman, 1970), which assumes that dissatisfied customers have the option of never use the services of the provider again and seek the services of another organisation. It has been noted that positive teacher attitudes are developed through the availability of appropriate support provisions in inclusive settings.

However, most of the principals (51.9% and teachers (36%) visited the offices when the need arose. Thus, the many who did not visit the offices might not have had the need to visit and not because of dissatisfaction. This issue require further interrogation on whether the stakeholders were satisfied with services rendered at the offices.

6.7 The roles of EPs in the School

The stakeholders gave varied comments on school psychological services in their schools. They felt that EPs had a good role to play in schools but lacked human and financial resources to be mobile and organise workshops regularly. It was the wish of the stakeholders that EPs should be present in schools to in-service both
teachers and parents on the services available. They also hoped that the number of personnel be increased and work in schools.

The most common services found appealing and satisfying were assessments of pupils, in-service training for teachers, counselling of abused pupils and placement of needy children. The worrying aspect is that the services found appealing and satisfying are mainly those that have to do with special education needs. It is worrying in that EPs can have a huge impact on the development of policy and practice towards the maintenance of segregated special education systems. This is evidenced by Jimerson et al. (2004)’s finding that EPs in ten countries continue to have a key role in the assessment of children with special education needs and making recommendations for educational provision. The thrust should be seen promoting inclusion. EPs might thus find themselves in a complex situation in that the stakeholders might only be satisfied with those services that promote segregated special education systems.

6.8 Problems encountered when working with EPs

Some participants indicated that they evaluated the services as bad because the EPs were failing in most critical areas. The following were mentioned as some of the reasons that made them see the services as bad. The participants felt that the EPs rarely visited schools. They were not stationed in the district but were at the provincial office which made them inaccessible to schools, particularly students, teachers and parents. Others perceived their services to be non-existent.

The principals and teachers called on EPs to go beyond individual education plan IEP designing and programme evaluation. A call was made to EPs to change paradigms with time. These sentiments seem to echo the wishes of psychologists in the USA who craved to diversify their professional functioning (Bramlett et al., 2002; Curtis et al., 2004; Watkins et al., 2001). The Zimbabwean EPs should seize this opportunity and broaden the scope of their service delivery.
6.9 Reasons for evaluating the services as good or excellent

Teachers and principals who evaluated the services as good or excellent felt the services were very helpful to students struggling in their school performance. Teachers appreciated the useful information they get from the EPs for teaching struggling pupils. Subtle undertones from responses were emphasis on special education and not the entirety of the school community and the nation. This could be the challenge alluded to by Mnkandla and Mataruse (2002) that psychologists have to contend with when implementing inclusion when other models of service provision, for example, special schools and resource units, are running parallel or competing with the inclusion idea.

6.10 Recommending psychological services to other people

According to Nordman (2004), a highly satisfied stakeholder is very likely to provide repeat business and spread the positive experience by word of mouth, resulting in increased usage and profitability. The inverse is that a dissatisfied stakeholder will most likely not provide repeat business and will be more than willing to share bad experience with whoever will listen (ibid).

The majority of the participants in the current study indicated that they would recommend psychological services to another person. The reasons included the importance of the services, positive results, placement of pupils with special needs and to get expert help. This illustrates their appreciation of the services of the EPs.

However, there were those who were dissatisfied with the services because the EPs were ineffective in responding to referrals made several times and do not inform schools as to when they will attend them. These are stakeholders who could
end up not providing repeat business and more than willing to share their bad experience with other teachers and principals (Nordman, 2004).

It is important to note that the respondents still see the provision of special education needs support as the key thing they appreciate from EPs services.

6.11 What is lacking in the psychological services

The participants summarised the following as the things that are affecting the operations of EPs:

- There is brain drainage and shortage of man power in the Department of School Psychological Services. This was making the provision of services by the department poor.
- The EPs were not making follow ups of pupils placed on various intervention programmes.
- Back up services such as the provision of teaching and learning materials was lacking.
- There was no one on one consultation with teachers so that they understand how to implement some of the recommendations made by EPs.
- The EPs were not attached to schools and communication between schools and EPs was not good.
- There was no focused vision on the programmes taking place in schools.

Proponents of attribution theory (Tsiros et al., 2004) utilize three causal dimensions of attribution: stability, locus of control and controllability to explain how a stakeholder attributes satisfaction. All the elements of the three dimensions are implied in the participants’ perceptions.

6.12 Suggestions for improving EPs services

The participants made the following suggestions to help improve the service provision by EPs:
• The government should provide adequate funding and legislation to fully address the requirements of pupils with special needs.
• EPs should establish frequent interaction with grassroots stakeholders.
• The department of school psychological services should increase the number of workshops to allow the sharing of ideas with stakeholders.
• They should increase psychological service personnel to cater for increased enrolment figures in schools.
• There should be regular school visits by the psychologists.

6.13 Limitations of the Current Study

The size of the sample of the stakeholders may limit the generalizability of these results to other stakeholders who are not educators.

Another potential inherent limitation in the postal survey was the return of incomplete questionnaire and unclear comments on open ended statements. As a precaution, the researcher included interviews with a few selected participants. However, the interviewees were different from the postal survey respondents.

6.14 Conclusion

This study investigated the extent of teachers and principals satisfaction with the school psychological services they were receiving from EPs in Zimbabwe. The study established the current types of psychological services schools receive from Educational Psychologists; the services teachers and principals expect from the Educational Psychologists. Lastly, the study ascertained whether there are significant differences between services rendered and what the teachers and principals expect.
It is hoped that the study shall be of particular appeal to the Ministry of Education, Sport, Art and Culture in Zimbabwe, specifically the Department of SPS and SNE, other stakeholders interested in school psychological services practices internationally. In the light of some of the recommendations of this empirical study it is hoped that this study provides a suitable insight into the general expectations and requirements by teachers and principals for improving school psychological services delivery in schools, likely to be enforced by the MoESAC.

6.15 Recommendations for Future Research

- While the results of this study came from a comprehensive survey questionnaire and face-to-face interview with a well-defined stakeholder population, it is possible for future studies to be conducted with other stakeholder populations like parents, non-governmental organisations and government to generate more general claims.

- Future studies could examine a larger number of participants from various stakeholder bodies to analyse how the systems integrate their functions. Further, a study could be conducted with principals and teachers who have never received a service to determine their expectations and comparisons could be made between them and those who have received a service.

- It is also important to note that the participants gave suggestion that impact on government and the educational psychologists. Future studies could examine the impact of government funding and legislation in facilitating the work of EPs and addressing the requirements of inclusive education.

- The current study generated suggestions and recommendations that have implications for school psychologists and deployment, as well as future studies that could contribute to a greater understanding of the role definition of the school psychologist. More research will be important to help further
refine the role definition of the school psychologist as a provider of services to help meet the increasing demands of the grassroots stakeholders.

6.16 Policy implication

This study has used empirical findings to show that the current psychological services delivery in Zimbabwe does not satisfy the principals and teachers’ needs. The findings have shown that the current number of EPs employed by MoESAC and the structure are not making the anticipated impact. The EP-client ratio is too high and EPs are far away from stakeholders. It is recommended that government increase the number of EPs and redesign the structure of Schools Psychological Services and Special Needs Education at regional, district and school level. (See Annexure N).
REFERENCES


Evans, J. R., & Lindsay, W. M. (2005). *The management and control of quality*: South-Western Mason, OH.


Kent, D. (1997). Zimbabwean teachers' attitudes toward five areas of the Educational Psychologists' work in Zimbabwe. (Masters of Science in Educational Psychology Dissertation), University of Zimbabwe, Harare. (36003130424)


ENQUIRIES: Mr B N Dludla

Mr D. Kent
UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

Dear Mr Kent

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2012 (S230/12)

An extract from the abovementioned minutes is detailed below for your information.

ITEMS:

C1.13.1 The Research Committee:

(a) considered document S.01/12; and

(b) approved the report by Mr D. Kent in the Department of Psychology and Speech Education.

D1.1 The Research Committee:

(a) considered document S150/12; and

(b) approved the registration of a research project by Mr D. Kent in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education.

Yours faithfully

for DEPUTY REGISTRAR
15 July 2011

Ministry of Education, Sport & Culture
Zimbabwe

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This serves to confirm that Mr Dennis Kent (Passport Number: BN826227) is a registered University of Zululand student, South Africa, who is studying towards a Ph.D. degree in the academic year 2011.

Mr Kent is doing his research in Zimbabwe and will be travelling frequently between Zimbabwe and South Africa for the next 6-8 months collecting data for his studies. His study topic is: Stakeholders Satisfaction with the Provision of School Psychological Services in Zimbabwe.

Any assistance you may give him during this period will be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Prof R Nzima (Study Leader)
HOD: Department of Educational Psychology
University of Zululand
SOUTH AFRICA
ANNEXURE C: Ethical clearance certificate

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
(Reg No: UZREC 171110-00- RA Level 01)

ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

Certificate Number: UZREC 171110-010-RA Level 02 PGC 2014/02
Project Title: Stakeholders satisfaction with the provision of school psychology services in Zimbabwe
Principal Researcher/Investigator: D Kent
Supervisor and Co-supervisor: Prof DR Ntoma, Dr S Govender
Department: Educational Psychology
Nature of Project: Honours/4th Year

The University of Zululand's Research Ethics Committee (UZREC) hereby gives ethical approval in respect of the undertakings contained in the above-mentioned project proposal and the documents listed on page 2 of this Certificate.

Special conditions:
1. The Principal Researcher must report to the UZREC in the prescribed format, where applicable, annually and at the end of the project, in respect of ethical compliance.
2. Documents marked "To be submitted" (see page 2) must be presented for ethical clearance before any data collection can commence.

The Researcher may therefore commence with the research as from the date of this Certificate, using the reference number indicated above, but may not conduct any data collection using research instruments that are yet to be approved.

Please note that the UZREC must be informed immediately of
- Any material change in the conditions or undertakings mentioned in the documents that were presented to the UZREC
- Any material breaches of ethical undertakings or events that impact upon the ethical conduct of the research

Page 1 of 2
University of Zululand  
Faculty of Education  
Private Bag X1001  
KwaDzangeza  
3886  
South Africa  
17 July 2011

The Director  
Ministry Of Education, Sport & Culture

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref. Permission to interview headmasters and teachers

I am seeking your permission to carry out a research in schools that are being serviced by the School Psychological Services and Special Needs department in all the provinces. I am studying towards a PhD degree at the University of Zululand in South Africa. I would like to post a questionnaire and interview teachers and headmasters in the respective schools. My study topic is: Stakeholders Satisfaction with the Provision of School Psychological Services in Zimbabwe.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Dennis Kent
ANNEXURE E: Approval (Head Office)

Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture

P.O. Box CY 121
Canaanway
Zimbabwe

- 2011

Mr. S. Kand
University of Zimbabwe

RE: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SPORT, ARTS AND CULTURE.

Reference is made to your application to carry out research in the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture institutions on the title:

"Schoolchildren's Satisfaction with the Provision of School Archaeological Services in Zimbabwe"

Permission is hereby granted. However, you are required to liaise with the Provincial Education Director responsible for the schools which you want to involve in your research.

You are also required to provide a copy of your final report to the Ministry since your study is instrumental in the development of education in Zimbabwe.

[Signature]

Masterpiece 1 (Education Officer Research)

For: SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION, SPORT, ARTS AND CULTURE
ANNEXURE F: Approval (Mash West)

Ref:C/246/1/MW

Ministry of Education Sport and Culture
Mashonaland West Province
P.O Box 328
Chinhoyi

21.7.2011

Mr. D. Kent
UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND
PRIVATE BAG X1001
KORAZANEZWA 3886
SOUTH AFRICA

Dear Sir/Madam:

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT AN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IN SOME SCHOOLS IN MASHONALAND WEST PROVINCE

Your application letter dated 19.7.2011...... For authority to carry out a research/survey in some schools in Mashonaland West refers.

Be pleased to know that the Provincial Education Director has granted you permission to carry out your research on these conditions:

a) that the learning and teaching programmes will not be interrupted in any way.
b) that you shall provide the Provincial Education Director a copy of your research findings for the benefit of the Province.
c) that the permission or authority may be withdrawn at any time by this office or a higher office should need be.

We wish you success in your research and studies.

By this letter all Heads of schools you wish to visit are kindly requested to give you any assistance in your work.

EDUCATION OFFICER PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES
FOR PROVINCIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR
MASHONALAND WEST PROVINCE
ANNEXURE G: Informed Consent Form/Declaration

University of Zululand in Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education

Title of Project: Stakeholder satisfaction with the provision of school psychological services in Zimbabwe

Investigator: D. Kent

I. The Purpose of this Research

The purpose of this study is to: (1) establish the current psychological services that schools are receiving from Educational Psychologists in Zimbabwe, (2) establish the expectations of the teachers and head teachers in respect of the services rendered by School/Educational Psychologist, (3) establish whether teachers and head teachers in Zimbabwean schools are satisfied with the services they are receiving from Educational Psychologists, (4) establish whether there are significant differences between services being rendered and teachers’ and head teachers’ expectations. Surveys are being sent to randomly selected teachers and head teachers in Zimbabwe (approximately 240) at schools that received or are receiving educational psychologist services. Ten teachers and 10 head teachers will be personally interviewed by the researcher.
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ANNEXURE H: Teachers Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire

The researcher is conducting a survey to determine the level of satisfaction of teachers with school psychological services. This questionnaire serves as part of this survey to (1) document the current services provided by educational psychologists and (2) determine the level of satisfaction that teachers have on the services they are receiving. Please complete the following questionnaire.

Part A

Biographical Details

Gender: ______________: Your current job title________________________

Teaching experience: Years

1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40  

Years you have been working with educational psychologist(s):

1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40  

Highest professional qualification/degree level obtained:

| Certificate | Diploma | B.Ed. | B.A | Masters | Other, specify |

Region of current practice/teaching

________________________________________________________________________

Part B

Please tick each statement on the service you are receiving or have received from educational psychologists and then state what you wish to receive from psychologists. Please answer as many questions as possible. Thank you!

1. The psychological services the school receive(d) from Educational Psychologists

1.1. Assessments and interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.</th>
<th>Psychological services you are receiving</th>
<th>Psychological services you have received</th>
<th>Psychological services you wish to receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Curriculum development/adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Working with children in regular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.6. Group counselling

#### 1.2. Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological services you are receiving</th>
<th>Psychological services you have received</th>
<th>Psychological services you wish to receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Consultation with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Attending staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Holding case conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.3. Research

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11. Research on school needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12. Program evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13. Research on best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.4. Resource mobilisation and advocacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological services you are receiving</th>
<th>Psychological services you have received</th>
<th>Psychological services you wish to receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14. Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15. Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16. Community outreach programmes through the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17. The designing and developing of procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18. The designing and developing of procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19. The designing and developing of procedures for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Level of satisfaction**

How satisfied are you in the overall performance of your educational psychologist(s) in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Contact with the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The arrangements for communication with the psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Consulting with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consulting with School personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The designing and developing of procedures for preventing disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 The designing and developing of procedures for promoting mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 The designing and developing of procedures for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 The designing and developing of procedures for improving educational systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 In-service training for school personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Parents workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Assessment for placement in special education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Group counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Working with children in regular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16 Curriculum development

2.17 Research

3 Have you ever visited the educational psychologist’s offices? (Tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 What was your reason for visiting the psychologist's offices?

_____________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________

5 How often do you use the services of the educational psychologist? (Tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Once per school term</th>
<th>More than once per term</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Thrice a year</th>
<th>When need arises</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Which psychologist services do you find most appealing and satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appealing and satisfactory</th>
<th>Appealing but unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not appealing but satisfactory</th>
<th>Neither appealing nor satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Consultation with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Information on inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7. Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8. Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9. Individual counselling
6.10. Working with children in regular education
6.11. Running workshops or in-service training
6.12. Researching or program evaluation
6.13. Group counselling

Any other psychologist services you find appealing and satisfying?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. (i) Rate the psychologist services below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with children in regular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching or program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Give reasons for your answers
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
8. (i) Would you recommend psychological services to another person?

Yes  No

(ii) Kindly give a reason for your answer

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

9. What recommendations or improvements, if any, would you suggest?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

10. How satisfied are you using psychological services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How satisfied are you with the procedure for using the psychologist services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How would you rate the psychologist services?

a) Excellent  b) Good  c) Average  d) Bad  e) Terrible

13. Do you agree that the recommendations provided by the psychologist for use in the classroom were useful to you?

a) Yes  b) No  c) To some extent

__________________________________________________________________
14. Does/Did the psychologist’s service meet your requirements?

| a) Yes | b) No |

15. What do you feel is lacking in the psychologist’s services?

16. What do you feel is the best thing about the psychologist’s services?

17. Are you likely to use the psychologists' services again? ______________

18. Do you have any comments in general about school psychological services in your area?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

19. What is your suggestion for improving school psychological services?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
ANNEXURE I: Head teachers Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire

The researcher is conducting a survey to determine the level of satisfaction of head-teachers with the school psychological services. This questionnaire serves as part of this survey to (1) document the current services provided by educational psychologists and (2) determine the level of satisfaction head-teachers have on services they are receiving. Please complete the following questionnaire.

Part A

Biographical Details

Gender: _______________  Your current job title ________________________________

Number of years of experience in teaching:

| 1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 |

Number of years of experience in headship

| 1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 |

Number of years you have been working with educational psychologist(s)

| 1-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 |

Professional qualifications/degrees obtained:

Certificate  Diploma  BEd  BA  Masters  Other, specify

Region of current practice/headship____________________________________

Part B

Please tick each statement on the services you received or you are receiving from educational psychologists and the service you wish to receive from psychologists. Please answer as many questions as possible. Thank you!

1. The psychological services the school receive(d) from Educational Psychologists

1.1 Assessments and interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological services you are receiving</th>
<th>Psychological services you have received</th>
<th>Psychological services you wish to receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Curriculum development/adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.5. Working with children in regular education

1.6. Group counselling

### 1.2 Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.7. Consultation with teachers</th>
<th>Psychological services you are receiving</th>
<th>Psychological services you have received</th>
<th>Psychological services you wish to receive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Attending staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Holding case conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Research

| 1.11. Research on school needs | | |
| 1.12. Program evaluations     | | |
| 1.13. Research on best practices | | |

### 1.4 Resource mobilisation and advocacy

| 1.14. Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution | Psychological services you are receiving | Psychological services you have received | Psychological services you wish to receive |
| 1.15. Running workshops or in-service training | | | |
| 1.16. Community outreach programmes through the school | | | |
| 1.17. The designing and developing of procedures for | | | |
1.18. The designing and developing of procedures for promoting mental health

1.19. The designing and developing of procedures for learning

1.20. The designing and developing of procedures for improving educational systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Level of satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you in the overall performance of your educational psychologist(s) in the following areas? (Tick)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Contact with the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The arrangements for communication with the psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The psychologist consulting with parents at your school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The psychologist consulting with your school personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The designing and developing of procedures for preventing disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 The designing and developing of procedures for promoting mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 The designing and developing of procedures for learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 The designing and developing of procedures for improving educational systems

2.9 In-service training for school personnel

2.10 Parents workshops

2.11 Assessment for placement in special education

2.12 Individual counselling

2.13 Group counselling

2.14 Working with children in regular education

2.15 Crisis intervention

2.16 Curriculum development

2.17 Research

3. How often do you use the services of the educational psychologist? (Tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Once per school term</th>
<th>More than once per term</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Thrice a year</th>
<th>When need arises</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Have you ever visited the educational psychologist’s offices? (Tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. What was your reason for visiting the psychologist’s offices?

____________________________________________________________________________

6. Which psychologist services do you find most appealing and satisfactory?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Appealing and satisfactory</th>
<th>Appealing but unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not appealing but satisfactory</th>
<th>Neither appealing nor satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Consultation with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Information on inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7. Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8. Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9. Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10. Working with children in regular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11. Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12. Research or program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13. Group counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other services you find appealing and satisfying?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

7. (i) Rate the psychological services by ticking the appropriate box.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1. Psycho-educational assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2. Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4. Consultation with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5. Staff meeting or case conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6. Information on inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7. Consultation with parents at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8. Information on how best the school can operate as an inclusive institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9. Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10. Working with children in regular education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11. Running workshops or in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12. Research or program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13. Group counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Give reasons for your answer

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

8. (i) Would you recommend psychological services to another person?

Yes | No

(ii) Kindly give a reason for your answer

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

9. What recommendations and improvements, if any, would you suggest?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

10. How satisfied are you with using psychological services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. How satisfied are you with the procedure for accessing the psychological services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. How would you rate the psychological services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Excellent</th>
<th>b) Good</th>
<th>c) Average</th>
<th>d) Bad</th>
<th>e) Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. How satisfied are you with the recommendations provided by the psychologist for use at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Does/Did this service solve your requirement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Yes</th>
<th>b) No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. What do you see as lacking in these psychological services?

____________________________________________________________________

16. What do you see as the best thing about these psychological services?

____________________________________________________________________

17. Are you likely to use these psychological services again?

________________________

18. Do you have any comments in general about school psychological services in your area?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
19. What is your suggestion for improving school psychological services?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
ANNEXURE J: Stakeholders satisfaction interviews schedule

Principals and Teachers

Thanks for taking time to give me your ideas. I am conducting a survey to determine the level of satisfaction teachers/principals have with school psychological services. These questions serves as part of this survey to (1) document the current services provided by educational psychologists and (2) determine the level of satisfaction that teachers/principals have on the services they are receiving. Please feel free to talk about the services your school has received this school year and the past year.

1. What are the roles of the educational psychologists to the school?

2. What have been the positive aspects of the services?

3. What have been the problems encountered?

3. How should educational psychologists improve the working relationship between the parents, and the members of the school staff providing instructional support?

4. What additional skills or knowledge might be helpful to educational psychologists at your school to allow them to be better service providers to parents and staff?

5. What other suggestions do you have to make for educational psychologists services to benefit the school, students, teachers and parents?

Once again, thank you.
ANNEXURE K: Map of Zimbabwe

Source: Map Resources. Adapted by CRS. (K.Yancey 11/12/04)
Mashonaland East is divided into nine districts:

- Chikomba
- Goromonzi
- Marondera
- Mudzi
- Murehwa (Mrehwa)
- Mutoko
- Seke
- Uzumba-Maramba-Pfungwe (UMP)
- Wedza (Hwedza)

It has an area of 32,230 km² and Marondera is the capital of the province. The number of schools is 604 primary schools and 248 secondary schools.
Mashonaland West is divided into 6 districts:

- Chegutu
- Hurungwe
- Kadoma
- Kariba
- Makonde
- Zvimba

It has an area of 57,441 km² and Chinhoyi is the capital of the province. The number of schools is 499 primary schools and 170 secondary schools.
Manicaland Province

Manicaland is divided into 7 districts:
- Nyanga
- Makoni
- Mutasa
- Mutare
- Buhera
- Chimanimani
- Chipinge

It has an area of 36,459 km² and Mutare is the capital of the province. The number of schools is 793 primary schools and 268 secondary schools.
Harare is the capital city of Zimbabwe and do not have districts. It has an area of 872 km². The number of schools is 218 primary schools and 84 secondary schools.

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Provinces_of_Zimbabwe
ANNEXURE M: Structure of the Ministry of Education

The Structure of the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture-Zimbabwe (Government of Zimbabwe, 2001)
ANNEXURE N: Proposed Restructured SPS structure