

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND
TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

By

ROBERT CLAUD WILEY

Bachelor of Science
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas
1957

Master of Education
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas
1959

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1969

SEP 29 1969

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND
TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clair

Thesis Adviser

Isella Lohmann

Robert M. Mason

Roy A. Habiby

Daniel Oplenday

D. D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

725140

PREFACE

As cities have increased in size, social stratification has developed more between than within schools. Numerous research studies have concentrated upon the impact of the socioeconomic environment upon students. However, in recent years an increasing number of investigations have stressed the social class composition of schools. Concurrent with increasing interest in the socioeconomic composition of schools has been a growing concern among educators and lay people regarding the professional role orientations of teachers. Many implications have been made regarding the existence of varying degrees of professionalism among teachers in schools situated in different socioeconomic levels. The possibility of a relationship between the socioeconomic status of a school attendance area and the professionalism of teachers emerges as an intriguing question. The primary purpose of this study was to discover what relationships, if any, existed between the socioeconomic status of the school and teacher professionalism.

Appreciation is expressed to the Oklahoma City Public

Schools for their assistance and splendid cooperation in making the study possible.

I am especially indebted to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Chairman of my Advisory Committee, for his encouragement, counseling, and infinite patience.

Special recognition is also extended to Dr. Idella Lohmann, Dr. David Glenday, Dr. Robert Meisner, and Dr. R. N. Habiby for their interest and guidance as additional members of the Advisory Committee.

Acknowledgment is also due Dr. Russell Dobson for his interest and assistance in my professional growth, and to Dr. Robert Brown for helpful suggestions regarding statistical technique.

I am extremely thankful for the patience and understanding shown by my children, Jeff, Lynn, and Jane Ann. Deep appreciation is expressed to Lenora, my wife, for her devotion, inspiration, and confidence during my academic program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Definition of Concepts	3
Statement of the Problem	4
Hypothesis	5
Assumptions	6
Limitations	8
Significance	8
Summary	10
II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Teacher Role	14
Professionalization	18
Socioeconomic Status	32
Summary	45
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	53
Design of the Study	53
Instrumentation	55
Professional Role Orientation Scale	55
NORC Occupational Prestige Scale	58
The Sample	60
Data Collection and Treatment	62
Summary	63
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	65
Analysis of Demographic Variables	76
Analysis of Data Relating to the Hypothesis	92
Summary	96

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	98
Review	98
Conclusions	102
Recommendations	103
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	107
APPENDIX A	114
APPENDIX B	120
APPENDIX C	129
APPENDIX D	135
APPENDIX E	150

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Chi-Square Analysis of Demographic Variables Which Were Not Significantly Different Between Socioeconomic Groups	67
II. Chi-Square Analysis of Demographic Variable Which Was Significantly Different Between Groups	70
III. Chi-Square Analysis of Demographic Variable Which Was Significantly Different Between Groups	72
IV. Level of Professional Preparation and Age . .	74
V. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Sex	78
VI. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Age	79
VII. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Marital Status	80
VIII. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Grade Placement	81
IX. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Years in This School	82
X. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Total Years Experience	83
XI. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Level of Professional Preparation	84

Table	Page
XII. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Undergraduate Preparation	85
XIII. Analysis of Variance of Mean Professionalism Scores and Graduate Preparation	86
XIV. Summary of Professionalism Scores and Number of Years in This School	87
XV. Type of Graduate Preparation by SES Classification	91
XVI. Analysis of Variance of Teachers' Mean Professionalism Scores and Socioeconomic Status of Schools	94

CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The concept of social class and its relationship to the educational process may seem, to some teachers and educators, remote or academic. However, the increasing frequency with which researchers in the area of education are focusing upon social class as an independent variable reflects the importance educators and the lay public attach to the interaction between the two.

American children live and learn in a society which is highly complex and diversified. There are differences in schools because the people who comprise the school community are different, and such diversity is reflected in the teachers as well as the school.¹ A school may be perceived as a small society in itself, with its members associating with one another formally and informally, grouping themselves into pupils, teachers, administrators, clerical and service employees. The interactions among these individuals, and between them and their working

environment has provided the nucleus for an increasing body of research.

The relationship which exists between social class and education in America is not of recent origin. Especially in recent years, one of the primary purposes of education in the United States has become an attempt to mend historical inequities by making education available without regard to social distinctions, with learning becoming a means of self-improvement accessible to all. An important aspect of the American dream is that low social or economic status shall not be a barrier to acquiring an education.

As cities have grown, social stratification has developed more between schools than within schools. Investigators such as Neugarten, Wilson, and Davis² have stressed research focusing upon the social level of the school, as well as upon the individual pupil. The emphasis in social class research has more recently begun to concentrate on a closer look at the relationship between the social class composition of a school and its effect upon professional personnel. The results of recent studies suggest the possibility that many aspects of teacher performance may vary with the social status of the school.³

The career line followed by many teachers in

metropolitan schools is from an initial assignment to an inner-city school in a low socioeconomic area to progressively "better" schools in the suburbs. A typical comment on this phenomenon is made by Clark,⁴ who observes that the mechanism employed by most teachers faced with teaching in the unattractive and difficult lower class situations is to manipulate the transfer system in such a way as to escape to a better school. Observations of this nature are often accompanied by the implication that those teachers in the "better" or "elite" suburban schools are of superior quality. The major objective of this study is to take one small step toward a fuller understanding of the influence of socioeconomic class upon the process of education.

Definition of Concepts

Professionalism The exhibition of subscription to the criteria of a profession. (From a synthesis and summary of the professionalism portion of Chapter II).

Socioeconomic status This term will refer to social stratification, and will often appear in abbreviated form (SES). SES will be based upon the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) Occupational Prestige Scale (also referred to as the North-Hatt scale), ranking the school attendance area into one of the following levels:

High SES schools Those school attendance areas in which the parental occupation is considered to be professional, semi-professional, or administrative in nature, with a NORC scale ranking of 1 through 37.

Middle SES schools Those school attendance areas in which the parental occupation is considered to be skilled or semi-skilled in nature, with a NORC scale rank between 39 and 62.5.

Low SES schools Those school attendance areas in which the parental occupation is regarded as unskilled or labor in nature, with a NORC scale rank between 65.5 and 90.

Teacher's professional orientation score This term refers to an individual teacher's score on the Professional Orientation Scale.

Status professional score This is the mean of all teacher scores on the Professional Orientation Scale at one socioeconomic level.

Statement of the Problem

A considerable body of information has been accumulated regarding various facets of social class and the educational processes. A review of the literature in the areas of social class and teacher professionalization raises the question as to the possibility of teacher variation in professionalism among schools of different SES.

In this study an attempt has been made to determine the extent to which teachers have developed professional role orientations and to discover how these are distributed among elementary schools of high, middle, and low socioeconomic level in the public schools of Oklahoma City. The major problems for investigation under this study were:

(1) to determine whether or not a relationship exists between elementary school socioeconomic status and teacher's sense of professionalism; (2) to define this relationship, if it exists. In addition to investigation of the major question, an effort was made to gather additional demographic information in order to examine factors other than professionalism which might be coincidental to school socioeconomic level.

Hypothesis

The study of professionalism centers around the professional model, which consists of a series of attributes to be considered when an attempt is made to distinguish between the professional and the non-professional. The attitudinal aspect of professionalism reflects the manner in which the practitioners visualize their work. An assessment of this attitude or orientation toward teaching as a profession is the major objective of this study.

When the career movement of teachers is from low to high SES schools, as previously reported, there seems to exist a basis for predicting a higher level of professionalism in the high status schools. On the other hand, since the orientation of a professional person to his profession is an individual matter, we would expect to find various degrees of professionalism randomly distributed throughout the school system. It is this manner of reasoning which leads to the presentation of the following null hypothesis:

H₀: It is hypothesized that there will be no significant differences between the mean professionalism scores of teachers from low, middle, or high socioeconomic level schools at the .05 level of significance.

Assumptions

The major assumption underlying the present study is that an individual's professional orientation is measurable by responses to a questionnaire. It may be contended that orientations are implicit in the behavior of others and that any true study of orientation would necessitate the observation of this behavior. However, Kluckhohn points out:

One must discover the prescriptions of individuals and groups about what behavior a person of given properties should manifest in more or less specified situations. The red herring, "this

doesn't tell us what the values of the individual or society really are but gives us only speech reactions," should not be drawn across this argument Acts, as has been said, are always compromises among motives, means, situation, and values. Sometimes what a person says about his values is truer from a long-term viewpoint than inferences drawn from his actions under special conditions. The fact that an individual will lie under stress of unusual circumstances does not prove that truth is not a value which orients, as he claims, his ordinary behavior. As a matter of fact, people often lie by their acts and tell the truth with words. The whole conventional dichotomy is misleading because speech is a form of behavior.⁵

This first methodological assumption is that the sample selected adequately represents the chosen area of investigation, and that the instruments used in the study produced valid and reliable measures of the concepts under investigation.

A second methodological assumption is that the procedure for determining the SES of a school attendance area by the median of occupational prestige rankings is adequate for the purpose of the study.

Finally, certain assumptions underlie the statistical techniques employed in the study. In this study both parametric and non-parametric statistical methods have been used. Parametric procedures involve a number of assumptions about the population from which the sample is drawn. It has been assumed by the investigator that the assumptions underlying the use of these statistical procedures have not been seriously violated.⁶

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is that the socio-economic status of a school is being determined by parent occupation. In addition, the method of placing occupations not listed on the NORC scale or the Duncan Socioeconomic Index is subjective.

An additional limitation is that the variable of professionalism represents only a selected aspect of larger concepts. Therefore, this writer recognized the professional orientation of a teacher as only one segment of the total concept an individual has of his role.

Finally, generalizations drawn from this study should be limited to the populations sampled, or cautiously applied to school organizations which closely resemble those included in this investigation.

Significance

Cave and Halsted⁷ are of the opinion that social class is an extraneous variable which derives significance from the impact it has upon the school environment. The authors report that numerous studies of student achievement, expectations, aspirations, and behavior have been made in which social class was treated as an independent variable. These writers believe that an important contribution can be made

to research projects investigating the relationship between education and social status by focusing upon educational variables which may be related to the socioeconomic status of the clients of educational organizations.

The significance of this study lies first in the investigation of the extent to which school socioeconomic status is related to the professionalism of teachers. Further, if the results of this investigation should reveal significant differences in professionalism among schools of differing socioeconomic status, it may point to an inequitable distribution of professional personnel through a school system insofar as the professional orientation of teachers is concerned. This could have special significance when the school is regarded as a complex network of social activity with various types of interaction going on simultaneously, with each affecting the whole.

In the event this study reveals that teachers in schools of different socioeconomic levels do vary in professional orientation, it could imply that institutions which engage in preparation of teachers should consider not only whether the candidate is preparing to teach elementary or secondary pupils, but in what socioeconomic environment the teacher is likely to be employed.

Finally, it is hoped this effort will contribute to existing knowledge regarding the interaction between the

school and professional personnel. The need for studies of this nature has been expressed by Herriott and St. John:

During the last twenty years there has been much valuable research on the relation of social class to education in America, and sound data have been amassed. However, the relevance of this research for the solution of contemporary problems is greatly limited by its emphasis on the social class of the child, instead of the social class of the school; on slum schools only, rather than contrasting schools of low, medium, and high social class levels; and on the pupils in slum schools, instead of their teachers and principals. In particular, we do not know enough about the effect on school staff of the social class composition of the schools in which they are situated.⁸

Summary

Study of the social factors in education is undergoing a period of rapid growth both as a field of research and as an area of teaching. Sociologists as well as educators have shown new interest in the school as a social institution. Apparently, it is well established that there is an intimate connection between our educational system and the social structure of American society. The interaction between the school environment and professional personnel is an important segment in the web of school-society influences.

Before the study could be actualized it was necessary to formulate a framework within which to conduct the study. The definition of concepts, limitations, assumptions, significance of the study, and the hypothesis as presented in

this chapter are part of this framework. Chapter II will contain a review of selected relevant literature. Chapter III will complete the structural portion of the study with a discussion of design and methodology.

FOOTNOTES

¹Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten, Society and Education, (Boston, 1967), p. 3.

²Bernice Neugarten, "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children," American Journal of Sociology, LI (June, 1946), pp. 305-313.

Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), pp. 836-845.

Allison Davis, Social Class Influence Upon Learning, (Cambridge, 1952).

³Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, Social Class and the Urban School, (New York, 1966), pp. 6-10.

⁴Burton R. Clark, Educating the Expert Society, (San Francisco, 1962), p. 99.

⁵Clyde Kluckhohn, "Value and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action." in T. Parsons and E. Shils (eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action, (Cambridge, 1951), p. 406.

⁶James W. Popham, Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation, (New York, 1967), pp. 164-174, 179-180, 270-279.

Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York, 1966), pp. 257-259.

⁷William M. Cave and Donald L. Halsted, "Sociology of Education," Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (February, 1967), p. 78.

⁸Herriott and St. John, pp. 4-5.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

The possibility of an interaction between social class and various aspects of the educational process was established in Chapter I. The present chapter will focus primarily upon a review of selected relevant literature in the area of role orientation, professionalism, and social class.

The possession of a professional orientation has been assumed to be a desirable characteristic of teachers. This manner of thinking suggests a positive relationship between professionalism and the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom as well as their influence upon the learning process. Although much has been written and said concerning the desirability of professionalism among teachers, little has been done in the assessment of this attribute. The discussion of professionalization in this chapter does not represent an attempt by the writer to determine whether or not teaching is a profession. Rather, the intention is to provide a background through which the concept of

professionalism as used in this study may be made more meaningful to the reader.

Even though sociologists have not generally succeeded in clearly delineating social class, we often speak in generalities of lower, middle, and upper, all the while bearing in mind that the boundaries are not firmly established. The main purpose of the second part of Chapter II will be to present in summary form the concept and assessment of social class, followed by an examination of the use of occupational prestige scales in the determination of social stratification.

Teacher Role

A study of the professional orientation of teachers requires some consideration of the teacher's role in the school environment. There is first of all the position of the teacher in relation to other adults in the school system. Ideally, in relation to the school board the teacher is in the role of an employee. In his relationship to the principal, the teacher occupies the role of subordinate; to the supervisor that of advisee; while to fellow teachers he plays the role of colleague. The most significant role the teacher plays is in relation to pupils; that of mediator of learning. The teacher's role in relation to the pupil carries with it, in addition to that of mediator, those of

confidante, parental substitute, disciplinarian, and judge. According to Havighurst and Neugarten,¹ the age, sex, marital status, social-class background and personality configuration all influenced the manner in which teachers fill their roles.

The duties and responsibilities accompanying a particular role may not be clearly understood by the group, or its members. On the other hand, there may be clearly defined rules, duties, and privileges which are understood by everyone concerned. However, in education, where suggestions and directions are plentiful, there seemed to be little agreement regarding the role of the teacher.²

An important aspect of the measurement of professionalism involves an assessment of professional role orientation. The role of the teacher as visualized by Hughes³ is that in an educational organization the type of role an individual plays depends upon the character of unspoken agreements and common understandings shared with others regarding the course his rightful role should take. Such agreements and understandings give rise to considerable individual interpretation due to the nature of school organization. As a result of the interaction in school situations each member develops a conception of what the role of his colleagues should be as well as what he believes his

own role to be. These individual interpretations over a period of time tend to assume a degree of uniformity.

Drawing conclusions from studies conducted over the past decade, Bush⁴ perceived the main role of today's teacher as being that of a purveyor of knowledge. The teacher also sees himself as a person who is expected by society and his colleagues to be instrumental in molding pupil behavior. In the area of instruction, teachers tend to believe they should perform all the tasks relevant to teaching. Bush, as well as Smith, Stanley, and Shores⁵ apparently saw teachers as willing to grant others some say in determining what is to be taught, but how it is to be taught is strictly a decision to be made by the teacher.

Aubrey⁶ presented four conceptions of the role of the elementary teacher. One is to cast the teacher as a general coordinator of instruction rather than a teacher of subject matter. A second role is that of a combination guidance-teacher person. The third role is more traditional in that the teacher is viewed as representing the established order, ever ready to bolster conformity and enforce discipline. This traditional concept casts the teacher as a strong disciplinarian, molder of values, task-master in the three R's, and model for pupil growth. In the final role the teacher is a subject-matter expert, with at least basic knowledge from all areas of the curriculum.

The role of the teacher as a coordinator of instruction is supported by Goodlad who argues:

The second alternative suggests a changing role for tomorrow's teacher: a coordinator of instructional resources rather than a conveyor of knowledge The increasing tendency of course revision projects to achieve self-sufficiency in their instructional packages is compatible with such a concept of teacher role.⁷

Those who are guidance-counselor oriented may picture the teacher as does Strang, who placed the teacher in a central position:

The teacher-counselor is like the hub of a wheel from which radiate relationships with the school counselor, specialist employed by the school, the principal, and other teacher⁸

Differing opinions on the role of the teacher which emerged from the 1959 Woods Hole Conference cast teachers at two extreme positions. Bruner summarized the opinions by saying:

The two extreme positions-stated in exaggerated form were, first, that the teacher must be the sole and final arbiter of how to present a given subject and what devices to use, and, second, that the teacher should be explicator and commentator for prepared materials made available through films, television, teaching machines, and the like.⁹

A definite contrast to the first three roles is offered by Waller, who casts the teacher in the traditional role:

The central role of the teacher in his professional capacity is his executive role. The

teacher is the representative of the established order; as such he must be ever ready to force conformity and to enforce discipline The teacher is the representative of authority, and his is par excellence the dogmatic position It is a role which demands an inflexibility of personality far surpassing that exacted or even allowed by most occupations.¹⁰

The orientation of teachers to their professional role appears to be largely a matter of individual interpretation. The possibility that interpretation of this role by the teacher could be influenced by the environment in which a person works is an important aspect of this study. However, since this investigation is concerned with the professionalism of teachers, of which role interpretation is only one part, attention shall now be focused upon professionalization.

Professionalization

The measurement of professional orientation in this study is based upon a scale which requires that teachers respond to statements designed to assess their feelings regarding various aspects of professionalism. In order to become more familiar with the criteria upon which the scale is based a review of selected relevant literature will be presented in the following pages.

According to Prandy¹¹ the nature of professions and the ideas surrounding the term make it quite difficult, if

not impossible, to define in such a manner that all who are professionals would be included, while all who are not would be excluded.

Stinnett¹² agreed with Prandy's opinion that the word "profession" is difficult to define, the result being that it is often defined loosely. In the opinion of Stinnett almost every group, as soon as it begins to offer a significant service to society, seeks to have itself regarded as a profession. He goes on to say that even though "profession" is difficult to define, it is possible to identify some commonly accepted criteria of professions.

Stinnett and Haskew,¹³ after commenting upon the difficulty of arriving at universal agreement on a definition for profession, suggested that the best solution is to list the characteristics which acknowledged professions seem to possess. The authors examined the teaching profession in terms of its altruistic nature, professional organizations, the degree to which the profession is self-governing, and the extent to which teaching is an intellectual activity embracing a body of specialized knowledge.

The characteristics of a profession listed by Lieberman, Musgrave, and Greenwood,¹⁴ were similar to those provided by Westby-Gibson:

Almost all definitions of a profession include the following criteria: (1) the performance of

a service to the public; (2) the possession of a unique body of scientific knowledge and technical skill; (3) the requirement of a highly specialized and usually formal preparation; (4) the regulation of standards for the admission to practice by members of the profession; (5) the organization of practitioners into comprehensive professional groups that maintain high standards of conduct and ethics.¹⁵

Blau and Scott¹⁶ proposed essentially the same criteria for professionalism as those previously discussed, but theirs were more operational in concept: (1) professional decisions and actions are governed by universalistic standards; (2) the professional is an expert qualified to deal with problems in a strictly limited area; (3) the professional's relations with clients are characterized by effective neutrality; (4) professional status is achieved by individual performance in accordance with the principles laid down by his colleague group; (5) a professional's decisions are not based on self-interest; (6) professionals organize themselves into voluntary associations for the purpose of self-control.

Another viewpoint on professionalization was to compare the work of a professional person with that of a non-professional. Corwin,¹⁷ by examining differences between a non-professional position in a large bureaucratic organization (such as bank cashier) and a professional position (resident physician or scientist), attempted to establish

more clearly the differences between professional and non-professional. Based on his analysis the work of the professional was less standardized, less centralized, and more specialized. The professional was responsible for policy decisions and his work depended primarily upon competence in being of aid to the client as opposed to efficiency or technique.

Colombotos,¹⁸ writing about high school teachers, believed that even though there is not complete consensus regarding a definition of professionalism, most definitions contain one or more of the following characteristics: (1) technical competence; (2) autonomy; and (3) the service ideal. He described these three components by saying the work of a professional is highly technical, and is intellectual rather than manual. Because the work of a professional is technical it required a period of training which is long, formal, and highly specialized. Due to the specialized nature of their work, professionals must be free to exercise their own judgment within their area of specialization. By organizing into professional associations, professionals maintain internal control over the behavior of colleagues. Since the efforts of the professional are socially essential while he personally is not normally controlled directly by the client and the lay community,

the lay public is vulnerable to the professional. However, the professional ethic that the welfare of the client precedes profit and self-interest serves to protect the client and community.

The term "profession" as used by Vollmer and Mills¹⁹ referred to an ideal type of occupational institution, of which many groups normally thought of as falling within the professional category actually fall short of the professional model in many respects. The authors believed it was more beneficial to think in terms of a concept of professionalization, assuming that most occupations may be placed somewhere on a continuum between the ideal-type "profession" at one end and completely unorganized or "non-professions" at the other end. Professionalization, then, would become a process affecting any occupation to a greater or lesser degree.

Continuing with the concept of professionalization just presented, Caplow²⁰ believed there were definite sequential steps involved in the process of professionalization. The first step was the establishment of a professional association with definite qualifications for membership. Second was the adoption of a name, which asserts a technological monopoly of practitioners. The development and adoption of a code of ethics comprised step three.

The fourth step was a prolonged agitation to obtain public support for maintenance of occupational barriers. Concurrent with step four was the development of training facilities which may or may not be directly controlled by the professional society, especially with respect to admission and final qualification.

The concept of professionalism presented by Leles²¹ is unique in that it presents professionalism as a process and professionalism as a group. Professionalism as a process becomes operational through a series of events beginning with the concentrated effort of the group in a particular direction. The next step is the drawing of boundaries for work and responsibility. The sequence is advanced further by means of a methodology which makes possible the fulfillment of responsibilities. Professionalism as a process commences to transform itself into professionalism as a group when the performance and competency of each member become subject to acknowledgement by the group. The group believes that the use of its particular competence creates a special bond between practitioner and client. Since the specialized methodology is a product of formal education and training this means the recipients of the methodology are vulnerable to the practitioners. This in turn brings about a need for ethical regulations by means of which both

client and practitioner may be protected. Professionalism as a group becomes operational when the membership establishes a code of ethics and the means to implement the code.

The most relevant dimensions of professionalism appear to have been summarized by Kornhauser²² as specialized competence embracing an intellectual component, extensive autonomy in the exercise of this competence, strong commitment to a career within the specialized area, and influence and responsibility in the use of special competence.

Specific Aspects of Professionalism

After exploring the characteristics of professionalism in general, opportunity will now be taken to examine in more detail some specific aspects of professionalization which have been previously mentioned.

A frequently mentioned criterion of a profession is that the practitioners are an organized body whose chief aim is to serve and promote the interests of its members. The process of professionalization requires such an organization if for no other purpose than to establish and maintain standards of practice. Professional organizations for teachers are no exception. Acting in 1961, the National Education Association Department of Classroom Teachers passed the following ruling, to become effective in August, 1964:

Any member who is actively engaged in educational work of a professional nature shall be eligible to become an active member of the Association if he (1) has a bachelor's or higher degree and (2) where required, holds or is eligible to hold a valid certificate of any kind except a sub-standard certificate or permit.²³

Even though the teacher holds a staff-terminal position, the role permits greater autonomy with less direct supervision than many similar positions, primarily due to professional status and separation of classrooms. Because the position is staff-terminal, subject to stereotyping, exposed to public scrutiny, and set apart from other occupations by the specialization factor (and predominately female composition), teaching is characterized by close collegueship and pervasive occupational identity.²⁴

The decision making authority of classroom teachers was surveyed recently when a nation wide sample of public school teachers was queried regarding the degree of authority possessed in four aspects of classroom teaching: (1) supplementing basic prescribed materials; (2) substituting or adding a unit of study; (3) altering time allotments for units of study; and (4) adapting course materials to meet the needs of individual pupils. More than half the respondents indicated they need not obtain permission to make any of these changes. For those who did need permission the school principal was the authority figure most often cited as granting permission.²⁵

A survey of mature experienced teachers, done at the University of Southern California, revealed that teachers view their colleagues as one of two types - the "dedicated" and those to whom teaching is "a job." The differentiating criterion is the degree of commitment to a teaching career. A dedicated teacher is perceived as one who possesses a career commitment, with or without a strong professional orientation. The teacher to whom teaching is only a means of livelihood is not thought of as being professionally oriented, his primary concerns being prestige, security, and salary. The surveyed teachers tended to regard those who were dedicated and interested in their work as very professionally oriented.²⁶

Professional Competency

The concept of professional competency encompasses the possession of the necessary knowledge and skills to carry out the objectives of the profession. This vital attribute stems from the study of such disciplines as anthropology, biology, economics, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, sociology, and statistics, as well as theoretical and practical training in the materials and techniques of teaching.²⁷

Lieberman,²⁸ made a point in the area of competency and professional training by saying professional work

emphasizes intellectual rather than physical techniques in that the tasks entail extensive defining of problems, locating relevant data, and formulating solutions, which in turn determine physical activities. The author is emphasizing the opinion that a profession is distinguished not by the absence of physical work but by the emphasis upon intellectual endeavors. The intellectual aspects of a profession require a long period of preparation, and the fact that the work is largely intellectual indicates that professional training will likewise be primarily of this nature.

Professional Autonomy

Autonomy is recognized by most writers as one of the characteristics of a profession. Lieberman²⁹ explained the basic scope of autonomy as referring to the range of decisions and behaviors which are left to the discretion of the professional group. When regarded in this manner, the scope of professional autonomy was dependent upon the functions of the professional and his degree of competence. When authority was delegated to an expert, the person to whom the authority was extended was acknowledged to know more about what should be done than the delegator. The conclusion of Lieberman was that: "Professional autonomy refers to the scope of independent judgment reserved to professional workers because of their expert skill and knowledge."

Still on the subject of authority, but speaking from the viewpoint of educational leadership and its relation to school personnel, Hughes³⁰ expressed the belief that the understanding of the structure of authority embraced not only the question of who shall exercise a certain authority but also how it was to be rightfully used. When human relations are involved the question of the right use of authority is as important as whether one has the right to use the authority. The fundamental question in educational application is how authority is used and how it could or should be used.

Finally, on the subject of professional autonomy, Stinnett³¹ offered the comment that autonomy means control by the profession of its standards to the extent that the profession can assume the responsibility for guaranteeing the competence of each member who is permitted to perform the service assigned the profession by society.

Teacher-Client Relationship

The area of teacher-pupil relationships is one which may become a source of problems. Becker³² was of the opinion that persons who perform a public service usually have an image of the "ideal" client, and it is in these terms they establish notions of how their work should be performed.

Teachers experience problems with their "clients" to the extent that pupils exhibit or fail to exhibit in reality the characteristics of the image of the ideal. Professional workers depend upon society to furnish them with clients who measure up to their image of the ideal. However, social classes operate in such a manner as to produce many students who depart from these expectations, aggravating the basic problems of the worker-client relationship. Three problems in the area of teacher-client relations which frequently require adjustment are the problems of teaching itself, the problem of discipline, and the problem of moral acceptability of the students.

By the nature of their work professional persons perform a service to the public which entitles them to special community considerations. This community service is sufficiently significant for the public to expect people entering a professional career to commit themselves to its full-time and life-long pursuit.³³

Professional Orientation Scales

Techniques for assessing the professional orientations of teachers are not numerous. One such instrument was developed by Colombotos,³⁴ in which a four-item index of professionalism was used to examine the sources of professionalism in teaching. The scale consisted of technical

competence (one item), the autonomy of teachers (two items), and a service ideal (one item). Teachers were asked to describe how important each of the following items were when they initially began teaching and how important that aspect is now: (1) chance to work with a teaching staff that is highly competent; (2) doing work his colleagues respect; (3) autonomy in his work; having enough freedom and responsibility to do his job the way it should be done; and (4) chance to help people; to do something worthwhile for society. Averaging the scores of the school faculty yielded an index of the professional working climate of the school.

Webb's³⁵ more elaborate method was composed of two multiple-item Likert-type scales. The employee scale was formulated around four bureaucratic principles: technical specialization, vertical differentiation, office-based integration, and uniformity due to rules. Four parallel scales were developed to assess allegiance to four professional principles: operational specialization, horizontal differentiation, competence integration, and uniformity based on general principles. This instrument was developed and used in an assessment of the professional orientation of two hundred teachers in central Ohio.

The Professional Role Orientation Scale, formulated by Corwin,³⁶ was selected as the professionalism measurement

technique for this study because the investigator believed the instruments developed by Webb and Colombotos were not as well suited for a global assessment of teacher professional orientation. Also, as will be seen, the Corwin scale received favorable comment by another researcher when used in a manner similar to its intended use in this study. This scale was also used by Robinson³⁷ in his examination of relationships between professionalism and bureaucracy in school organizations. The Robinson investigation involved twenty-nine schools in British Columbia at the elementary and secondary level. Both the pilot study and the experimental sample revealed the Corwin scale did identify differences in teacher professionalism between schools. The experimental sample detected significant differences in professionalism between schools only in the top and bottom quartiles of score distributions, and not between scores of the total range of distribution. Robinson commented that the Professional Role Orientation Scale "proved to be a highly discriminative instrument and it should become a useful research tool for the future."³⁸

Corwin's Professional Role Orientation Scale will be discussed at greater length in Chapter III.

Socioeconomic Status

Individual members of a society customarily view their particular society as organized, at least to some extent. Consciously or unconsciously a person has some idea of his relationship to other members of society.³⁹ This understanding of position is developed through interaction of people and experiences, which serve as points of reference for the individual. Part of the understanding of who people are in a society is based upon class orientation. In other words, a person rationalizes his relationships with others in terms of class differences or similarities. It has become commonplace to distinguish members of society by assigning them to "higher" or "lower" categories. Acceptance of the idea of social classes implies some degree of social differences, which in turn involves viewing society in terms of hierarchical categories. This hierarchy may be based upon a number of referents, such as income, education, or occupation. The major purpose of this portion of the study is to examine the measurement of social stratification.

The United States has an open type of social stratification, which means a person may, according to individual initiative, improve, maintain, or reduce his social status. Such fluidity presents a challenge to those who would attempt to identify social status.⁴⁰

Social Class

Differences in the prestige or rank of members of a group or a society describe an aspect of social organization in that they determine the manner in which people communicate with each other. In instances in which these segments of society are distinguishable from each other, these segments are referred to as social classes.⁴¹ Even in America, where class lines have varied greatly, people are aware of differences in rank, or social status in communities.⁴²

Havighurst and Neugarten,⁴³ in a discussion of socioeconomic classes in cities, noted that a large population clearly within a particular social class may be difficult to locate in some cities. The authors pointed out that the newer cities (experiencing major development since 1900) in the West and Southwest have a less clearly defined social structure than older cities in other parts of the country. A similar observation has been made by Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb.⁴⁴

The existence of social classes and a connection between community composition and the local school was clearly made by Havighurst when he said:

There are now three clearly marked types of homogeneous communities with corresponding school systems. One is an upper-middle and

upper-class suburb, with a very small number of lower-middle-class residents. Another is a working-class and lower-middle-class suburb, essentially of the "common man" character, with very few lower-lower-class residents. A third is a city slum, almost solid lower class, and as much as half lower-lower. Wherever such communities exist, the school system reflects the fact, and teachers are acutely aware of it.⁴⁵

The terms social class, social status, and socioeconomic status appear often in the literature of social research. Stendler's⁴⁶ viewpoint was that social class and social status are not synonymous. She gives the example of a man holding top status with respect to wealth but an entirely different status with respect to golf.

Although seemingly certain that there is a distinction to be made between class and status, Weber acknowledged the boundary may be vague:

With some other simplification, one might thus say that "classes" are stratified according to their relations to the production and acquisition of goods; whereas "status groups" are stratified according to the principles of their consumption of goods as represented by special "styles of life."⁴⁷

Later, however, Weber presented a definition of social status with an economic perspective containing elements ("subjective satisfaction or frustration" and "external conditions of life") which could be difficult for researchers to define or measure:

. . . the typical probability that a given state of (a) provision with goods, (b) external conditions of life, and (c) subjective satisfaction

or frustration will be possessed by an individual or group. These probabilities define class status in so far as they are dependent on the kind and extent of control or lack of it which the individual has over goods or services and existing possibilities of their exploitation for the attainment of income or receipts within a given economic order.⁴⁸

Distinctions between terms used in the area of social class and social stratification presents an enigma to some authors. This is apparently the case with Lasswell, who commented:

The vista is admittedly depressing. We find it peopled by those who insist that social class is indistinguishable from social stratification; by those who insist that social class is real and social stratification is a fiction; by others who insist that neither social class nor social stratification has any real referent. The only universal element seems to be that all the writers are, to a lesser or greater extent, sure they are right and often intolerant of those who feel differently.⁴⁹

Since it is not within the major scope of this study to draw distinctions between technical terminology used in social class research, the approach utilized by Westby-Gibson will be adopted for this study:

In this book we do not attempt to differentiate the use of the terms social class, socioeconomic status, and social status. When an investigator has used one term or the other, we have usually followed his designation. These terms have been employed so interchangeably that it becomes an impossible task to distinguish them.⁵⁰

One early attempt in the assessment of social status was made in the early 1930's by Chapin,⁵¹ who developed a

scale that could be checked by observing living-room furnishings. A family which had a living room floor of hardwood, fireplace and hardware, draperies, books, periodicals and newspapers, received a higher rating than a family with softwood floors, no fireplace, and no reading materials. The factors entering into social class composition were summarized by Chapin: "Social status is usually a consistent whole; that is, the elements that go to make it up - income, occupation, culture, etc. - are interrelated."

Warner⁵² has been very influential in the area of determining social status. Since the early 1940's his findings and methodology have been employed in numerous studies of social class. His method involved the use of both subjective and objective data. The subjective evaluation was by a panel of "judges" who were believed to possess good knowledge of the community. The "judges" were asked how the members of their community were viewed by others. A consensus of opinion was reached concerning the number of social classes in a community and the social class placement of specific individuals. This process was known as Evaluated Participation (E.P.). The objective portion of the instrument was the Index of Status Characteristics (I.S.C.). The total I.S.C. was derived from weighted subscores on four scales: occupation (4); dwelling area (2);

house type and source of income (3). The total score was then convertible into one of five levels of social class.

Occupational Prestige Scales

The interest in occupational prestige scales is derived in part from a desire to define social strata on the basis of a single criterion. The following quotation from Westby-Gibson introduces the discussion regarding occupational prestige scales:

Social stratification depends on more than objective criteria such as possessions, income, or place of residence. Also involved is a prestige component which confers status. Thus, occupation has often been selected as the most significant single criterion of social class or social status. Rank ordering of occupations encompasses in large measure objective criteria, such as years of education or amount of income, but it also includes the subjective factor of prestige. If it did not, United States Supreme Court Justices who usually head the list of prestige ratings of occupations might rank below ballplayers!⁵³

An early effort in the development of an occupational prestige scale was made by Counts⁵⁴ in 1925. The Counts' study involved six groups of raters - high school students, college students, and teachers in Minnesota and Connecticut who rank ordered forty-five occupations according to the standing they thought society extended each occupation. Counts was able to obtain a correlation of .90 or higher for the rank orders of any two groups of raters.

Recognizing the need for a grouping of occupations according to social-economic class, Edwards,⁵⁵ an official in the Bureau of the Census, undertook a classification of occupations based on the 1930 census. The occupations were arranged into six groups, which are, in descending order:

1. Professional persons
2. Proprietors, managers, and officials:
 - a. Farmers (owners and tenants)
 - b. Wholesale and retail dealers
 - c. Other proprietors, managers, and officials
3. Clerks and kindred workers
4. Skilled workers and foremen
5. Semiskilled workers:
 - a. Semiskilled workers in manufacturing
 - b. Other semiskilled
6. Unskilled workers:
 - a. Farm laborers
 - b. Factory and building construction laborers
 - c. Other laborers
 - d. Servant classes

It will be noted that three of the six occupational groups have been subdivided, thus the occupational scale is divided into twelve social-economic classes.

In a large-scale study of the nature of relationships between socioeconomic status and the psychological characteristics of individuals, Centers⁵⁶ utilized a variation of census occupational categories. Centers employed a sampling method in which 1,100 respondents were chosen from

different sections of the United States according to the proportion of workers that area contributed to the national work force. The occupational categories employed by Centers were divided into urban and rural classifications as follows:

Urban Strata

Large business

Professional

Small business

White collar

Skilled manual

Semiskilled manual

Unskilled manual

Rural Strata

Farm owners and managers

Farm tenants and laborers

In an effort to overcome the limitation of a small number of occupational listings the Duncan Socioeconomic Index⁵⁷ was used in the current study as a supplement to the NORC scale.⁵⁸ The Duncan scale is a relatively recent occupational scheme listing four-hundred twenty-five occupations. The factors of education and income were also considered in construction of this scale, as they were in the NORC. The Duncan Socioeconomic Index is constructed

in such a manner that its scores may be transformed directly to the NORC scale. In speaking of the design of the Duncan Socioeconomic Index and its relationship to the NORC scale, Duncan stated:

Our problem, then, is defined as that of obtaining a socioeconomic index for such of the occupations in the detailed classification of the 1950 Census of Population. This index is to have both face validity, in terms of its constituent variables, and sufficient predictive efficiency with respect to the NORC occupational prestige ratings that it can serve as an acceptable substitute for them in any research where it is necessary to grade or rank occupations in the way that the NORC scale does but where some of the occupations are not on the NORC list.⁵⁹

Lasswell, in his evaluation of the Duncan Index, makes the following observation:

There can be little doubt but that this is the most analytically powerful occupational scale now in existence. Even though the census classification often represents a distressing hodgepodge of ordered, partially-ordered, nominal, and highly indiscriminate categories ("not elsewhere classified," and "other retail trade," for example), application of the index leaves no opportunity for the introduction of biased judgments or intuitive ratings. For development of a demographic theory of occupational stratification, as opposed to a social psychological theory of social class the Duncan scale is far superior to any other occupational scale.⁶⁰

The NORC Occupational Prestige Scale

Attempts to stratify a population have been attempted in many ways, most often through the prestige ratings of

persons and by socioeconomic status scales. Income, education, and occupation are the three most commonly used measures of socioeconomic status. These three variables are each conceived as being capable of rank or scale-order in such manner that a population can be stratified from high to low status.⁶¹ Both income and education are known to be correlated with occupational ranks since education is a basis for entry into many occupations and income is derived from occupation. Median income level correlation with NORC prestige scores for occupation is .85. The median level of educational attainment correlation with NORC prestige scores is .83.⁶²

Hatt,⁶³ one of the directors of the NORC study, in writing of the purpose, basis, and method of the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale stated that: "The purpose of this paper is to present a theory and to suggest a method of occupational classification usable in the study of social stratification."

According to Kahl⁶⁴ the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) study of occupational prestige, directed by North and Hatt, surpassed all others. The rankings of the NORC scale were based on the opinions of 2,920 persons in March, 1947; a representative sample of the entire adult population of the United States was utilized. The data gathering technique was rather simple in that the respondent was asked to

rank each of ninety occupations as having excellent standing, good standing, average standing, somewhat below average standing, poor standing, or "I don't know." The results clearly indicated that the public could rank order occupations with considerable consensus of opinion. The obtained ratings produced a continuum of arithmetic scores which could be arranged in rank order. In descending order the listed occupations classified themselves into professional and administrative, semiprofessional and medium-level administrative, highly skilled manual workers, semiskilled manual workers, and unskilled laborers.

In commenting upon the usefulness of occupational prestige scales for determining social stratification Gordon stated:

For a number of reasons, including its use of a national cross-section of the American population as raters and its relative recentness, the North-Hatt NORC scale appears to be one of the most useful occupational scales available.⁶⁵

Gordon proceeded to point out that for a single factor index which is substantially valid, a well-constructed scale of occupations offers promising possibilities. A major criterion of such a scale should be that it is based upon a national cross-section of the population or a representative sample.

In 1963 a replication of the 1947 NORC study was undertaken by Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi,⁶⁶ primarily to investigate

whether changes in American occupational structure have been reflected in shifts in the prestige of occupations between 1947 and 1963. A correlation of .99 was obtained, leading the authors to conclude that the ratings have remained quite stable during this period of time.

Research Uses of the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale

Since the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale is the basic instrument for determining SES in this study, similar uses of this scale in research will be reviewed. Additionally, the following studies offer an opportunity to show how other researchers have overcome the limitations of a small number of occupational listings on the NORC scale. The NORC scale will be presented in greater detail in Chapter III.

Adams,⁶⁷ in a 1952 study of mobility into the medical profession, assigned scores to father's occupations on the basis of the North-Hatt (NORC) scale of occupational prestige. Ratings for occupations not listed on this scale were obtained by interpolation, assisted by the use of the occupational scales of Edwards, Counts, and Deeg and Patterson.

Lenski,⁶⁸ studying status crystallization in Detroit, employed social status as one of two basic variables. The NORC scale of occupational prestige was chosen as the basis

on which to determine social status. Five occupational prestige levels were defined, and extrapolations were made from rated occupations to others not listed in the study. Extrapolations were necessary in over fifty percent of the occupations in the Detroit sample.

A method of measuring the existence of social mobility patterns on the basis of occupation, education, and religious affiliation was undertaken by Deasy.⁶⁹ The North-Hatt (NORC) scale was utilized in rating the occupations of respondents' spouses and their fathers. For those occupations not on the NORC scale, the writer assigned scores as nearly equivalent as possible to scores that had been assigned to similar occupations on the North-Hatt scale.

The relationship between social status and leisure styles was the object of an investigation by Clarke.⁷⁰ The NORC Occupational Prestige Scale was selected as the measure best suited to determine social status since: "Occupational prestige is generally regarded as the most valid index of social status." Final ratings of occupations not mentioned on the NORC scale were based on the average of individual ratings made by five sociologists asked to compare and equate these occupational titles with those on the scale and assign prestige ratings to them.

Empey⁷¹ conducted a study of the occupational plans

and aspirations of high school seniors in an effort to obtain a more accurate picture of occupational aspirations. The occupational status of the father was the criterion for defining the social class of respondents. The author formulated an occupational scale for the study by combining the North-Hatt (NORC) and the Smith occupational prestige scales.

A study testing the belief that educational and occupational aspirations of young people are associated with the social status of their families was conducted by Sewell, Haller, and Straus⁷² among 4,167 high school seniors. Data for the dependent variable, level of occupational aspiration, were taken from a question concerning the vocation the student planned to enter. Responses to this question were assigned real or interpolated North-Hatt (NORC) occupational prestige values.

The studies just presented represent only a sample of the wide variety of situations in which the NORC scale has been used by researchers for the purpose of determining socioeconomic status.

Summary

The intent of the first part of Chapter II was to explore the nature and significance of various aspects of

professionalism. A brief review of literature in the area of teacher role was presented since, in the writer's opinion, a teacher's attitude toward the profession is largely dependent upon an individual's understanding and acceptance of his own professional role. The various dimensions of professionalization were discussed at length due to the necessity of considering these factors in a measurement of professionalism. The main characteristics of a professional, as brought out by the review of literature, may be summarized as the possession of a client-service orientation, a disposition to unite with colleagues, a monopoly of knowledge in a particular area, and an authority to make decisions within the field of specialization.

Socioeconomic status was first reviewed in a general manner, then some methods of assessing SES were presented. The use of occupational prestige as a means of determining socioeconomic class was discussed, followed by a review of selected studies in which the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale has been used to determine social class.

FOOTNOTES

¹Havighurst and Neugarten, p. 452.

²William C. Trow, "Role Functions of the Teacher in the Instructional Group," The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, (Fifty-Ninth Yearbook, Part Two, National Society for the Study of Education, 1960), pp. 33-34.

³James M. Hughes, Human Relations in Educational Organization, (New York, 1957), p. 131.

⁴Robert Bush, "Redefining the Role of the Teacher," Theory into Practice, VI (December, 1967), pp. 246-251.

⁵Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores, Fundamentals of Curriculum Development, (New York, 1950), pp. 147-152.

⁶Roger F. Aubrey, "What is the Role of the Elementary-School Teacher," The Elementary School Journal, LXVIII (March, 1968), pp. 277-283.

⁷John I. Goodlad, School Curriculum Reform in the United States, (New York, 1964), p. 72.

⁸Ruth Strang, Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work, (New York, 1953), p. 98.

⁹Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education, (Cambridge, 1966), p. 15.

¹⁰Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching, (New York, 1932), p. 325.

¹¹Kenneth Prandy, Professional Employees, (London, 1965), p. 63.

¹²Timothy M. Stinnett, The Profession of Teaching, (New York, 1962), p. 2.

¹³Timothy M. Stinnett and Lawrence D. Haskew, Teaching in American Schools, (New York, 1962), pp. 85-91.

¹⁴Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession, (Englewood Cliffs, 1958), pp. 2-6.

P. W. Musgrave, The Sociology of Education, (London, 1965), pp. 206-217.

Earnest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, II (1957), pp. 44-55.

¹⁵Dorothy Westby-Gibson, Social Perspectives on Education, (New York, 1965), pp. 401-402.

¹⁶Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, (San Francisco, 1962), pp. 60-62.

¹⁷Ronald G. Corwin, A Sociology of Education, (New York, 1965), pp. 229-247.

¹⁸John L. Colombotos, Sources of Professionalism: A Study of High School Teachers, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Cooperative Research Project Number 330; University of Michigan Department of Sociology; (Ann Arbor, 1962), pp. 3-5.

¹⁹Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, Professionalization, (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), pp. 1-3.

²⁰Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work, (Minneapolis, 1954), pp. 139-140.

²¹Sam Leles, "Using the Critical Incidents Technique to Develop a Theory of Professionalism: An Exploratory Study," Journal of Teacher Education, XIX (Spring, 1968), pp. 59-69.

²²William Kornhauser, Scientists in Industry: Conflicts and Accommodations, (University of California Press, 1962), p. 8.

²³NEA Department of Classroom Teachers, "Classroom Teachers Speak on Teaching as a Profession," (Washington, 1961), p. 8.

²⁴F. Donovan, The Schoolma'am, (Philadelphia, 1938).

²⁵NEA Research Division, "Teacher Opinion Poll: Classroom Autonomy," NEA Journal, LVII (May, 1968), p. 13.

²⁶Michael V. Belok, "Career Orientations: A Teacher Typology," Education, LXXXVI (October, 1965), pp. 102-105.

²⁷Westby-Gibson, pp. 403-408.

²⁸Lieberman, pp. 2-3.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 87-89.

³⁰Hughes, p. 132.

³¹Timothy M. Stinnett, "Teacher Professionalization: Challenge and Promise," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, XL No. 5, (September, 1964), p. 12.

³²Howard S. Becker, "Social-Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXV (March, 1952), pp. 451-465.

³³Westby-Gibson, pp. 402.

³⁴Colombotos, pp. 40-41.

³⁵Thomas W. Webb, "Classification of Teachers by Bureaucratic and Professional Normative Orientations to Educational Issues," (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964).

³⁶Ronald G. Corwin, The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; CRP No. 1934, 1963), pp. 463-468.

³⁷Norman Robinson, "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to the Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations," (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 1966).

³⁸Ibid., p. 198.

³⁹Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, (Princeton, 1949), pp. 27-29, 76.

- ⁴⁰Westby-Gibson, p. 34.
- ⁴¹Herbert C. Quay, Juvenile Delinquency, (Princeton, 1965), pp. 35-36.
- ⁴²John E. Gillen, "Educators and Social Class," in Social Foundations of Education, by Jonathan C. McLendon, (New York, 1966), p. 284.
- Musgrave, p. 58.
- ⁴³Havighurst and Neugarten, p. 20.
- ⁴⁴W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb, Who Shall be Educated? (New York, 1944), pp. 29-32.
- ⁴⁵Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class Influences on American Education." Social Forces Influencing American Education, (Sixtieth Yearbook, Part Two, National Society for the Study of Education, 1961), p. 139.
- ⁴⁶Celia Burns Stendler, Children of Brasstown, (Urbana, 1949), pp. 14-15.
- ⁴⁷Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, (New York, 1946), p. 193.
- ⁴⁸Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, (New York, 1947), p. 424.
- ⁴⁹Thomas E. Lasswell, Class and Stratum, (Boston, 1965), p. 53.
- ⁵⁰Westby-Gibson, p. 41.
- ⁵¹F. Stuart Chapin, The Measurement of Social Status, (Minneapolis, 1933), p. 21.
- ⁵²W. L. Warner, Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status, (Chicago, 1949), pp. 34-43.
- ⁵³Westby-Gibson, p. 39.
- ⁵⁴George S. Counts, "The Social Status of Occupations: A Problem in Vocational Guidance," School Review, XXXIII (January, 1925), pp. 16-27.

⁵⁵Alba S. Edwards, "A Social-Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers of the United States," (United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1938), pp. 1-3.

⁵⁶Centers, pp. 34-54, 85-89.

⁵⁷Otis D. Duncan in Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et al., Occupations and Social Status, (New York, 1961), pp. 109-161.

⁵⁸Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et al., Occupations and Social Status, (New York, 1961), pp. 111-113.

⁵⁹Duncan, p. 115.

⁶⁰Lasswell, p. 439.

⁶¹A. B. Hollingshead and Frederick Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness, (New York, 1958), p. 394.

⁶²Reiss, pp. 83-84.

⁶³Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, LV (May, 1950), pp. 533-543.

⁶⁴Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure, (New York, 1957), pp. 72-76.

⁶⁵Milton M. Gordon, Social Class in American Sociology, (New York, 1963), pp. 230-233.

⁶⁶Robert W. Hodge, Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi, "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963," The American Journal of Sociology, LXX (November, 1964), pp. 286-320.

⁶⁷Stuart Adams, "Trends in Occupational Origins of Physicians," American Sociological Review, XVIII (August, 1953), pp. 404-409.

⁶⁸Gerhard E. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), pp. 405-413.

⁶⁹Leila C. Deasy, "An Index of Social Mobility," Rural Sociology, XX (June, 1956), pp. 149-151.

⁷⁰Alfred C. Clarke, "The Use of Leisure and Its Relation to Levels of Occupational Prestige," American Sociological Review, XXI (June, 1956), pp. 301-307.

⁷¹Lamar T. Empey, "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), pp. 703-709.

⁷²William H. Sewell, Archie O. Haller, and Murray A. Straus, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), pp. 67-73.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The hypothesis being investigated by this study is: It is hypothesized that there will be no significant differences between the mean professionalism scores of teachers from low, middle, or high socioeconomic level schools at the .05 level of significance. In order to test the proposed hypothesis, it was necessary to collect data on the professional role orientation of teachers and determine the socioeconomic level of the elementary schools involved in the study. Realizing that factors of a demographic nature might also have a bearing upon the study, a form was devised to collect personal information on each respondent participating in the study.

Design of the Study

The basic design of the study is ex post facto. Kerlinger defines ex post facto research as:

. . . that research in which the independent variable or variables have already occurred and in which the researcher starts with the observation of a dependent variable or variables. He then studies the independent

variables in retrospect for their possible relations to, and effects on, the dependent variable or variables.¹

Theoretically speaking, an ex post facto design is less scientific than a true experimental design. As implied in the definition, the greatest limitation of ex post facto research is inability to control independent variables (in the case of this study, socioeconomic class). Although it is possible to choose subjects randomly in ex post facto studies, it is not possible to assign either subjects or treatments to groups at random. In other words, both subjects and treatments are already assigned to the groups. Therefore, lack of opportunity to select subject in a truly random fashion is a second limitation of this type research design. A third weakness of ex post facto research is the danger of improper interpretation. This third weakness is largely a result of the first limitation, lack of independent variable control.² It is the presence of the risk of improper interpretation which makes it imperative that the present study explore the possibility that factors other than socioeconomic status of the school would have a bearing upon professional orientation scores.

However, Kerlinger points out the value of ex post facto research designs to the area of education by saying:

Despite its weaknesses, much ex post facto research must be done in psychology, sociology,

and education simply because many research problems in the social sciences and education do not lend themselves to experimental inquiry.³

Instrumentation

Personal Data Questionnaire

The personal data questionnaire was constructed especially for this study to elicit the following information from each respondent: sex, age, marital status, level of assignment, number of years in the present school, total teaching experience, and amount of professional preparation. It was felt that an examination of these variables would be necessary as an aid in avoiding misinterpretation of study data. The personal data questionnaire may be found in Appendix A.

Professional Role Orientation Scale

As previously stated, the professional role orientation of teachers was measured by the Professional Role Orientation Scale. This scale was developed by Corwin and his staff as part of a United States Office of Education project.⁴ The first step in development of the scale was an intensive review of the literature from which a number of items were selected which were believed to be appropriate to a measurement of this type. The items were then screened

for possible duplication. One-half of the items were rejected and the remainder were submitted to a panel of sociologists who judged them for relevance to dimensions of the professional concept. Five categories were established as representing sub-scales of the total professional scale. The five sub-scales were subsequently reduced to four as follows: client orientation, orientation to the profession and to colleagues, competence based on knowledge, and belief that teachers should have decision-making authority. The items were then organized into a questionnaire which respondents answered by choosing one of five responses: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." The responses were weighted from five to one.

Following initial administration of the scale, those items which did not discriminate sufficiently between the high and low of the sample were eliminated. To determine the items for elimination, the responses of those individuals whose total scale scores were in the upper quartile were compared on each item with those individuals who were in the lower quartile of score distribution. Items on which there were no significant differences were then excluded from the scale.⁵

Scale Reliability

Items tentatively chosen for the scale were then randomly divided into two sets, which were correlated with each other. Split-half correlation for the professional scale was $r=.48$, which when corrected with the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula is $r_n=.65$. The split-half reliability for the scale was considered acceptable.⁶

Scale Validity

Final scale validation was accomplished by administering the scale to groups of persons with reputations of being "good" and "poor" professionals. Those in the high professional validating groups had five or more years of professional training and were full-time classroom teachers. In order to include persons who were highly professional but who might not meet the above qualifications, persons who had presented papers to one or more professional meetings, had been active in professional committees, published two or more articles, or held office in a professional association were included in this validating group. The low professional validating group was composed of both full and part-time teachers trained in all types of institutions, who were not members or were infrequent members of professional associations, who had not held office in or been

very active in professional associations, who subscribed to only one professional journal, or who had done little if any publishing.⁷

Following administration of the Professional Role Orientation Scale to the high and low professional validating groups, the critical ratio of 10.7 was obtained. This critical ratio was significant beyond the .01 level.⁸

NORC Occupational Prestige Scale

The basic social class measurement scale for this study was the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale, often referred to as the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale after Professors Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, directors of the project for the National Opinion Research Center.⁹ The scale was developed as a result of a 1946 study based upon the responses of 2,920 persons.

The original list of occupations for the NORC survey contained one hundred entries based on the most frequently reported occupations from all levels of status on the 1940 census report. This list was later reduced to seventy-eight, primarily by eliminating women's occupations. To these seventy-eight were added nine more occupations of a scientific or governmental nature. Two near-duplicates (instructor in the public schools and automobile repairman)

were added as a check on the consistency of respondents' judgments. This list was expanded to ninety with the addition of "official of an international labor union."

Respondents were asked to indicate their personal opinion of the general standing of an occupation as represented by one of six responses: excellent standing, average standing, poor standing, and "don't know."

Correlations between educational attainment, income level, and occupation were achieved by selecting forty-five occupations from the NORC Scale and the 1950 census which were comparable and determining the median level of educational attainment and the median income level. The rank correlation of median income level with NORC prestige scores for occupations is $+0.85$. For median level of educational attainment and NORC prestige scores the correlation is $+0.83$. Thus either income or education may be regarded as a good predictor of the general standing of an occupation.¹⁰

The first step in the ranking of occupations was to eliminate all "don't know" responses. The five remaining choices were then weighted with "excellent," given a score of five; "good," four; "average," three; "somewhat below average," two; and "poor," one. The percentage of total ratings in each response category was multiplied by its weight. The total of the weighting of the five percentages

was divided by five to obtain a single score for each occupation. Thus, United State Supreme Court Justice receives a NORC score of ninety-four and a rank of one by multiplying the percentage of raters who choose this occupation as "excellent" (77%) by five; "good" (18%) by four; "average" (4%) by three; "below average" (1%) by one. The sum of the weighted scores divided by five yields a NORC score of ninety-four. The final result is a progression of scores from a high of ninety-four to a low of thirty-four, with a frequent number of equal scores. The rank ordering of scores results in half-number ranks and gaps in rank order.¹¹

The Sample

Participants in this study were elementary teachers employed by the Oklahoma City Public Schools. The total sample, consisting of over three-hundred teachers, was divided approximately equally among schools in the three SES level. After the questionnaires were administered, one hundred teachers were randomly selected from each SES category as the basis for the study.

Participating schools were chosen with the aid of the Director of Research and the Director of Elementary Education for the Oklahoma City Public Schools. Six schools were suggested as being within the requirements for high

SES schools, all of which participated in the study. Ten schools were suggested for the low SES schools. Five of the ten were randomly selected for participation, with two alternates. Nine schools were recommended for the middle SES level, of which four were chosen along with two alternates. Following tentative selection, occupational information was gathered to determine whether alternate schools would be utilized.

The criterion by which schools were placed in SES categories was the median occupational prestige score for the school as established by the NORC Occupational Prestige Scale. Socioeconomic levels for the study were based upon a modification of socioeconomic classifications suggested by Kahl,¹² who divided the NORC scale scores into five groups; professional and administrative, semiprofessional and medium-level administrative, highly skilled manual workers, semiskilled manual workers, and unskilled laborers. These classifications were modified for this study to: high SES school, those occupations regarded as professional, semiprofessional or administrative, with a NORC scale score between 1 and 37; middle SES school, those occupations regarded as skilled or semiskilled, with a NORC scale score between 39 and 62.5; low SES school, those occupations regarded as unskilled or manual labor, with a

NORC scale score between 65.5 and 90. Information regarding parent occupation was obtained from a twenty percent random sample of student enrollment cards in each school. Examples of occupation information and corresponding NORC scale scores are available in Appendix B.

Data Collection and Treatment

Responses were obtained from respondents assembled in faculty meetings at the individual schools. Accuracy of responses to personal data questions was stressed, as was the necessity for responses to all items on the Professional Orientation Scale.

After data had been collected from all schools, the questionnaires in each SES category were numbered. Then by use of a random number table one hundred were selected from each SES category as the basis for the study. Personal data and responses to each item of the Professional Orientation Scale were transferred to IBM cards, after which programs designed for the IBM 7040 computer were used in the analysis of data. Analysis of data consisted of the following procedures:

1. Chi-square tests of the randomness of subject distribution among the three SES levels.
2. One-way analysis of variance of (a) total staff professionalism scores for the three SES groups;

- (b) staff professionalism scores in each SES level for all demographic variables.
3. Tabulation of subject responses to each item of the Professional Orientation Scale, available in Appendix C.

Summary

In this chapter the design of the study has been presented as being ex post facto. The two major instruments employed in the study have been reviewed in greater detail. Finally, the statistical treatment of the data gathered from the respondents has been outlined. Chapter IV will contain the presentation and analysis of data.

FOOTNOTES

¹Kerlinger, p. 360.

²Ibid., pp. 361-362.

³Ibid., p. 372.

⁴Ronald G. Corwin, The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools, (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; CRP No. 1934, 1963).

⁵Ibid., pp. 125-127.

⁶Ibid., p. 127.

⁷Ibid., p. 131.

⁸Ibid., p. 132.

⁹Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, LV (May, 1950), pp. 533-543.

¹⁰Reiss, pp. 83-84.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 53-58.

¹²Ibid., pp. 72-76.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary objective of this chapter is to analyze the data collected from respondents in an effort to determine whether differences in teacher professionalism are present among schools which vary in socioeconomic status. A secondary objective is to investigate the relationship, if any, existing between demographic factors and professionalism.

Findings of the study are reported under two headings; first, analysis of data related to sample distribution in regard to demographic variables; and second, analysis of data relating to the testing of the hypothesis. A discussion of the conclusions and recommendations resulting from the study will be presented in Chapter V.

Analysis of Demographic Variables in the Sample

Chi-square tests were employed to test for randomness of distribution of demographic variables in the sample.

Table I presents chi-square analyses of dependent variables in which teachers were normally distributed among the three groups.

The variable "Number of Years at this School" in Table I, although insignificant in the chi-square analysis, is deserving of comment. The number of teachers in high SES schools drops sharply from seventy-one in the one-to-five year cell to eighteen in the six-to-ten year cell. The most probable explanation is that of the six schools in the high SES category, only two were over ten years old, therefore only a relatively small number of teachers in the high SES group had an opportunity to be assigned to one school over ten years.

The analyses indicate that the three SES groups are most nearly homogeneous in the variables of sex and marital status. A random distribution of teachers throughout a large school system would be expected to reflect normality on these two variables.

Chi-Square Analysis of Level of Teacher Assignment

Chi-square analyses of demographic factors which proved to be significantly different among the three SES levels are presented in Tables II and III.

The most striking feature in Table II is the number of

TABLE I
 CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WHICH WERE NOT
 SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC GROUPS

Factor	Cell Classification						x ²
<u>NUMBER OF YEARS AT THIS SCHOOL</u>	Low SES (of) (ef)		Middle SES (of) (ef)		High SES (of) (ef)		
1 - 5	57	60	52	60	71	60	
6 - 10	24	22.66	26	22.66	18	22.66	
11 - 15	8	8.66	14	8.66	4	8.66	
16 and Above	11	8.66	8	8.66	7	8.66	11.62 n.s.*
<u>TOTAL YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE</u>							
1 - 10	44	51	56	51	53	51	
11 - 20	26	24.67	26	24.67	22	24.67	
21 - 30	20	15.33	8	15.33	18	15.33	
30 and Above	10	9	10	9	7	9	8.01 n.s.*
* at .05 level							

TABLE I (continued)

<u>AGE</u>	Low SES		Middle SES		High SES		
	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	
20 - 29	23	27	23	27	35	27	
30 - 39	21	23	30	23	18	23	
40 - 49	28	20.66	18	20.66	16	20.66	
50 - 59	20	21	21	21	22	21	
60 - 69	8	8.33	8	8.33	9	8.33	11.43 n.s.*
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>							
Single	14	12.33	10	12.33	13	12.33	
Married	71	75	78	75	76	75	
Divorced	8	5.67	5	5.67	4	5.67	
Widow/er	7	7	7	7	7	7	2.61 n.s.*
<u>SEX</u>							
Males	9	6.33	4	6.33	6	6.33	
Females	91	93.66	96	93.66	94	93.66	2.14 n.s.*
* at .05 level							

teachers classed as "other" in the low SES schools as compared to middle and high. One factor entering into this difference probably lies in the fact that all schools in the low SES group are Title I schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Being thus qualified, these schools are eligible for additional funds to secure special-help teachers. This feature of personnel distribution is however worthy of additional discussion.

The finding of an unusually large number of teachers classified as "other" (Table II) in the low SES group may actually reflect a situation which could have been predicted. A report by the NEA Research Division in 1961 indicated a trend toward more specialists in elementary education for the purpose of working with students experiencing difficulties in school.¹ An indication that Oklahoma is following the expected trend is reflected in NEA Research Division reports of 1959 and 1965. In the school year 1958 and 1959 Oklahoma employed nine-hundred fifty-seven new elementary classroom teachers, of which twenty-seven were special education teachers. For the 1964 and 1965 school year these figures had increased to one thousand sixty-four and thirty-nine respectively.² Further indication that this finding should have been expected is contained in another NEA Research Division publication

TABLE II

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE WHICH
WAS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN GROUPS

Factor	Cell Classification						x ²
	Low SES		Middle SES		High SES		
<u>LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT</u>	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	
K - 3	50	52.33	53	52.33	54	52.33	
4 - 6	35	39.67	43	39.67	41	39.67	
Other*	15	8	4	8	5	8	10.30**

* Includes multi-level assignments and special education teachers.

** Significant at .05 level

wherein the opinion is expressed that passage of Public Law 89-10, containing special provisions applicable to disadvantaged areas of school districts, would call for a large number of specially trained elementary teachers.³ Evidence as to whether the teachers in this sample conform to projected trends may be gathered from an examination of the data, Appendix D. Of the fifteen teachers classified "other" in the low SES cell, thirteen are special education teachers and two have multi-grade assignments. In the middle SES group there are two teachers with multi-grade assignments and two special education teachers. Of the five "other" teachers in the high SES group, one is multi-grade and four are special education. Thus, finding a large number of special education teachers in the low SES schools of Oklahoma City confirms a compliance to state and national trends.

Chi-Square Analysis of Teacher Professional Preparation

The greatest departure from normality of distribution occurs in level of professional preparation, as shown in Table III. In order to present a more complete picture, Table IV has been prepared, showing the level of professional preparation and age of teachers. One noticeable feature is that there are almost two times as many teachers

TABLE III

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE WHICH WAS
SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BETWEEN GROUPS

Factor							x ²
<u>TEACHER PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION</u>	Low SES		Middle SES		High SES		
	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	(of)	(ef)	
Bachelors	18	22	30	22	18	22	
Bachelors +	30	41.33	40	41.33	54	41.33	
Masters	26	20.33	21	20.33	14	20.33	
Masters +	26	16.33	9	16.33	14	16.33	24.33*

* Significant at .05 level

with Masters Degrees or above in the low SES group of schools as in the middle or high. Since special education teachers tend to be more experienced and are often required to have specialized training beyond that required for normal certification, the reported difference might have been predicted.⁴

Another source of difference indicated in Table III is that teachers in the low SES schools are better educated as a total group than are teachers in middle and high SES schools; a phenomenon encountered by Herriott and St. John in their study of urban schools.⁵ The higher level of professional preparation by teachers in low SES schools is broken down in Table IV which shows forty-one teachers in low SES schools with a Masters Degree or above in the forty and over age groups, compared to eighteen in the same categories of high SES schools and twenty-three in the middle SES schools. When examining the factor of professional preparation one must keep in mind that women teachers frequently interrupt their career for family reasons. Table IV shows this situation may well be operating in this sample when it is observed that there are only twenty-eight teachers out of three hundred with a Masters Degree or above in the twenty to thirty-nine age group. Finally, the data in Tables III and IV suggest that, as far as

TABLE IV
LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND AGE

<u>LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION</u>	Age Groups in Low SES Schools					Total
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-Over	
Bachelors	9	3	5	1	0	18
Bachelors +	12	9	5	2	2	30
Masters	1	5	9	10	1	26
Masters +	1	4	9	7	5	26

<u>LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION</u>	Age Groups in Middle SES Schools					Total
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-Over	
Bachelors	13	9	6	2	0	30
Bachelors +	8	16	4	9	3	40
Masters	2	5	5	5	4	21
Masters +	0	0	3	5	1	9

TABLE IV (continued)

	Age Groups in High SES Schools					Total
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-Over	
Bachelors	11	3	1	2	1	18
Bachelors +	21	8	8	11	6	54
Masters	2	5	3	4	0	14
Masters +	1	2	4	5	2	14

professional preparation is concerned, teachers in the middle, and particularly in the high SES schools, have a tendency to become content with their level of professional preparation.

Analysis of Variance of Demographic Variables

Tables V to XIII present one-way analysis of variance results for demographic variables and professionalism scores. Two out of nine demographic factors yielded significant differences in professionalism scores. The first, which tests the relationship between number of years at the school and professionalism scores is shown in Table IX. Professionalism scores and number of years at the school do not show significant relationships in low or middle SES schools. However, the results of the analysis indicate that in the high SES schools there is a relationship between teacher professionalism scores and the number of years assigned to the school. In order for the reader to gain a better understanding of this situation Table XIV has been prepared showing professionalism scores according to the number of years teachers have been assigned to the present school.

Inspection of Table XIV shows a score range of thirteen points for the three hundred teachers, with all scores

except three falling within a range of nine points. The possible score range on the Professional Orientation Scale was from a low of sixteen to a high of eighty. It is readily observed that of the three hundred teachers in the study, one hundred eighty had been in the present school five years or less. Of the one hundred teachers in the high SES group, in the zero-to-five year category, seventy-one had a professionalism score of fifty-five. The remaining twenty-nine were scattered in various year categories to a high score of sixty-five, a range of ten points. No teacher in this group had been at the participating school over twenty-five years. The middle SES teachers were likewise concentrated in the zero-to-five year category, with fifty-two teachers scoring fifty-six. The scores in the middle SES group range to a maximum of sixty-two, a spread of six points. Three teachers in this group had been assigned to the school over twenty-five years. Teachers in the low SES schools provided the widest range of scores, thirteen points, between a low of fifty-four and high of sixty-seven. Even though six teachers in this group were lower than all others in score, the majority is again concentrated in the zero-to-five year category. There are four teachers in this group who have been at the school over twenty-five years.

TABLE V
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND SEX

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	1	.679	.67968	
Within Groups	98	5315.832	54.24318	.01253
<hr/>				
3.94 required				
<hr/>				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	1	3.921	3.92187	
Within Groups	98	1690.242	17.24736	.22738
<hr/>				
3.94 required				
<hr/>				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	1	59.117	59.11718	
Within Groups	98	2293.476	23.40282	2.52607
<hr/>				
3.94 required				

TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND AGE

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	4	140.437	35.10937	
Within Groups	95	5176.074	54.48499	.64438
2.46 required				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	4	50.996	12.74902	
Within Groups	95	1643.167	17.29650	.73708
2.46 required				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	4	36.671	9.16796	
Within Groups	95	2315.921	24.37812	.37611
2.46 required				

TABLE VII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND MARITAL STATUS

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	3	240.441	80.14713	
Within Groups	96	5076.070	52.87573	1.51576
<hr/> 2.70 required <hr/>				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	3	25.839	8.61328	
Within Groups	96	1668.324	17.37837	.49563
<hr/> 2.70 required <hr/>				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	3	60.792	20.26432	
Within Groups	96	2291.800	23.87292	.84884
<hr/> 2.70 required <hr/>				

TABLE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND GRADE PLACEMENT

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	8	379.046	47.38085	
Within Groups	91	4937.464	54.25785	.87325
<hr/>				
2.04 required				
<hr/>				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	8	77.578	9.69726	
Within Groups	91	1616.585	17.76468	.54587
<hr/>				
2.04 required				
<hr/>				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	8	265.300	33.16259	
Within Groups	91	2087.292	22.93728	1.44579
<hr/>				
2.04 required				

TABLE IX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	7	458.593	65.51339	
Within Groups	92	4857.917	52.80345	1.24070
2.12 required				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	7	43.578	7.26302	
Within Groups	92	1650.585	17.74823	.40922
2.12 required				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	7	206.562	51.64062	
Within Groups	92	2146.031	22.58980	2.28601*
2.12 required				

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	9	437.714	48.63498	
Within Groups	90	4878.796	54.20885	.89717
2.04 required				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	9	190.179	27.16852	
Within Groups	90	1503.984	16.34765	1.66192
2.04 required				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	9	92.589	11.57373	
Within Groups	90	2260.003	24.83520	.46602
2.04 required				

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM SCORES
AND LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	3	291.183	97.06119	
Within Groups	96	5025.328	52.34716	1.85418
2.70 required				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	3	26.628	8.87630	
Within Groups	96	1667.535	17.37015	.51100
2.70 required				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	3	11.179	3.72656	
Within Groups	96	2341.414	24.38972	.15279
2.70 required				

TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATION

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	1	24.273	24.27343	
Within Groups	98	5292.238	54.00243	.44948
<hr/>				
3.94 required				
<hr/>				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	1	29.804	29.80468	
Within Groups	98	1664.359	16.98325	1.75494
<hr/>				
3.94 required				
<hr/>				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	1	31.890	31.89062	
Within Groups	98	2320.703	23.68064	1.34669
<hr/>				
3.94 required				

TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND GRADUATE PREPARATION

Low SES				
<u>SOURCE</u>	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	99	5316.511		
Between Groups	1	223.660	223.66015	
Within Groups	98	5092.851	51.96787	4.30381*
3.94 required				
Middle SES				
Total	99	1694.164		
Between Groups	2	12.878	6.43945	
Within Groups	97	1681.285	17.33283	.37151
3.94 required				
High SES				
Total	99	2352.593		
Between Groups	2	45.242	22.62109	
Within Groups	97	2307.351	23.78712	.95098
3.94 required				

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONALISM SCORES AND
NUMBER OF YEARS IN THIS SCHOOL

PROFESSIONALISM SCORES	Number of Years in this School by SES Groups																	
	0-5			6-10			11-15			16-20			21-25			26-Above		
	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H	L	M	H
54										6								
55	57		71															
56		52			26	18		14										1
57			24								5							3
58																		
59																		
60													1		5			1
61																		
62							8											1
63																		
64																		
65												2						
66																		
67																1		
Totals	57	52	71	24	26	18	8	14	4	6	5	2	1	-	5	4	3	-

Examination of Table IX reveals a low F score for the middle SES group, indicating little relationship between professionalism scores and number of years at the school. The range of scores in this group was six points, and only three teachers had been at the school over twenty-five years. Table IX shows that teachers in the low SES schools were approaching the significance level in relationship between professionalism score and number of years at the school. It will be recalled that these teachers had a score range of thirteen points, and that four teachers had been assigned to their current school over twenty-five years. Finally, the statistically significant F score for teachers in the high SES schools reflects a highly concentrated group whose professionalism scores had a range of ten points, with no teacher assigned to the school over twenty-five years.

Examination of Tables IX and XIV reveal that as the difference in range of scores between SES groups increases, the F score decreases. For example, the difference in score range between low SES and middle SES is seven points and the F score difference is .84, whereas the F difference between high SES and low SES is 1.04 with a score range difference of three. Therefore, it appears that range of

scores is not the factor which effects statistical significance.

Investigation of Table IX and XIV indicated that difference in number of teachers in an age group scoring approximately the same varies in the same direction as F scores. The greatest difference in F score is between middle and high SES teachers, and the greatest difference in number of teachers in one age-group scoring approximately the same is also between high and middle. The least difference in both F score and concentration of teachers is between high SES and low SES.

Thus, analysis of the data indicates that in this sample there is a relationship existing between professionalism score and number of years at the school among teachers of high SES schools but not among teachers in middle and low SES schools. Since range of scores does not seem to be a factor, and the distribution of scores among other year periods are approximately equal, the significance producing factor must lie in a concentrated number of teachers. This situation is found to be operating in the zero-to-five year category, with the low and middle SES schools having similar numbers, whereas the high SES level has an unusually large number of teachers in this category. The conclusion reached is that, in this instance, significance

results from teacher distribution, not from a variability in professionalism scores.

The second significant F score resulted from analysis of variance which tested for the existence of a relationship between professionalism score and graduate preparation. Table XIII shows that F scores for high and middle SES groups do not approach the point of significance, while the low SES teachers score just beyond significance level. When the difference between significance and non-significance is .36 the observation may be made that while a relationship is present, it is not a vigorous one. A more comprehensive presentation of information relevant to this relationship is given in Table XV, which presents the type of graduate preparation possessed by teachers in each SES group and mean professionalism scores.

Inspection of Table XV shows that there are thirty teachers in the middle SES group with no graduate preparation, as compared to eighteen and nineteen in the high and low SES groups respectively. Looking at the analysis of variance F score, Table XIII, then at Table XV, it is noted that the number of teachers who do not have graduate preparation apparently has little affect upon F scores. However, the F scores for the high SES group and the low SES group are radically different, even though they are similar

TABLE XV

TYPE OF GRADUATE PREPARATION BY SES CLASSIFICATION

Type of Graduate Preparation	Number of Teachers and Mean Professionalism Score					
	<u>Low SES</u>	<u>Mean Professionalism Score</u>	<u>Middle SES</u>	<u>Mean Professionalism Score</u>	<u>High SES</u>	<u>Mean Professionalism Score</u>
None	19	53.84	30	57.26	18	57.33
Within Field of Education	81	57.65	67	56.49	78	57.73
Outside Field of Education	0		3	56.33	4	61.00

in respect to number of teachers having no graduate preparation and graduate preparation within the field of education. Therefore, the significance must lie in the fact that all teachers in the low SES schools have graduate majors within the field of education, whereas those in the middle and high SES schools do not.

It is interesting to note that the mean professionalism score of teachers in the high SES group, with graduate majors outside the field of education, was five points above those in the middle SES group. The small number of teachers (seven) in this latter situation make a meaningful analysis of this latter phenomenon impractical in the present study.

Finally, a tabulation has been made showing how teachers in different SES classifications responded to each item of the Professional Orientation Scale. These data are available in Appendix C.

Analysis of Data Relating to the Hypothesis

The study hypothesis was tested by an analysis of variance, which measured the amount of difference existing between teachers' mean professionalism scores and the socioeconomic status of the schools in which they taught.

The analysis of variance testing the hypothesis is presented in Table XVI. As previously stated, the hypothesis is:

H0: It is hypothesized that there will be no significant differences between the mean professionalism scores of teachers from low, middle, or high socioeconomic level schools at the .05 level of significance.

The primary purpose of this study was an attempt to ascertain the extent to which teachers possess a professional orientation and to discover how these were distributed among elementary schools of different socioeconomic status. When the factor of horizontal career mobility is considered⁶ the implication is often made that teachers remaining in low SES schools are in some manner inferior to those moving to "better" schools.⁷ If the teachers moving to higher SES schools are indeed professionally superior, there may well be differences in their professional orientation as compared to teachers in the low status schools. On the other hand, the null hypothesis under which this study was conducted was based on the premise that a person's orientation to his profession is an individual matter (p. 6). If this premise is correct, we would expect to find no significant relationship between professionalism mean scores and the socioeconomic status of schools.

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHERS' MEAN PROFESSIONALISM
SCORES AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF SCHOOLS

SOURCE	df	S.S.	M.S.	F
Total	299	9427.55468		
Between Groups	2	64.28125	32.14062	
Withing Groups	297	9363.27343	31.52617	1.01049

3.03 required at .05

Table XVI indicated no statistically significant relationship between professionalism scores and socioeconomic status of schools in which responding teachers are employed. There are indications in recent literature that teachers from different SES schools should be similar in their professional orientation. Herriott and St. John in their study of four hundred ninety schools in 1962 found that their prediction of a significantly lower career satisfaction among teachers in low status schools was not upheld. Current job difficulties and dissatisfaction with certain environmental conditions did not seem to affect their appraisal of the professional aspects of their careers.⁸ In fact they report that elementary teachers in low SES schools actually indicate greater enjoyment with most aspects of the work of teaching than do teachers from higher SES schools.⁹

The image of the ghetto teacher revealed in a 1968 study by the National Advisory Commission of Civil Disorders is far different from the prevailing opinion held by the lay public and many educators. The commission reports that instead of fitting the accepted image of unhappy, untrained, green recruits, they like their work and want to stay. The teachers in ghetto schools are well educated and experienced. They are not excessively worried

about classroom discipline, and are confident of the quality of their schools and colleagues.¹⁰

Summary

The first portion of Chapter IV was concerned with an investigation of demographic factors related to the study. Chi-square analyses revealed significant departure from normality on two variables, level of assignment and amount of professional preparation. Examination of the data and related literature points out that while statistically significant, these two deviations from random distribution are plausible and might well have been predicted. Analysis of variance procedures testing the relationship between demographic variables and professionalism score revealed two significant F scores, one regarding professionalism and years at the school, the other professionalism and type of graduate preparation. Even though these two relationships are statistically significant, the significance is not strong, and a plausible explanation is available.

The concluding part of Chapter IV presented an analysis of the data in regard to the hypothesis and mention of literature which would lend support to the findings of the study.

FOOTNOTES

¹NEA Research Division, Administrative Practices in Urban School Districts, 1958-59, (Washington, 1961) pp. 21-25.

²NEA Research Division, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959, (Washington, 1959), p. 46.

NEA Research Division, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1965, (Washington, 1965), p. 55.

³NEA Research Division, "The Selective Shortage of Teachers," NEA Research Bulletin, XLIII (October, 1965), p. 74.

⁴Harold Ruvlin and Frank M. Cordasco, "Staffing of Special Education Classes," Peabody Journal of Education, XLV (May, 1968), pp. 356-357.

⁵Herriott and St. John, p. 233.

⁶Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (March, 1952), pp. 470-477.

Havighurst and Neugarten, pp. 487-490.

⁷Elizabeth G. Cohen, "Status of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (June, 1967), pp. 289-290.

⁸Herriott and St. John, pp. 92-93.

⁹Ibid., p. 169.

¹⁰Education USA, "Study Debunks Accepted Image of Ghetto Teacher," National School Public Relations Association, (September, 1968), p. 6.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review

The central problem of this study was an investigation of the relationship, if any, existing between the professional role orientation of teachers and the socioeconomic status of the school in which the teachers are employed. In this study the term "professionalism" has been used interchangeably with professional role orientation. No attempt has been made to determine the extent to which teaching meets the various criteria of a profession. The definition of professionalism used in this study was formulated by the writer on the premise that there is sufficient commonality in the criteria offered by different authors to form a general concept of a profession, and subsequently, professionalism.

Socioeconomic status (SES) refers to social stratification. The social status of an elementary school was determined by the median of occupational prestige scores of parental occupation in an elementary school attendance

area. The NORC Occupational Prestige Scale was the criterion by which occupational prestige scores were determined. The three socioeconomic levels and their score limits were specified on page four. The Duncan Socioeconomic Index was utilized as an adjunct to the NORC scale in order to gain access to the four hundred twenty-five occupations listed by this scale. An additional advantage offered by the Duncan Index is that scores may be readily transformed from the Duncan Socioeconomic Index to the NORC scale.

The Sample

Chapter IV, Presentation and Analysis of Data, contains the major portion of data investigation. However, there are conditions brought to light by the study which are worthy of additional discussion. The chi-square analyses of the randomness of sample distribution shows two demographic variables in abnormal distribution. The first of these, level of assignment, was discussed at length in Chapter IV. Various sources¹ indicate that the findings of the study are in conformity with current trends in teacher placement and could therefore have been expected to influence a statistical analysis of this factor.

The second demographic variable reflecting an abnormal sample distribution was that of level of professional

preparation. As reported in Chapter IV, this phenomenon is linked by this writer to the number of teachers in low SES schools engaged in special education. Although the findings of this study regarding assignments to special education are in accord with current trends, there is reason to believe that the level of professional preparation found in this study is peculiar to this particular group of teachers. This is indicated by the fact that the national average of teachers possessing a Masters Degree is 15.7%,² whereas 20.3% of the teachers in this sample have a Masters Degree. The percent of teachers in low SES schools of this study who have a Masters Degree (26%) is slightly above the 24.4% of low SES teachers reported in the Herriott and St. John³ study. An unexpected finding of this investigation was that only fifty-eight teachers in the middle and high SES schools had a Masters Degree or above, while fifty-two in low SES schools had a Masters Degree or above. The data would seem to indicate that middle and high SES teachers have a tendency to become satisfied with their level of professional preparation, but those in low SES schools feel a need or desire for additional study.

Instrumentation

The NORC Occupational Prestige Scale has proven to be a satisfactory instrument with which to determine socioeconomic status. As noted in Chapter II, the greatest limitation of this scale is the small number of occupations listed. However, if the choice was to be made again, the Duncan Socioeconomic Index would be used in lieu of the NORC because of the more extensive listing of occupational scores.

The Professional Role Orientation Scale has proven to be a discriminating instrument as was demonstrated when significant differences in professionalism mean scores were detected on the two demographic variables "number of years at this school" and "type of graduate preparation." Although subjective, it is the opinion of this writer that the discrimination qualities of the instrument could be improved by adding more items, which should aid the development of more reliable sub-scales. The split-half correlation for the Professional Orientation Scale was $r=.48$ which when corrected with the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula is $r_n=.65$, but the correlation coefficient for the monopoly of knowledge sub-scale (items 10, 11, 12, 13) is only $r=.18$ as presented in the present scale. Since, other things being equal, the larger number of items the larger

will be the reliability coefficient,⁴ the inclusion of additional items could strengthen the sub-scale and improve the over-all instrument.

Conclusions

The null hypothesis investigated in this study was that there will be no significant differences between the mean professionalism scores of teachers from low, middle, or high socioeconomic level schools at the .05 level of significance.

The Hypothesis

The finding of no significant differences in status professionalism scores is, on the surface, surprising. Cohen⁵ has noted that literature dealing with the status of teachers in depressed area schools strongly implies that recruitment policies operate in a manner which tends to place certain types of teachers, often considered professionally inferior, in low SES schools. Also implied in the literature was the fact that discouraging conditions in such schools were responsible for the large teacher turnover in these districts. Herriott and St. John,⁶ as well as Havighurst and Neugarten, report that teachers in low status schools are more likely to request transfers to

schools in better socioeconomic areas. Since teachers are predominantly middle class⁷ it would appear natural that they would make an effort to secure positions in schools which are similar to their background.

The results of this study indicate that a teacher's orientation to his profession is an individual matter, and does not seem to be related to the socioeconomic status of the school in which he teaches. The conclusion of this investigator is that the failure of the present study to reject the null hypothesis represents an accurate assessment of the distribution of teacher professional orientation in the study sample, and is one which has some support in related literature.

Recommendations

Research studies can often be characterized by what they fail to consider as well as by what they study. This investigation is no exception, and the writer has suggestions for future work in the realm of social status and teacher professionalism.

First, as previously mentioned, it is recommended that improvements be made on the Professional Role Orientation Scale specifically directed toward strengthening the subscales. The present instrument is adequate for a global

assessment of professionalism, but an instrument with more reliable sub-scales is needed.

Secondly, because the manipulation of nine variables would be an impractical task, no attempt has been made to go beyond one-way analysis of variance and into a study of variable interactions. As Kerlinger⁸ notes, in most research studies, main effect interactions are usually of most interest, while third or fourth order interactions are rarely significant. Factorial analysis of variance ideally requires an equal number of cases in the various cells, and it is difficult to get enough subjects to fill the cells of complex designs. Also, factorial designs involving more than four variables are uncommon in educational research and pose problems in data manipulation. The recommendation of this writer is that studies specifically designed to test for interaction of variables be undertaken in an effort to determine the extent, if any, of such relationships.

In view of the interaction between faculty and principal, a fruitful area of future research might be an investigation of the influence the school principal has upon teacher professionalism. Such a study could concentrate upon the similarities and differences in professional role orientations exhibited by teachers and administrators of different SES levels.

Three studies bearing upon teacher-training and relationship to professionalism are suggested. One investigation could concentrate upon the type of graduate preparation, whether within or outside the field of elementary education, and professionalism. Table XV indicated that teachers with graduate preparation outside the field of education score higher on the professionalism scale than do those with a major within the field of education. A study related to teacher-training might profitably inquire into the relationships existing between the professional education curriculum and teacher professionalism. A study of this nature could seek to determine whether access to a campus laboratory school influences professional orientation; does the length of time spent in student teaching influence professional orientation, et cetera. A third investigation related to teacher education would involve a before-and-after design. The study would examine the influence of the cooperating teacher upon the professional role attitude of the student teacher.

Finally, the writer recommends further studies into the nature of the relationship between the socioeconomic status of the school and teacher professionalism. Through continued efforts directed toward the assessment of professional role orientation may come a more adequate concept of the professional role of the teacher.

FOOTNOTES

¹NEA Research Division, Administrative Practices in Urban School Districts, 1958-59, (Washington, 1961), pp. 21-25.

NEA Research Division, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959, (Washington, 1959), p. 46.

NEA Research Division, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1965, (Washington, 1965), p. 55.

NEA Research Division, "The Selective Shortage of Teachers," NEA Research Bulletin, XLIII (October, 1965), p. 74.

²NEA Research Division, The American Public School Teacher, 1965-66, (Washington, 1966), p. 8.

³Herriott and St. John, p. 233.

⁴Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York, 1962), p. 176.

⁵Elizabeth G. Cohen, "Status of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (June, 1967), pp. 289-290.

⁶Herriott and St. John, pp. 92-93.

⁷Ibid., p. 413.

⁸Kerlinger, pp. 227-229, 325-333.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart. "Trends in Occupational Origins of Physicians." American Sociological Review, XVIII (August, 1953), 404-9.
- Aubrey, Roger F. "What Is the Role of the Elementary-School Teacher." The Elementary School Journal, LXVIII (March, 1968), 277-83.
- Becker, Howard S. "Social-Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship." Journal of Educational Sociology, XXV (March, 1952), 451-65.
- Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public School-Teacher." American Journal of Sociology, LVII (March, 1952), 470-77.
- Belok, Michael V. "Career Orientations: A Teacher Typology." Education, LXXXVI (October, 1965), 102-5.
- Blau, Peter M., and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Bush, Robert. "Redefining the Role of the Teacher." Theory into Practice, VI (December, 1967), 246-51.
- Caplow, Theodore. The Sociology of Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- Cave, William M., and Donald L. Halsted. "Sociology of Education." Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (February, 1967), 74-81.
- Centers, Richard. The Psychology of Social Classes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

- Chapin, Stuart. The Measurement of Social Status. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933.
- Clark, Burton R. Educating the Expert Society. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Clarke, Alfred C. "The Use of Leisure and Its Relation to Levels of Occupational Prestige." American Sociological Review, XXI (June, 1956), 301-7.
- Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Status of Teachers." Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (June, 1967), 280-94.
- Colombotos, John L. Sources of Professionalism: A Study of High School Teachers. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Cooperative Research Project Number 330. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Department of Sociology, 1962.
- Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Corwin, Ronald G. The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; CRP No. 1934. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1963.
- Counts, George S. "The Social Status of Occupations: A Problem in Vocational Guidance." School Review, XXXIII (January, 1925), 16-27.
- Davis, Allison. Social Class Influence Upon Learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Deasy, Leila C. "An Index of Social Mobility." Rural Sociology, XX (June, 1956), 149-51.
- Donovan, F. The Schoolma'am. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938.
- Duncan, Otis D. in Albert J. Reiss, Jr., et al. Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Edwards, Alba S. "A Social-Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers of the United States." United States

Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1938.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1962.

Education USA. "Study Debunks Accepted Image of Ghetto Teacher." National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C., (September, 1968).

Empey, Lamar T. "Social Class and Occupational Aspiration: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement." American Sociological Review. XXI (December, 1956), 703-9.

Gillen, John E. "Educators and Social Class." in Social Foundations of Education, by Jonathan C. McLendon. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Goodlad, John I. School Curriculum Reform in the United States. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1964.

Gordon, Milton M. Social Class in American Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Greenwood, Earnest. "Attributes of a Profession." Social Work, II (July, 1957), 45-55.

Hatt, Paul K. "Occupation and Social Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, LV (May, 1950), 533-43.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Social Class Influences on American Education." Social Forces Influencing American Education. Sixtieth Yearbook, Part Two. National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, 1961.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Bernice Neugarten. Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.

Herriott, Robert E., and Nancy H. St. John. Social Class and the Urban School. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

- Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963." The American Journal of Sociology, LXX (November, 1964), 286-302.
- Hollingshead, A. B., and Frederick Redlich. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Hughes, James M. Human Relations in Educational Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Kahl, Joseph A. The American Class Structure. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1957.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Value and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action." in T. Parsons and E. Shils (eds.) Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry: Conflicts and Accommodations. Berkley: University of California Press, 1962.
- Lasswell, Thomas E. Class and Stratum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.
- Leles, Sam. "Using the Critical Incidents Technique to Develop a Theory of Professionalism: An Exploratory Study." Journal of Teacher Education, XIX (Spring, 1968), 59-69.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status." American Sociological Review, XIX (August, 1954), 405-13.
- Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Musgrave, P. W. The Sociology of Education. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1965.
- NEA, Department of Classroom Teachers. "Classroom Teachers

- Speak on Teaching as a Profession." Washington, C.C.: National Education Association, 1961.
- National Education Association, Research Division. Administrative Practices in Urban School Districts, 1958-1959. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1961.
- National Education Association, Research Division. "Teacher Opinion Poll: Classroom Autonomy." NEA Journal, LVII (May, 1968), 13.
- National Education Association, Research Division. Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959.
- National Education Association, Research Division. Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1965. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
- National Education Association, Research Division. The American Public School Teacher, 1965-1966. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.
- National Education Association, Research Division. "The Selective Shortage of Teachers." NEA Research Bulletin, XLIII (October, 1965), 55.
- Neugarten, Bernice. "Social Class and Friendship Among School Children." American Journal of Sociology, LI (June, 1946), 305-13.
- Popham, James W. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Prandy, Kenneth. Professional Employees. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1965.
- Quay, Herbert C. Juvenile Delinquency. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1965.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr., et al. Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.
- Robinson, Norman. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to the Bureaucratic Characteristics of School

- Organizations." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta (1966).
- Rubin, Harold and Frank M. Cordasco. "Staffing of Special Education Classes." Peabody Journal of Education, XLV (May, 1968), 356-58.
- Sewell, William H., Archie O. Haller, and Murray A. Straus. "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration." American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), 67-73.
- Smith, Othanel, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950.
- Stendler, Celia Burns. Children of Brasstown. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Stinnett, Timothy M. "Teacher Professionalization: Challenge and Promise." Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, XL No. 5 (September, 1964), 12.
- Stinnett, Timothy M. The Profession of Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Stinnett, Timothy M. and Lawrence D. Haskew. Teaching in American Schools. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.
- Strang, Ruth. Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.
- Trow, William C. "Role Functions of the Teacher in the Instructional Group." The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Fifty-Ninth Yearbook, Part Two. National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, 1960.
- Vollmer, Howard M. and Donald L. Mills. Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932.

Warner, W. L. Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949.

Warner, W. L., Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb. Who Shall be Educated? New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Webb, Thomas W. "Classification of Teachers by Bureaucratic and Professional Normative Orientations to Educational Issues." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1964.

Weber, Max. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Westby-Gibson, Dorothy. Social Perspectives on Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Wilson, Alan B. "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys." American Sociological Review, XXIV (December, 1959), 836-45.

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE AND PROFESSIONAL
ROLE ORIENTATION SCALE

INFORMATION SHEET

Instructions: Please complete this form by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in blanks where indicated.

1. Sex: Males Female
2. Marital Status: Single Married
 Separated or Divorced
 Widow(er)
3. Age: 20-29 years 30-39 years
 40-49 years 50-59 years
 60-69 years
4. Present position (specify as indicated):
 Elementary Teacher (please specify grade _____)
 Other (please specify position _____)
5. Number of years of experience in this school including present _____.
6. Experience as an educator (as of the end of this academic year).

_____ years as a teacher

_____ years as a principal, supervising principal,
or superintendent

_____ years as a guidance counselor

_____ years, other (please specify position _____)
7. Amount of education

_____ Less than Bachelor's degree

_____ Bachelor' degree

_____ Bachelor's degree plus additional credits

_____ Master's degree

_____ Master's degree plus additional credits

_____ Doctor's degree

8. Undergraduate preparation

() Major within the field of education

() Major in area outside the field of education

9. Graduate preparation

() Major within the field of education

() Major in area outside the field of education

Information for respondents:

On the following pages a number of statements about teaching are presented. Our purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements.

You will recognize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinion of them.

Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual or school will be named in the report of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Instructions

Following are sixteen statements. Please indicate your personal opinion regarding each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

Key: SA - Strongly Agree
 A - Agree
 U - Undecided
 D - Disagree
 SD - Strongly Disagree

1. It should be permissible for the teacher to violate a rule if he/she is sure that the best interest of the students will be served in doing so. SA A U D SD
2. Unless she is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher should not do what she is told to do. SA A U D SD
3. A good teacher should not do anything that he believes may jeopardize the interests of his students regardless of who tells him to or what the rules state. SA A U D SD

Key: SA - Strongly Agree
 A - Agree
 U - Undecided
 D - Disagree
 SD - Strongly Disagree

4. Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of their profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect them. SA A U D SD
5. One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect it commands from other teachers around the state. SA A U D SD
6. A teacher should try to put his standards and ideals of good teaching into practice even if the rules or procedures of the school forbid it. SA A U D SD
7. Teachers should subscribe to and diligently read the standard professional journals. SA A U D SD
8. Teachers should be an active member of at least one professional teaching association, and attend most conferences and meetings of the association. SA A U D SD
9. A teacher should consistently practice his/her ideas of the best educational practices even though the administration prefers other views. SA A U D SD
10. A teacher's skill should be based primarily on his acquaintance with his subject matter. SA A U D SD
11. Teachers should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their knowledge of the subject that is to be taught, and their ability to communicate it. SA A U D SD

Key: SA - Strongly Agree
 A - Agree
 U - Undecided
 D - Disagree
 SD - Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 12. | Schools <u>should</u> hire no one to teach unless he holds at least a 4-year bachelors degree. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 13. | In view of the teacher shortage, it <u>should</u> be permissible to hire teachers trained at non-accredited colleages. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 14. | A teacher <u>should</u> be able to make his own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 15. | Small matters <u>should not</u> have to be referred to someone higher up for final answer. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 16. | The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions <u>should</u> be exercised by professional teachers. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

APPENDIX B

SAMPLES OF OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION USED
TO DETERMINE SCHOOL SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

SES of School 1D

<u>No</u>	<u>Occupation - Explanation for Placement</u>	<u>NORC Rank</u>
2	Secretary - Duncan - Clerical and kindred	44
1	Professional Football - Duncan - Professional, technical, and kindred (Athletes)	48
1	Paint Salesmen - Duncan - Salesman and clerk - n.e.c.	49.5
1	TV Repairman - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - Mechanics and repairmen	57
1	Electro Plater - Duncan - Operative and kindred Metal working	59
1	Machinist - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	59
1	Service Station Operator - Duncan - Managers, official, and proprietor - Gasoline service station	59
1	Metal Fabricator - Duncan - Operatives and kindred - Metal working trades	59
1	Plumber - NORC	59
1	Plastics Fabricator - Duncan - Operatives and kindred - Other trades	59
6	Mechanic - NORC	60
1	Brick Layer - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	65.5
1	Welder - Duncan - Operatives and kindred	66
2	Domestic Help - Duncan - Private household worker	67
1	Furniture Delivery - NORC - As truck driver	67
1	Stockroom Operator - Duncan - Clerical and kindred	67
1	School Bus Driver - NORC - As truck driver - Also Duncan - As operative	67
1	Radio Station (MKY) - Duncan - Operatives and kindred non-manufacturing telecommunications	67
3	Truck Driver - NORC	67
5	Painters - Duncan - Operatives and kindred	69
1	Paper Company - Duncan - Nondurable goods	70
5	Armed Forces (No rank given) - Duncan - Craftsmen - Armed forces	70
3	Store Clerk (Grocery, dime, etc.) - NORC	70
1	Factory Worker - Duncan - Operative manufacturing	70
1	Cook (Restaurant) - NORC	72.5
1	Packing Company - Duncan - Operatives and kindred Nondurable meat products	72.5
1	Roofer - Duncan - Craftsmen	74

2	Tire Shop Employee - Duncan - Laborer - Nondurable goods - Rubber products	75
7	Hospital Aids - Duncan - Service worker - Hospital and other institutions	75
3	Warehouse Man - NORC - Dock worker - Duncan - Longshoremen and stevedores	77.5
12	City Employee (Parks, Garbage, Maintenance, Streets) Duncan - Service workers - n.e.c.	77.5
1	Waitress - NORC	80.5
2	Janitor - NORC	83
1	Auto Salvage - Duncan - Laborer - Non-manufacturing	84
1	Laundry - NORC	85
1	Construction - Duncan - Non-manufacturing industry	86.5
7	Laborer - Duncan - Laborer - Non-manufacturing	87
1	Parking Lot Attendant - Duncan - Service worker (Porter)	89
1	Hotel - Duncan - Service worker (Porter)	89
57	ADC	

SES of School 2C

<u>No</u>	<u>Occupation - Explanation for Placement</u>	<u>NORC Rank</u>
1	Professor at Kansas State - NORC	8
2	Minister - NORC	17.5
1	Agricultural Engineer - Duncan - Professional - Technical and kindred - Engineer - n.e.c.	24.5
1	News Editor - Duncan - Professional - Technical and kindred	27.5
3	Teacher - NORC	27.5
2	Accountant - NORC	29.5
1	Chiropractor - Duncan - Professional - Technical and kindred	33
1	Credit Manager - Duncan - Manager, Official and proprietor - Credit manager	33
1	Professional Painter - NORC	34.5
1	Musician - NORC	34.5
1	Radar-Radio Operator - Duncan - Professional - Technical and kindred	37
1	Manager (Zales) - Duncan - Manager, official and proprietor	37
1	Manager (Guy's Foods) - Duncan - Manager, official and proprietor - Wholesale trade	37
2	Electrician - NORC	39
1	Humble Oil Company - Duncan - Manager, official and proprietor - Salaried	41.5
1	Owner-Operator Printing Shop - NORC	41.5
1	State Welfare Department - Duncan - Professional technical and kindred - Welfare and social worker	41.5
1	ADC (Place of Employment) - Duncan - Professional technical and kindred - Welfare and social worker	41.5
1	Oilfield Salesman - Duncan - Wholesale sales	44
1	Robinson Janitor Supply - Duncan - Wholesale sales	44
1	Reactor Technician - Duncan - Professional technical and kindred - Technician - n.e.c.	44
1	Architectural Representative - Duncan - Manager official and proprietor - Salaried	44
1	Reservationist (Continental Air Lines) - Duncan Clerical and kindred	44
1	Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce - Duncan - Manager, official and proprietor - Official of lodge, Society, etc.	46

1	Gateway Pipe Line - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen and kindred	46
1	TV Studio - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - Telecommunication	46
1	Detective - NORC - As policeman	47
1	Manager AAMCO - Duncan - Manager, official, and proprietor - Salaried	47
1	Lone Star Brewery - Duncan - Sales - n.e.c.	49.5
1	Division Foreman (OG&E) - DOT 1:330 - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - n.e.c.	49.5
1	Insurance Salesman (John Hancock) - NORC - As insurance agent	51.5
3	Insurance Agent - NORC	51.5
3	Carpenter - NORC	53
1	Piano Salesman - Duncan - Sales - Retail	54.5
1	Salesman (Mathis Brothers) - Duncan - Sales - Retail trade	54.5
2	Salesman - Duncan - Sales - Retail trade median	54.5
1	Glass Cutter - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - As glazier	54.5
1	Aerial Observer - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - As inspector - n.e.c.	54.5
1	Fireman - Duncan - Service worker	54.5
2	Service Station Operator - Duncan - Manager, official, and proprietor	59
1	Refrigeration and Air Conditioning - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - n.e.c.	59
1	Plumber - NORC	59
1	Tile Setter - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - Tile setter	65.5
1	Sylvania Electric - Duncan - Operatives and kindred manufacturing durable goods	65.5
1	Tailor - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - Tailor	66
1	Baker (Dennis Donuts) - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred - Baker	66
3	Welder - Duncan - Operative and kindred	66
1	State Highway Department - Duncan - Operative and kindred - Non-manufacturing - Transportation	66
2	Oklahoma Gas and Electric - Duncan - Operative and kindred - Non-manufacturing - Utilities	67
1	Pace-Setter - DOT 1:506 - Duncan - Farm laborers and foremen	67
3	Truck Drivers - NORC	67
1	Tinker AFB - Duncan - Operative and kindred - n.e.c.	69

3	Painter - Duncan - Operatives and kindred	69
2	Milk Route Man - NORC	70
3	Store Clerk (Drive, Grocery, etc.) - NORC	70
1	USAF - Duncan - Craftmen, foremen, and kindred Armed forces	70
2	Roofer - Duncan - Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	74
1	Iron Worker - Duncan - Operative, manufacturing durable goods	75
2	Construction - Duncan - Laborer - Non-manufac- turing construction	86.5
2	Disabled	
1	Unemployed	
6	Welfare	

SES of School 3B

<u>No</u>	<u>Occupation - Explanation for Placement</u>	<u>NORC Rank</u>
33	Physician - NORC	2.0
1	Physician (Navy) - NORC	2.0
1	Neurosurgeon - NORC	2.0
1	Oral Surgeon - NORC	2.0
2	College Professor - NORC	8.0
1	Chemist - NORC	11.0
11	Lawyer - NORC	11.0
1	U.S. Attorney - NORC	11.0
4	Architect - NORC	14
1	Colonel (Army) - Placed in relation to Captain on NORC	17.3
2	Minster - NORC	17.5
1	Airline Pilot - NORC	21.5
1	Special Commission Official (Governor Bartlett) NORC	21.5
1	State Soil Conservation Board Member - Just below head of state government on NORC	24.5
5	Banker - NORC	24.5
1	Title & Trust Company (Vice President) - Duncan Manager salaried - Banking and other Finance	25
1	Bank Loan Officer - Duncan - Manager - Salaried Banking and other finance	25
2	Trasury Agents - DOT II:245 - Duncan - Manager, official, federal, public administration	26
1	FBI Agent - DOT II:416 - Duncan - Manager, official, federal, public administration	26
5	Engineer - Duncan - Professional - Technical	26
1	Petroleum Engineer - Duncan - Professional - Mining	26
2	School Teacher - NORC	27.5
9	Geologist - Duncan - Professional - Natural Scientist	29.5
5	Accountants - NORC	29.5
1	Veterinarian - Duncan - Professional	29.5
1	IBM Branch Manager - Duncan - Manager - Salaried business services	29.5
1	Kerr-McGee (Vice President) - Duncan - Manager - Salaried manufacturing	29.5
5	Oil Company Executives - Duncan - Manager - Salaried manufacturing	29.5
2	Realtor - Duncan - Manager - Self Employed - Insurance and real estate	31.5
1	Free Lance Writer - Duncan - Professional - Author	31.5

1	Pipe Line Firm Owner (Oil) - Duncan - Manager - Salaried telecommunication and utilities	31.5
1	Construction & Investments - NORC - As contractor	31.5
4	Contractor - NORC	31.5
2	Stockbroker - Duncan - Sales workers - Stocks & bond salesman	32.0
2	Interior Decorators - Duncan - Professional - Designer	33
1	Marketing Consultant - NORC - As economist	34.5
1	Chief of Office Services (FAA) - Duncan - Manager - Inspector - Federal, public administration	34.5
1	Aeromedical Instructor - Duncan - Professional - Teacher - n.e.c.	34.5
2	Landmen - DOT II:239 - Some training in law	34.5
1	IBM Programmer - DOT II:381 - Tool programmer - Numerical control	37
1	Auto Parts (Vice President) - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail - Motor vehicles	37
1	Ford Dealer - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail - Motor vehicles	37
2	Public Relations Specialist - Duncan - Sales workers - Advertising agents	39
1	Oil Field Equipment Salesman - Duncan - Sales workers - Manufacturing	41.5
1	Juvenile Officer - DOT 1:105 (Professional and kindred) - Duncan - Professional - Social and welfare workers	41.5
1	Wholesale Grocer - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Wholesale trade	44
3	Undertaker - NORC	44
1	Lumber Company Owner - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail - Hardware, etc.	44
1	Oil and Gas Broker - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Wholesale trade	44
1	City Enterprises Manager - Duncan - Manager - Salaried - All other industry	44
1	Glass Company Manager - Duncan - Manager - Salaried - All other industry	44
1	Manufacturer - Duncan - Manager - Self employed Manufacturing	44
1	Curator of Science and Arts Foundation - Duncan - Manager - Officials - Local public administration	47
1	Retail Sales Manager - Duncan - Manager - Salaried Retail trade	47
1	Goodwill Industries Manager - Duncan - Manager - Salaried personal services	48

1	Film Maker Owner - Duncan - Professional - As photographer	48
1	Printer - Duncan - Craftsmen - Pressmen, etc.	49.5
1	Drug Store Owner - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail - Other retail trade	49.5
1	Rental Company Owner - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - All other industries	49.5
1	Door Closer Mechanic - Duncan - Craftsmen - Electrician	51.5
4	Insurance Agent - NORC	51.5
1	Material Processing Inspector - Duncan - Craftsmen - Inspector - n.e.c.	53
1	Roofing Superintendent - Duncan - Craftsmen - Construction - Foreman	53
1	Construction Foreman - Duncan - Craftsmen - Construction foreman	53
1	Driver for Fire Department - Duncan - Service workers - As firemen	54.5
1	Labor Union Official - NORC	54.5
1	TV Technician - Duncan - Craftsmen - Mechanics - Radio and television	57
3	Salesmen - NORC	57
1	Jeweler - Duncan - Craftsmen - Jeweler	57
2	Postal Clerks - NORC - As mail carrier	57
1	Hair Stylist - Duncan - Craftsmen - n.e.c.	59
1	Service Station Owner - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail - Gas service station	59
1	Grocery Store Owner - Duncan - Manager - Self employed - Retail food	59
1	Locksmith - Duncan - Craftsmen - Mechanic - n.e.c.	65.5
1	Air Brake Specialist - Duncan - Craftsmen - Mechanic - n.e.c.	65.5
2	Truck Drivers - NORC	67

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT RESPONSES TO PROFESSIONAL
ROLE ORIENTATION SCALE ITEMS

RESPONSES TO PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION SCALE ITEMS

SCALE ITEMS	NUMBER OF TOTAL SAMPLE RESPONDING TO EACH ATERNATIVE ACCORDING TO SCHOOL SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS*														
	Strongly Agree			Agree			Undecided			Disagree			Strongly Disagree		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. It <u>should</u> be permissible for the teacher to violate a rule if he/she is sure that the best interests of the students will be served in doing so.	20	8	11	46	61	62	15	9	12	14	22	12	5	0	3
2. Unless she is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher <u>should not</u> do what she is told to do.	9	4	3	26	29	38	21	18	16	32	48	35	12	1	8
3. A good teacher <u>should not</u> do anything that he believes may jeopardize the interests of his students regardless of who tells him to or what the rules state.	15	5	13	35	53	42	24	19	22	22	23	20	4	0	3

*1 = low SES; 2 = middle SES; 3 = high SES

SCALE ITEMS	Strongly Agree			Agree			Undecided			Disagree			Strongly Disagree		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	4. Teachers <u>should</u> try to live up to what they think are the standards of their profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect them	36	31	37	52	63	59	3	3	4	9	3	0	0	0
5. One primary criterion of a good school <u>should</u> be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the state.	19	10	12	40	43	53	14	12	8	24	28	24	3	7	3
6. A teacher <u>should</u> try to put his standards and ideals of good teaching into practice even if the rules or procedures of the school prohibit it.	18	6	9	28	45	35	15	24	26	35	24	29	4	1	1

SCALE ITEMS	Strongly									Strongly								
	Agree			Agree			Undecided			Disagree			Disagree					
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
7. Teachers <u>should</u> subscribe to and diligently read the standard professional journals.	34	14	23	52	73	65	7	6	6	6	7	6	1	0	0			
8. Teachers <u>should</u> be an <u>active</u> member of at least one professional teaching association, and attend most conferences and meetings of the association.	35	24	34	60	67	61	2	2	3	3	6	2	0	1	0			
9. A teacher <u>should</u> consistently practice his/her ideas of the best educational practices even though the administration prefers other views.	12	5	7	34	47	34	26	27	22	25	21	33	3	0	4			
10. A teacher's skill <u>should</u> be based primarily on his acquaintance with his subject matter.	8	3	9	34	33	40	12	14	7	41	42	38	5	8	6			

SCALE ITEMS	Strongly Agree			Agree			Undecided			Disagree			Strongly Disagree		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
	11. Teachers <u>should</u> be evaluated primarily on the basis of their knowledge of the subject that is to be taught, and their ability to communicate it.	9	7	16	48	55	53	10	3	1	23	29	21	10	6
12. Schools <u>should</u> hire no one to teach unless he holds at least a 4-year bachelors degree.	38	35	48	44	56	43	6	2	2	9	6	6	3	1	1
13. In view of the teacher shortage, it <u>should</u> be permissible to hire teachers trained at non-accredited colleges.	0	2	0	12	6	5	20	10	9	46	55	51	22	27	35
14. A teacher <u>should</u> be able to make his own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom.	32	24	36	54	69	57	7	3	3	6	4	4	1	0	0

SCALE ITEMS	Strongly Agree									Strongly Disagree								
	Agree			Agree			Undecided			Disagree			Disagree					
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3			
15. Small matters <u>should not</u> have to referred to some-one higher up for final answer.	35	32	37	54	66	60	4	1	1	5	1	1	2	0	1			
16. The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions <u>should</u> be exercised by professional teachers.	22	24	31	54	65	57	11	10	8	12	1	4	1	0	0			

APPENDIX D
RAW DATA TABULATION

Data Code

Individual Number: Number assigned to individual teacher questionnaire.

Group Number: Low SES-1, Middle SES-2, and High SES-3.

Total Professionalism: Individual teacher total score on the Professional Orientation Scale.

Age: 20-29 years - 1
 30-39 years - 2
 40-49 years - 3
 50-59 years - 4
 60-69 years - 5

Educational Level: Bachelor's Degree - 1
 Bachelor's plus credits - 2
 Master's Degree - 3
 Master's plus credits - 4

Years Experience in this School: Number of years teaching at the current school.

Total Years Experience: Total years experience as an educator.

Marital Status: Single - 1
 Married - 2
 Separated or divorced - 3
 Widow(er) - 4

Level of Assignment: Kindergarten - 0
 Grade 1 - 1
 Grade 2 - 2
 Grade 3 - 3
 Grade 4 - 4
 Grade 5 - 5
 Grade 6 - 6
 Multi-level - 7
 Other - 8

Undergraduate Preparation:

Major within the field of education - 1
 Major outside the field of education - 2

Graduate Preparation:

Major within the field of education - 1

Major outside the field of education - 2

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
0	1	51	4	3	11	26	2	6	1	1
1	1	51	3	1	1	22	1	6	1	0
2	1	46	3	1	1	20	2	6	1	0
3	1	48	2	4	1	16	1	0	1	1
4	1	57	5	4	16	39	2	0	1	1
5	1	52	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	0
6	1	62	4	4	6	29	1	1	1	1
7	1	52	3	4	5	18	2	1	1	1
8	1	47	4	3	9	21	2	3	1	1
9	1	55	4	3	4	15	2	2	1	1
10	1	47	5	4	9	24	2	2	1	1
12	1	57	5	4	37	39	2	3	1	1
13	1	59	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	0
14	1	57	3	3	8	14	2	8	2	1
15	1	53	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0
16	1	62	3	4	12	12	2	8	1	1
17	1	56	3	3	4	14	4	5	2	1
18	1	62	2	1	2	5	2	5	1	0
19	1	63	2	4	8	8	1	3	2	1
20	1	53	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	0
21	1	51	3	2	2	5	2	6	1	1
22	1	54	1	2	5	5	2	4	1	1
23	1	57	1	1	2	3	2	5	1	0
24	1	53	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	1
25	1	55	2	2	6	6	2	0	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educa Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
26	1	44	2	2	4	4	2	6	1	1
27	1	55	3	3	2	16	2	1	2	1
28	1	52	1	2	2	7	2	3	1	1
29	1	46	4	1	33	33	2	0	1	0
30	1	61	5	2	2	30	2	1	2	1
31	1	57	3	4	12	15	2	5	1	1
32	1	49	4	4	8	34	1	4	1	1
33	1	52	2	1	2	2	2	5	1	0
34	1	52	3	3	5	15	2	3	1	1
35	1	51	3	2	2	3	2	5	1	1
36	1	60	5	3	23	50	2	6	1	1
37	1	53	3	3	6	26	2	2	1	1
38	1	55	1	2	2	2	1	5	1	1
39	1	59	2	2	5	5	2	4	1	1
40	1	66	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
41	1	54	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
42	1	46	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	0
43	1	46	1	1	1	4	2	4	2	0
44	1	57	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	0
45	1	69	2	2	1	21	2	4	1	1
46	1	61	1	2	1	1	1	6	1	1
47	1	59	3	1	1	8	2	8	1	0
48	1	57	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0
49	1	63	2	3	8	11	2	8	1	1
50	1	67	2	4	7	10	2	2	2	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
51	1	60	3	3	6	6	2	7	1	1
52	1	68	1	3	2	5	2	1	1	1
53	1	47	3	4	5	6	2	5	2	1
54	1	68	4	4	18	20	2	1	1	1
55	1	59	5	4	1	44	2	5	2	1
56	1	59	5	4	17	38	3	0	1	1
57	1	67	4	2	28	28	2	4	1	1
58	1	47	3	4	8	20	2	5	1	1
59	1	57	4	3	8	21	2	3	1	1
60	1	65	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	1
61	1	44	3	3	20	20	4	6	1	1
62	1	58	3	2	1	1	4	8	2	1
63	1	53	4	3	9	24	3	1	1	1
64	1	71	4	4	14	24	4	2	1	1
65	1	50	5	2	20	24	2	2	1	1
66	1	43	4	3	12	20	2	8	2	1
67	1	56	1	2	3	3	1	4	1	1
68	1	56	1	2	2	3	2	0	1	1
69	1	50	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
70	1	69	4	3	14	26	4	3	2	1
71	1	76	3	4	14	16	2	2	1	1
72	1	46	2	3	5	5	2	8	1	1
73	1	69	2	3	4	14	2	0	1	1
74	1	66	1	2	4	4	4	8	2	1
75	1	50	2	4	4	4	2	2	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
77	1	58	1	2	1	3	2	8	1	1
78	1	68	4	4	31	31	3	5	1	1
79	1	65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
80	1	65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
81	1	56	2	3	6	11	2	1	1	1
82	1	58	1	2	2	4	2	8	2	1
83	1	70	2	2	11	11	2	6	1	1
84	1	59	4	4	2	31	2	6	1	1
85	1	50	4	3	8	24	4	2	1	1
86	1	60	2	2	2	11	1	2	1	1
87	1	51	3	3	8	18	2	3	2	1
88	1	58	3	4	8	12	2	3	1	1
89	1	46	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	0
90	1	61	3	2	6	16	2	4	1	1
91	1	62	3	4	8	8	3	4	2	1
92	1	68	4	3	9	36	3	5	1	1
93	1	52	4	2	3	27	3	5	1	1
94	1	57	3	2	2	23	4	8	1	1
95	1	61	1	4	3	3	2	8	1	1
96	1	71	4	4	6	25	3	7	1	1
97	1	51	3	1	18	18	2	6	1	0
99	1	69	2	3	8	13	2	0	1	1
100	1	56	3	3	4	14	2	1	1	1
101	1	59	4	3	7	26	2	1	1	1
102	1	57	3	4	3	25	2	8	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Pre
0	2	56	5	3	35	35	2	6	2	1
1	2	49	3	1	2	7	2	3	1	0
3	2	56	4	3	7	17	2	5	1	1
4	2	55	4	4	5	35	1	6	2	2
5	2	59	2	2	1	7	2	0	1	1
6	2	58	4	4	15	34	1	0	1	1
7	2	53	3	4	16	31	2	2	1	1
8	2	55	4	3	20	20	2	3	2	1
9	2	58	2	3	2	10	2	4	1	1
10	2	55	4	3	12	12	3	5	1	1
11	2	52	4	1	7	20	2	4	1	0
12	2	57	5	2	17	25	2	2	1	1
13	2	59	4	1	8	20	2	6	1	0
14	2	58	4	3	15	15	4	1	1	1
15	2	60	5	3	45	45	3	3	1	1
16	2	58	4	2	15	20	2	2	2	2
17	2	56	1	2	3	3	2	4	1	1
18	2	65	5	2	13	35	2	5	1	1
19	2	55	2	2	1	4	2	4	1	1
20	2	58	2	1	3	7	2	0	1	0
21	2	58	2	1	3	6	2	4	1	0
22	2	57	3	3	13	21	2	0	1	1
23	2	56	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
24	2	56	3	4	14	20	1	5	1	1
25	2	62	4	2	9	14	2	4	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
26	2	52	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
27	2	51	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
28	2	56	4	4	6	17	3	3	2	1
29	2	53	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	0
30	2	54	2	3	7	7	2	3	1	1
31	2	56	4	4	14	24	2	3	1	2
32	2	55	3	2	10	19	2	3	1	1
33	2	50	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	0
34	2	61	1	1	6	6	4	6	1	0
35	2	63	2	2	2	2	2	6	2	1
36	2	58	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	0
37	2	56	2	2	6	7	2	5	1	1
39	2	52	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
40	2	54	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0
41	2	57	3	2	9	13	2	5	1	1
42	2	57	2	2	5	13	2	2	1	1
43	2	57	2	2	1	8	2	5	1	1
44	2	60	3	3	16	23	2	3	1	1
45	2	51	4	2	6	19	2	0	1	1
46	2	62	3	3	16	21	2	6	1	1
47	2	50	2	3	1	15	2	5	2	1
48	2	54	4	2	6	6	3	4	1	1
49	2	61	3	1	3	6	2	3	1	0
50	2	68	1	2	4	4	2	4	1	1
51	2	57	3	1	1	1	2	5	1	0

Ind No.	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
53	2	62	5	3	37	37	1	5	1	1
54	2	59	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	0
55	2	54	4	2	13	18	3	0	1	1
56	2	59	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	0
57	2	62	3	3	3	9	4	6	2	1
58	2	59	5	2	1	18	2	2	1	1
59	2	54	4	2	1	4	3	3	2	1
60	2	62	4	2	8	22	2	1	1	1
61	2	55	3	4	12	12	2	8	1	1
62	2	46	5	3	4	9	2	7	1	1
63	2	50	2	2	9	9	4	0	2	1
64	2	57	1	2	3	3	2	5	1	1
65	2	55	4	2	12	12	2	5	2	1
66	2	53	2	2	7	7	2	0	2	1
67	2	59	2	2	6	9	2	0	1	1
68	2	58	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	0
69	2	54	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	0
70	2	60	3	2	10	22	2	5	1	1
71	2	51	3	1	6	16	2	2	1	0
72	2	66	2	1	2	11	2	1	1	0
73	2	61	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
74	2	56	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	1
75	2	59	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1
77	2	51	2	2	5	6	2	6	1	1
78	2	56	1	2	3	3	1	5	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
79	2	59	3	3	7	13	1	4	1	1
80	2	59	1	1	7	7	2	2	1	0
81	2	63	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	0
82	2	55	2	2	5	8	2	1	1	1
83	2	62	4	2	7	21	2	2	1	1
84	2	63	2	1	5	5	2	1	1	0
85	2	52	1	2	2	2	1	4	1	1
86	2	59	3	1	6	6	2	3	1	0
87	2	54	1	1	2	4	2	4	1	0
88	2	62	1	1	3	3	2	2	1	0
89	2	55	2	1	9	13	2	3	1	0
90	2	58	2	1	7	7	2	3	1	0
91	2	59	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	1
92	2	52	3	1	13	15	3	4	1	0
93	2	55	1	2	1	1	1	6	1	1
94	2	56	2	1	2	3	2	5	1	0
95	2	61	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0
96	2	62	4	3	2	32	2	8	1	1
97	2	52	1	3	7	7	2	5	1	1
98	2	52	2	3	13	13	2	6	1	1
99	2	59	1	3	3	5	2	3	1	1
100	2	54	3	2	3	6	2	6	1	1
101	2	46	4	4	2	34	2	1	1	1
102	2	63	5	4	13	43	2	4	1	1
103	2	56	2	3	6	13	4	6	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
0	3	59	1	2	1	7	2	0	1	1
1	3	53	4	2	23	23	2	1	2	1
2	3	57	5	2	9	43	3	1	1	1
4	3	58	2	1	3	3	2	2	1	0
5	3	59	4	1	17	25	2	3	1	0
6	3	57	4	2	2	25	3	3	1	1
7	3	56	4	3	11	34	2	3	1	1
8	3	61	3	3	10	22	2	4	2	1
9	3	60	5	2	22	25	2	4	1	1
10	3	53	4	3	10	29	2	5	1	1
11	3	54	5	4	5	16	3	5	2	1
12	3	55	1	2	1	4	2	5	1	1
13	3	64	3	2	1	14	2	6	1	1
14	3	60	2	1	4	7	2	6	1	0
15	3	52	3	4	5	25	1	6	1	1
16	3	56	2	3	5	17	2	1	1	1
17	3	56	3	3	5	20	2	3	1	1
18	3	53	2	2	3	12	2	1	2	1
19	3	58	3	2	9	17	2	4	1	1
20	3	57	2	2	8	8	2	0	1	1
21	3	60	4	4	4	18	2	4	1	1
22	3	59	4	2	6	28	2	6	1	1
23	3	52	3	2	7	13	2	4	1	1
24	3	56	5	1	8	18	2	5	1	0
25	3	56	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Pred
26	3	56	1	1	4	4	2	2	1	0
27	3	54	2	1	1	5	2	4	1	0
28	3	64	1	2	2	5	2	1	1	1
29	3	52	1	2	2	4	2	2	1	1
30	3	59	1	3	2	5	4	3	1	1
31	3	58	1	1	3	3	2	3	1	0
32	3	56	1	2	2	5	1	1	1	1
33	3	53	1	2	7	7	4	2	1	1
34	3	50	3	4	2	24	2	2	1	1
35	3	51	2	3	2	6	2	1	1	1
36	3	64	5	2	12	32	3	6	1	2
37	3	51	1	1	2	3	2	5	1	0
38	3	59	1	2	1	1	2	5	1	1
39	3	58	2	2	4	12	2	6	1	1
41	3	57	5	4	9	23	2	0	1	1
42	3	63	5	2	4	30	3	0	1	1
44	3	56	1	2	2	3	2	2	1	1
45	3	56	1	2	1	8	2	5	1	1
46	3	71	4	4	25	25	4	0	1	1
47	3	72	4	3	18	18	3	5	1	1
48	3	56	2	4	9	9	2	4	1	1
49	3	51	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0
50	3	65	1	1	3	3	2	6	1	0
51	3	61	1	2	5	5	2	6	1	1
52	3	60	4	2	5	20	1	6	1	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
53	3	56	1	2	3	3	1	3	1	1
54	3	53	1	2	3	3	1	3	1	1
55	3	63	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	0
56	3	53	2	4	5	15	2	0	1	1
57	3	52	1	1	1	5	2	1	1	0
58	3	51	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	1
59	3	66	4	4	22	25	2	1	1	1
60	3	56	1	2	5	5	2	0	1	1
61	3	58	1	4	1	5	1	6	1	1
62	3	52	1	2	3	3	1	4	1	1
63	3	65	2	2	3	4	2	2	1	2
64	3	56	2	2	2	8	2	1	1	1
65	3	59	3	1	4	14	2	1	1	0
66	3	53	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0
67	3	50	4	2	4	36	3	5	1	1
68	3	65	1	3	1	4	2	1	1	1
69	3	54	2	3	5	15	2	6	1	1
70	3	61	4	1	5	19	2	3	1	0
71	3	57	3	3	2	6	2	5	1	1
72	3	57	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	0
73	3	68	2	2	1	8	2	0	1	1
74	3	56	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	0
75	3	67	2	2	1	15	2	5	1	1
77	3	59	3	2	3	5	2	3	1	1
78	3	58	4	2	1	16	2	4	2	1

Ind No	Group No	Total Prf	Age	Educ Level	Yrs Exp This School	Total Yrs Exp	Marital Status	Level of Assignment	Und Prep	Grd Prep
79	3	59	4	4	2	20	4	5	1	1
80	3	61	3	2	1	5	2	7	1	1
81	3	56	2	3	1	13	2	6	1	1
82	3	63	1	1	2	5	2	3	1	0
83	3	56	5	2	8	24	2	3	1	1
85	3	54	4	4	2	12	2	8	1	2
86	3	57	4	2	13	28	2	1	1	1
87	3	51	3	4	1	6	2	8	2	1
88	3	58	2	2	9	9	2	2	1	1
89	3	54	3	2	23	27	2	4	1	1
90	3	56	4	2	14	35	2	1	1	1
91	3	61	1	2	1	3	2	6	1	1
92	3	59	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
94	3	61	3	4	3	5	2	8	1	2
95	3	62	1	2	3	3	1	0	1	1
96	3	67	1	2	2	3	2	2	1	1
97	3	51	4	2	7	31	2	4	1	1
98	3	52	4	2	7	18	2	2	1	1
99	3	52	4	2	7	28	2	2	1	1
100	3	55	4	3	7	39	2	8	1	1
101	3	70	5	2	7	26	2	6	1	1
102	3	59	2	3	4	9	2	0	2	1
103	3	58	3	2	1	3	2	4	2	1
104	3	63	1	2	1	1	1	5	1	1
105	3	65	3	2	3	3	2	5	1	1

APPENDIX E
NORC OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCALE

NORC OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGAE SCALE DISTRIBUTIONS
OF PRESTIGE RATINGS, 1963

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
U.S. Supreme Ct. Justice	94	1
Physician	93	2
Nuclear Physicist	92	3.5
Scientist	92	3.5
Government Scientist	91	5.5
State Governor	91	5.5
Cabinet Member in the Federal Government	90	8
College Professor	90	8
U.S. Representative in Congress	90	8
Chemist	89	11
Lawyer	89	11
Diplomat in the U.S. Foreign Service	89	11
Dentist	88	14
Architect	88	14
County Judge	88	14
Psychologist	87	17.5
Minister	87	17.5
Members of the Board of Directors of a Large Corporation	87	17.5
Mayor of a Large City	87	17.5
Priest	86	21.5
Head of a Department in a State Government	86	21.5
Civil Engineer	86	21.5
Airline Pilot	86	21.5
Banker	85	24.5
Biologist	85	24.5
Sociologist	83	26
Instructor in Public Schools	82	27.5
Captain in the Regular Army	82	27.5
Accountant for a Large Business	81	29.5
Public School Teacher	81	29.5
Owner of a Factory that Employs About 100 People	80	31.5
Building Contractor	80	31.5
Artist Who Paints Pictures that are Exhibited in Galleries	78	34.5
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	78	34.5
Author of Novels	78	34.5
Economist	78	34.5
Official of an International Labor Union	77	37

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Railroad Engineer	76	39
Electrician	76	39
County Agricultural Agent	76	39
Owner-Operator of a Printing Shop	75	41.5
Trained Machinist	75	41.5
Farm Owner and Operator	74	44
Undertaker	74	44
Welfare Worker for a City Government	74	44
Newspaper Columnist	73	46
Policeman	72	47
Reporter on a Daily Newspaper	71	48
Radio Announcer	70	49.5
Bookkeeper	70	49.5
Tenant Farmer -- One Who Owns Livestock and Machinery and Manages the Farm	69	51.5
Insurance Agent	69	51.5
Carpenter	68	53
Manager of a Small Store in a City	67	54.5
A Local Official of a Labor Union	67	54.5
Mail Carrier	66	57
Railroad Conductor	66	57
Traveling Salesman for a Wholesale Concern	66	57
Plumber	65	59
Automobile Repairman	64	60
Playground Director	63	62.5
Barber	63	62.5
Machine Operator in a Factory	63	62.5
Owner-Operator of a Lunch Stand	63	62.5
Corporal in the Regular Army	62	65.5
Garage Mechanic	62	65.5
Truck Driver	59	67
Fisherman Who Owns His Own Boat	58	68
Clerk in a Store	56	70
Milk Route Man	56	70
Streetcar Motorman	56	70
Lumberjack	55	72.5
Restaurant Cook	55	72.5
Singer in a Nightclub	54	74
Filling Station Attendant	51	75
Dockworker	50	77.5
Railroad Section Hand	50	77.5
Night Watchman	50	77.5
Coal Miner	50	77.5
Restaurant Waiter	49	80.5

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Taxi Driver	49	80.5
Farm Hand	48	83
Janitor	48	83
Bartender	48	83
Clothes Presser in a Laundry	45	85
Soda Fountain Clerk	44	86
Share-Cropper -- One Who Owns No Live- stock or Equipment and does not Manage Farm	42	87
Garbage Collector	39	88
Street Sweeper	36	89
Shoe Shiner	34	90

VITA

Robert Claud Wiley

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

Major Field: Elementary Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Barry County, Missouri, November 14, 1930, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Van Wiley.

Education: Graduated from Aurora High School, Aurora, Missouri, in May, 1949; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, in 1957, with a major in elementary education; received the Master of Education degree from Trinity University in 1959, with a major in school administration; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1969, with a major in elementary education.

Professional Experience: Elementary grade teacher in San Antonio, Texas, Public Schools, 1957-1958; elementary grade teacher in Joplin, Missouri, Public Schools, 1958-1960; elementary school principal in Joplin, Missouri, Public Schools, 1960-1967; graduate teaching assistant, College of Education, Oklahoma State University, 1967-1969.