This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

69-18,457

McNUTT, Garland W., 1933-

AN ANALYSIS OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS AND NON-PROFESSIONAL TEACHER AIDES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1969
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

©Copyright by
Garland W. McNutt
1969

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2602

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS AND NONPROFESSIONAL TEACHER AIDES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

GARLAND W. McNUTT

Norman, Oklahoma

1969

AN ANALYSIS OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS AND NONPROFESSIONAL TEACHER AIDES

APPROVED BY

Jack F. Parker

W. L. Fulton

Robert W. Kitner

Herbert R. Hengst

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Dedicated to:

THE MEMORY OF MY MOTHER

A WOMAN OF GREAT FAITH

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to the many people who contributed to this study. Without their cooperation and assistance this study would not have been possible.

Special recognition and appreciation are due the writer's major professor and committee chairman, Dr. Jack F. Parker. His guidance, inspiration, and patient understanding during the course of the research and writing of the dissertation may not be unique, but Dr. Parker's manner of communicating them, through genuine warmth and concern, is a rare quality of its own.

Additionally, the writer is indebted to Dr. Herbert R. Hengst, Dr. W. R. Fulton, and Dr. Robert W. Ketner, the other members of the graduate committee. Their encouragement and criticisms at various stages of the study proved invaluable.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the participating schools. In order to maintain anonymity, they are not named.

Sincere thanks are due Mrs. Kathy Steiner for her devoted effort in the typing of this manuscript.

Special appreciation is extended to the members of the family of the writer. Their cooperation, patience, and personal sacrifice seemed without limit. To Wandella, Gary, and Kathy, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
Background and Need for the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	10
Organization of the Study	10
II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Theoretical Background for the Study of Role	12
Professional-Nonprofessional Relationships	29
Formulations of the Teacher Aide Role	36
Summary	40
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	42
Introduction	42
Population	42
Instrumentation	43
Data Collecting Procedures	48
The Hypotheses	49
Treatment of the Data	51
Summary	54
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	56
Introduction	56
Division-of-Labor	57

On-The-Job Expectations. 64
Analysis of the Nonprofessional Position by Selected Variables. 70
Summary. 74

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 75

Introduction 75
Summary. 75
Findings 79
Conclusions. 80
Recommendations. 83

BIBLIOGRAPHY 85

APPENDIX A 89

APPENDIX B 93

APPENDIX C 109

APPENDIX D 111

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Cumulative Frequencies for All Tasks Assigned to the Professional Position	59
II.	Cumulative Frequencies for "Least Technical" Tasks Assigned to the Professional Position	59
III.	Cumulative Frequencies for "Most Technical" Tasks Assigned to the Professional Position	60
IV.	Cumulative Frequencies for "Less Technical" Tasks Assigned to the Professional Position	61
V.	Chi-Squares and Level of Significance for Division-of-Labor Assignments to Own Position and Counter Position	62
VI.	"High" On-The-Job Expectations Assigned to the Nonprofessional Position	66
VII.	"High" On-The-Job Expectations Assigned to the Professional Position	66
VIII.	Chi-Squares and Levels of Significance for On-The-Job Expectations by Both Groups for Incumbents of Professional and Nonprofessional Positions	67
IX.	Assignments by Nonprofessionals by Selected Variables to the Professional Position	71
X.	Data by Selected Variables Among Nonprofessionals	72

AN ANALYSIS OF ROLE EXPECTATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHERS AND NONPROFESSIONAL TEACHER AIDES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

In an era characterized by staggering increases in both population and knowledge, the nation's schools are confronted with the problem of educating more persons and educating them more effectively. In many communities, administrators of public school systems have been unable to employ enough teachers to meet the demand of greatly increased numbers of children. Not only has the demand for teachers exceeded the supply, but the necessity for teaching more effectively those children who are educationally disadvantaged has also complicated the problem.

Many teachers spend a substantial portion of their day with duties which do not require professional preparation. Many of these duties can be carried out by individuals without experience or training in professional education. Consequently, teacher aides have been employed by some schools, thus allowing the teacher to spend a greater portion of his

time in activities involving use of his professional competence.

Experience in the use of teacher aides has varied among school systems. While some school systems have apparently been able to establish conditions that allow satisfying and rewarding experience in the use of teacher aides, many have found it difficult to use nonprofessionals effectively. Among the apparent problems are specific role definition, proper supervision, teacher-time utilization, in-service training, pre-service training, opportunity for upward mobility, and selection and recruitment.

Directly or indirectly, it would appear that many of these problems may be related to lack of clear role perceptions by the professional and the nonprofessional. William Goode has expressed the view that institutions are made up of role relationships.[1] Any formulations concerned with role analysis, according to Gross, Mason, and McEachern, must attend to three elements which are common to most role definitions: social locations, behavior, and expectations.[2] This study attended to role analysis by directing efforts toward the reciprocal role expectations of professional

---

[1]W. J. Goode, "A Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), 484.

[2]Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies in the School Superintendency Role. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), p. 17.

teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides in terms of (1) attributes and behavior on the job, and (2) the division of tasks assigned.

Background and Need for the Study

An essential criterion of any innovation in education is whether or not it helps to meet the learning and developmental needs of children and youth. The teaching-learning process is likely to be truly effective only as it relates to the totality of the child's experiences. The school operates within a social context and not in isolation.

It appears that there is increasing awareness among educators that bringing additional adults into the classroom may improve the quality of education. It would seem that such people should be selected on the basis of their concern for children as well as their potential as supportive personnel rather than primarily on the basis of their previous professional training. The use of the professional-nonprofessional team may help the teacher differentiate the teaching-learning process to meet the individual needs of pupils. This multi-dimensional team approach may assist in establishing a less rigid classroom structure. For example, there could be more freedom of movement, more small groupings, more independent and individual activities than would be feasible for one teacher. The teacher who has this

assistance possibly will have increased opportunity to experiment with innovative techniques.

Wilbur J. Cohen stressed the future need of education personnel as follows:

> Without any change in present teacher-pupil ratio, increasing elementary and secondary school enrollments will require an additional 7,000-8,000 teachers a year. By 1972, 90,000 additional teachers will be needed . . . At present, there are only 60,000 teachers and other professional personnel available in the field of education of handicapped children. By 1973, more than 300,000 teachers and other personnel will be needed.[3]

Arthur Pearl emphasized the problem another way. He stated ". . . one in fifteen are now employed in the teaching force and by 1975 this will increase to one in twelve.[4]

The evidence indicates that educational administrators are using teacher aides increasingly to relieve the professional teacher of many routine tasks. Educational Research Service conducted a survey of 217 school systems with enrollments of 12,000 or more. A total of 44,351 teacher aides were reported for 1965-66. Estimates by educators range upward to 120,000 teacher aides now employed in education.[5]

---

[3]Wilbur J. Cohen, "Revitalizing the Schools," Congressional Record House, CXIII, (October 24, 1967), p. H12921.

[4]Arthur Pearl, Address presented to a "New Careers" Conference. New York, January, 1968.

[5]Educational Research Circular, American Association of School Administration and Research Division, National Education Association, No. 2, 1967, p. 1.

Even if there were no shortage of teachers, the proponents of this new development in education have suggested the possibility of numerous other benefits. Bowman and Klopf enumerated them as follows:

1. To the pupil, by providing more individualized attention by concerned adults, more mobility in the classroom and more opportunity for innovation;
2. To the teacher, by rendering his role more satisfying in terms of status and more manageable in terms of teaching conditions;
3. To the other professionals, by increasing the scope and effectiveness of their activities;
4. To the nonprofessional, by providing meaningful employment, which contributes at one and the same time to his own development and to the needs of his society;
5. To the school administrator, by providing answers to his dilemma of every-increasing needs for school services coupled with shortage of professionals to meet these needs--a solution, not the solution, and certainly not a panacea;
6. To family life, by giving nonprofessionals, many of whom are or may someday become parents, the opportunity to learn child-development principles in a reality situation;
7. To the community at large, by providing a means through which unemployed and educationally disadvantaged people may enter the mainstream of productivity.[6]

The traditional view of professionalized human services--health, education, and welfare--in America suggests that they are the prerogative of highly-trained professionals with complex specialized skills in the art of helping people.

---

[6]Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopf, "Auxiliary School Personnel," in Up From Poverty, ed. by Frank Riessman and Hermine I. Popper (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 124-25.

While this attitude has possibly fostered improvements in the quality of service, it has limited the number of people available to serve. Furthermore, it has probably produced gaps in communication between the professional and those most in need. Although some educators recognize the potential value of the indigenous nonprofessional in communicating with those experiencing language difficulties, many have not acknowledged the same problems as they relate to the disadvantaged who have other communication problems.

The nonprofessional who has actually lived in a disadvantaged environment may be able to relate to the disadvantaged child or youth in a way that is neither strange nor intimidating. He may help the new pupil to adjust to the unfamiliar world of the school without undue fear or defensiveness and to fill the gaps in his preparation for learning. He may help the child to identify and build upon strengths, which may have more relevance to the new situation than the child realizes. The cultural bridge may be seen as an asset in and of itself.

The nonprofessional, because of his position, may be able to do tasks which the professional may not be able to do and probably should not do. The professionals, even though they are skilled in developing relationships with pupils, may often be limited by the very nature of their function as "experts." This role ascription may often prevent the development of satisfactory relationships. Yet,

it is probably this very type of relationship that may be the key to effective participation and learning on the part of students. It is this relationship gap that the nonprofessional may be able to fill for the students from his socio-economic group.

As Brager pointed out, the indigenous nonprofessionals give more active direction and they are more "partisan." Where a professional teacher will "suggest" and "enable" the nonprofessional is "in the center of activity, exhorting, training by demonstration and providing direction."[7]

J. William Rioux pointed out that there are fourteen full or part-time positions that could be filled by non-teaching personnel and that could strengthen the educational program. He further stated that these positions could be handled by capable but educationally deprived adults or school dropouts.[8]

In support of teacher aides, Jody Stevens reported that as little as five percent and as much as thirty percent released time for the teacher may be gained through the use of classroom teacher aides. He identified over 250 duties that can be performed by the nonprofessional in support of

---

[7]George Brager, The Low-Income Nonprofessional, (New York: Mobilization for Youth, 1964a).

[8]J. William Rioux, "Here are Fourteen Ways to Use Non-Teachers in Your School District," Nations Schools, LXXVI (December, 1965), 42.

the teacher in the teaching-learning process.[9]

Problems concerning role were indicated in a study by Curt Stafford.

> Most of the controversy over the program (teacher aide) centered on the lowering of standards of teacher certification and so insufficient attention was paid to the program's potential contribution to fundamental reorganization of the role of the teacher in the classroom.[10]

The experience in the fifteen demonstration programs which were operating during the summer of 1966, as reported by Bowman and Klopf, indicated that the desired results from the use of teacher aides in a given school situation would not be realized unless certain preconditions were established. Six of the preconditions recommended dealt with role definition and development.[11]

Statement of Problem

This study examined the role expectations of professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides as they were perceived by role incumbents. The role expectations, as revealed by an inventory developed by the investigator,

---

[9]Jody L. Stevens, "The Need for Teacher Aides." The Texas Outlook, (May, 1967), 54.

[10]Curt Stafford, "Teacher Time Utilization with Teacher Aides," Journal of Educational Research, LVI (October, 1962), 82.

[11]Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopf. New Careers and Roles in the American School: A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education. A Report Prepared by Bank Street College of Education. (New York: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967), p. 139.

were analyzed to determine the degree of consensus, or dissensus, between the professional teachers and the non-professional teacher aides.

Additionally, the nonprofessional teacher aide position was examined by selected variables to determine if a degree of consensus, or dissensus, of role expectations was indicated. The variables selected were: race, previous training, age, previous experience, education level, and economic status.

Limitations

Certain limitations existed in the study. One was inherent in the ex post facto design of the study which made impossible the manipulation of independent variables and the exercise of control over randomization of subjects.

Uncritical generalizing of the findings cannot be defended. Though the study deals with a specific type of population, no statistical evidence was available to indicate that this population was typical of any larger group of teachers or teacher aides.

This study was limited to include only teacher aides and their supervising teachers from four selected school systems. Two school systems were selected in Texas where the participating nonprofessional teacher aides had received some training. The two Oklahoma school systems were comparable to the ones chosen in Texas, but the Oklahoma teacher

aides had received little or no training. All other personnel were excluded from the study. In the sub-problem, all variables other than previous training, race, age, previous experience, educational level, and economic status were excluded from the study.

Definition of Terms

Professional -- the certified teacher to whom the aide is assigned.

Nonprofessional -- the non-certified person assigned to assist a teacher. This term is used synonomously with teacher aide, teacher auxiliary, paraprofessional, and sub-professional.

Incumbent -- the occupant of a position or role.

Dissensus -- the degree of disagreement.

Role -- the function assumed or assigned and the behavior exhibited performing that function.

Consensus -- the degree of agreement among those involved.

Expectation -- a concept or a standard held for the behavior of a person or a group of people.

Organization of Study

Chapter One introduced the study, stating the need for the study, the problem, the definition of terms,

limitations, and organization of the study. A study of professional research and literature related to role theory, professional-nonprofessional relationships, and teacher aides was presented in Chapter Two. Chapter Three included an explanation of the design of the study. This chapter identified the population, gave description of the methods and procedures used in collecting the data, the hypothesis, and the type of treatment applied to the data. Chapter Four presented and analyzed the data. A summary of the study, the findings, the conclusions, and the recommendations based upon this investigation were given in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present ideas and information obtained from reviewing literature and research relevant to the study. The first section dealt with role in relation to its theoretical formulations. The second section reviewed information relating to professional and nonprofessional relationships. The last section examined the research and literature dealing with formulations of teacher aide role descriptions.

A Theoretical Background for the Study of Role

The concept Role provides a theoretical framework for the investigation of a variety of problems affecting the functioning of social systems and subsystems and for viewing the conditions of individuals who must function within these systems. According to Gross, Mason, and McEachern, any theoretical formulations concerned with role must attend to three elements which are common to most role

definitions: social locations, behavior, and expectations.[12]

Leonard Cottrell developed a series of propositions "covering what appear to be the chief determinants of the degree of adjustment an individual is likely to realize as he functions in a given role in a given culture."[13] These propositions take account of factors which affect a person's adjustment to a social role of which he is an incumbent, and of those which influence his ability to assume a new role. According to Cottrell, among factors which influence an individual's adjustment to a role he occupies were the following:

1. The clarity of the definitions of behaviors appropriate to the role, and the explicitness of the definitions of reciprocal behavior expected.
2. The consistency of the response of others in his life situation to his role.
3. Where more than one age-sex role is assigned or permitted, the compatibility of the roles.
4. Where there are multiple roles which are incompatible, the segregation of situations in which the incompatible role behaviors would be indicated.[14]

In addition to the statements above which apply to the adjustment of an individual to a role which he occupies, Cottrell advanced a series of propositions which were

---

[12]Gross, Mason, and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

[13]Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles," Readings in Social Psychology, ed. by Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947), pp. 370-73.

[14]Ibid., pp. 317-72.

concerned with transition from one role to another. According to him:

> Successful adjustment to a future role is directly related to such conditions as:
> 1. How clearly the expected behaviors appropriate to the future role are defined.
> 2. Whether there has been contact with persons functioning in the role which was sufficiently intimate to allow for identification to take place, and whether there has been some rehearsal, or practice through some other device, to prepare the person to assume the role.
> 3. The kinds of transitional procedures, or institutionally sanctioned devices built into the structure of the society, that designate role changes, or rites passages, as they are designated by anthropologists.
> 4. . . . the completeness of the shift in the responses and expectations exhibited by the society to the individual in his new role.[15]

Cottrell asserted that:

> . . . if these propositions were put in the form of questions about any given cultural role, the answers would fairly precisely indicate the degree of adjustment which individuals are likely to make to such a role. The answers would also indicate the chief sources of maladjustment.[16]

In his definition of role, Newcomb stated that "the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitute the role (which is) associated with that position."[17] Similarly, it was said by Sarbin that

---

[15] Ibid., p. 372.

[16] Ibid.

[17] T. M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York: Dryden Press, 1950), p. 280

> . . . roles are defined in terms of the actions performed by the person to validate his occupance of the position. In sum, all societies are organized around positions and the persons who occupy these positions perform specialized action or roles. . . .[18]

Sargent pointed out that ". . . those patterns of social behavior which may be reasonably called 'roles' have ingredients of cultural, of personal, and situational determination."[19] And again, "the demands and expectations of others, learned through one's social experience, give role its basic character. Most roles are reciprocal; their structure is patterned through the mutual expectations of group members."[20] He also pointed to the very relevant distinction made by Newcomb between role and role behavior: "The actual role behavior is a function of an individual's role along with various intervening variables deriving from personality and characteristics of the specific social situations."[21]

Recent attempts have been made to bring some order into various aspects of role phenomena. Biddle and Thomas

---

[18] T. R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. by G. Lindzey (Vol. I; Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 224.

[19] S. S. Sargent, "Conceptions of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Social Psychology at the Cross-Roads, ed. by J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif (New York: Harper, 1951), p. 359.

[20] Ibid., p. 360.

[21] Ibid.

produced a classification scheme, elaborated on the possible variables for study, and presented an organized anthology of relevant role studies. First in their classification system was the delimitation of a set of phenomenal referents. These included behaviors, persons, or a combination of persons and their behaviors. Second are the conceptual operations for the formulations of role concepts; (a) the analytic partitioning of phenomenal referents, (b) the relating of analytic partitions, and (c) the combining of analytic partitions. Third was the formulation criteria used for evolving subclasses of phenomenal referents, among them being similarity, determination, and numerosity. The final classificatory concept was that of categorized elements, which are units of phenomenal referents formed into subclass. The authors provided further elaboration of this classificatory concept and derived a person-behavior matrix.[23]

The language of role was also a concern of Biddle and Thomas as:

> . . . (role) has grown from a few to many concepts, from vague to more precise ideas, and from concept to operational indicator; and that role concepts and terms can describe complex real-life phenomena, . . . with an exactness that probably surpasses that which is provided by any other single conceptual vocabulary in behavioral science.[23]

---

[22] B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), pp. 23-382.

[23] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

The authors undertook the organization of the various terms and their definition for use in role theory. These definitions, presented under concepts of partitioning, were presented in four categories: (1) terms for partitioning persons, (2) terms for partitioning behavior, (3) terms for partitioning sets of persons and behaviors, and (4) terms for relating sets of persons and behaviors.[24]

Terms for partitioning persons included actor, alter, ego, other, person, and self. Terms for partitioning behaviors included expectations, norms, performance, and sanction. Terms for partitioning sets of persons and behaviors included position and role, while terms for relating sets of persons and behaviors included role, status, accuracy, conformity, consensus, role conflict, and specialization. These authors pointed out the existence of denotative difficulties, citing as an example the large number of role metaphors, such as role playing, role enactment, role-playing ability, role taking, coaching, altercasting, front, realization, performance, actor, mask, persona, self, identity, and "as-if" behavior. It was pointed out that the metaphors of role theory increased the articulateness of role language but did not have the advantage of scientific precision which is needed in behavioral research.[25] Biddle

---

[24] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[25] Ibid., p. 13.

and Thomas emphasized this aspect by stating:

> At present, the language of role is a particularly articulate vocabulary that stands midway in precision between the concepts of the man in the street, who uses what the common language just happens to offer as a terminology, and the fully articulate, consensually agreed-upon set of concepts of the mature scientific discipline.[26]

In order to develop hypotheses for the testing of theoretical constructs, a number of different variables have been identified and investigated or suggested for investigation. Biddle and Thomas compiled a number of these variables which included (1) behavioral variables, (2) position variables, (3) role variables, (4) variables for interdependence, and (5) variables for personal adaptation. Included among identified behavioral variables were the following: permissiveness of prescription, approval of evaluation, adequacy of performance, complexity of performance, declaration of description, completeness of transistors, transistor complexity, transistor universality, codification, organismic involvement, presentation bias, environment constraint, reinforcement, and reward-punishment.[27]

According to Biddle and Thomas, among the position variables were membership achievement, discrimiability by characteristic, position continuity, joint membership, and interpersonal contact. Variables for role included behavioral commonality, repertoire extensiveness, and aggregate

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., pp. 51-63.

differentiation. Two variables for interdependence have been identified as facilitation and hindrance and reward and cost. The essential variables for personal adaptation were personal-role fit and pressure and strain.[28]

An important area of investigation has been that of role differentiation. Roles may be construed as having specialized properties which can be stated in terms of instrumental, expressive, and integrative problems, with these problems providing the basis for differentiated behavior. For example, ". . . instrumental activities suggest a variety of role specializations associated with the provision and distribution of facilities, among these being the supplier, consumer, collaborator, and source of income."[29] Parsons and Shils' delineation of six major types of combinations were of particular relevance to the differentiation of role types:

1. The segregation of specific expressive interests from instrumental expectations; for example, the role of a casual spectator at an entertainment.
2. The segregation of a diffuse object attachment from instrumental expectations; for example, the pure type of romantic role love.
3. The fusion of a specific expressive or gratificatory interest with a specific instrumental performance; for example, the spectator at a commercialized entertainment.
4. The fusion of a diffuse attachment with diffuse expectations of instrumental performance; for example, kinship roles.

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 57-62.

[29] Ibid., p. 237.

5. The segregation of specific instrumental performance, both from specific expressive interests and attachments and from other components of the instrumental complex; for example, technical roles.
6. The fusion of a plurality of instrumental functions in a complex which is segregated from immediate expressive interests; for example, "artisan" and "executive" roles.

This classification has been constructed by taking the cases of fusion and segregation of the instrumental and direct gratification complexes and, within each of the segregated role orientations, distinguishing the segregation of role components from the fusion of role complexes. The technical role and the executive role (5) and (6) are the two possibilities of segregation and fusion in the instrumental complex when it is segregated from the direct gratification complex. The role of casual spectator (1) and the romantic love role (2) are the two possibilities of segregation and fusion of the direct gratification complex. There is a fusion of the two complexes of roles (3) and (4). In the role of the paying spectator, segregation is in both the direct gratification and in the instrumental orientation; in the role of member of a kinship group there is fusion of all role components in each orientation.[30]

In his group research, Bales identified three distinct factors for the differentiation of role types in small group interaction. These were labeled; (1) activity, (2) task-ability, and (3) likeability. It is rare for a person to fit all three role types. Such a person corresponds to the traditional "great man" conception of the good leader. The person who is high on activity was called the task specialist. The social specialist was a member who was

---

[30]Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils, "The Content of Roles," Role Theory: Concepts and Research, ed. by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 242.

high on likeability but less high on activity, while the member who was high on activity but relatively low on task-ability and likeability ratings may be called an overactive deviant (shows domination rather than leadership). A person who was low on all three ratings was considered an under-active deviant and may actually be a scapegoat in the group.[31]

In their treatment of the role identity model, McCall and Simmons defined role identity as ". . . the character and the role that an individual devises for himself as an occupant of a particular social position."[32] In claiming and acting out this character and role, role support is given an actor by his audience in the form of reactions and performances which tend to confirm his view of himself as an occupant of a position. If the view of self is disconfirmed, or if actor does not live up to his role identities, he continues to strive to foster the social impression that his identities are legitimate through further seeking of role support.

Thibaut and Kelley analyzed behavior in terms of behavior sequence or set, utilizing interaction in a two-person relationship as the basic unit of analysis and

---

[31] R. F. Bales, "Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem-Solving Groups," Readings in Social Psychology, ed. by Eleanor MacCoby, R. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (3d. ed.; New York: Holt, 1950), pp. 437-47.

[32] C. J. McCall and J. L. Simmons, Identities and Interactions (New York: MacMillan Co., 1966), p. 67.

distinguishing between reward and cost as significant components in human interaction. The behavioral repertoire, (role performances) which a person may enact, consisted of all possible sets and combinations of sets, while interaction was described in terms of what is actually produced from the respective repertoires, rising reward and cost as measures of outcome of interaction. Thus, concerns with performances were found to have at least theoretical quantification possibilities in the interaction matrix presented by the authors, specifically in terms of factors external to the relationships and factors intrinsic to the interaction itself.[33]

Nadel attempted to analyze social structure in terms of the role system of any society, with its given coherence, as the matrix of the social structure. Initial designs of a single social structure gave way to the notion that its matrix, or basic structure, was broken by logical cleavages and the factual dissociation of roles.[34] Many roles were found to be entities in themselves, but roles which could still be played by the same actor; ". . . it simply makes no sense to construe any 'mutual' implication; viz., actor relationships between such roles as chief, a father, pagen,

---

[33]J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 10-50.

[34]S. F. Nadel, The Theory of Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 1-159.

'old man, friend, coward, musician. . ."[35] but these are mutually inclusive classes of role across which the same actor can travel. It was suggested, however, that logical cleavages may be overruled by a regular interrelationship between roles as summarized below:

1. Leadership or authority roles. These roles imply the supervision of all or numerous other roles in the society, e.g., a chief who must concern himself with the conduct of the occupants of specific roles. Thus, he has the power and authority to cross roles.

2. Expressive roles. In these roles, the actor's task is the communication of ideas and emotional experiences which may be done by manipulating, applying, and perhaps creatively adding to the expressive symbols prevailing in a society. A priest, for example, may comment on numerous subjects which cross role systems.

3. Services. This relates to the production, as through the rendering of services expected by some kind of contractual relationship, which potentially satisfies wants or needs.

Nadel presented, at a relatively high level of abstraction, a structuralist approach to the concept of role and social structure. He made the point that only at such a high level of abstraction can the many sub-systems whose

---

[35] Ibid., p. 74.

matrices are role systems be tied together into a coherent description of human societies. To describe the interaction between cultures under a single superordinated conceptual system in terms of interaction schemas, he contended that ". . . 'real' roles and relationships are valid for numerous and diverse contexts, so that the overall social structures must be based upon something like the resultant or syntheses of all these contexts, each duly weighted according to some criterion of relevance."[36]

Newcomb gave particular emphasis to two concepts in terms of role: (1) groups share role anticipation, and (2) role behavior as motive pattern.[37] In terms of the former, Newcomb stated:

> . . . the significant thing about a group is that its members share common understandings as to their respective roles . . . a poker club . . . is a group of individuals whose roles are defined and understood in terms of the rituals associated with the game . . . (implying) a universality among the members with regard to understandings and anticipations of roles . . . (therefore) the individual is provided with the dependable frame of reference for his own role.[38]

In this sense, group behavior may be construed as being characterized by standards or norms by which individual perceptions are made, and which involves the anticipation of roles of others and responding to those as anticipated

---

[36]Nadel, op. cit., p. 114.

[37]Newcomb, op. cit., pp. 321-34.

[38]Ibid., pp. 321-22.

by others.

In review of role behavior as motive patterns, Newcomb stated:

> It is not the observable form of a motive pattern which identifies it as a role behavior, but the context in which it occurs, any motive pattern may be a role behavior if it is identifiable as behavior on the part of the person as he takes a recognized role. A traffic policeman's beckoning to a motorist, a school teacher's reproof of a child for misconduct . . . these are unmistakably role behavior in our culture. They are at the same time motivated behaviors and communicative behaviors. In each of these instances the behavior anticipates that he will be responded to as an occupant of his position and the direction of his behavior is influenced by such anticipation.[39]

While structural role theory, utilizing a mathematical system of terms and concepts, may not be the most universally accepted approach to the study of role at this time, its adherents have demonstrated its potential for quantification and graphic representation of role structures. Oeser and Harary applied the concepts and terminology of graph theory to the structural modeling of role systems using the basic elements of persons. The context of interaction was viewed as the totality of relations of the structural role diagraph.[40]

While there exists a considerable lack of clarity surrounding the use of the concept "role" it can be said

---

[39] Ibid., p. 330.

[40] O. A. Oeser and F. Harary, "A Mathematical Model for Structural Role Theory," Human Relations, IV (May, 1962), 82-109.

that the term itself relates directly to an individual's behavioral repertoire in terms of position. Consequently, role may be best viewed in terms of the following three distinct conceptualizations:

1. The role consists of the system of expectations which exists in the social world surrounding the occupant of a position-exceptions regarding his behavior toward occupants of some other position. This may be termed as the prescribed role.
2. The role consists of a position perceived as applicable to his own behavior when he interacts with the occupa[redacted]ther position. This may be termed [redacted]role.
3. The role consist[redacted]ert behaviors of th[redacted]on when he interacts w[redacted]osition. This may be te[redacted]

A number of wr[redacted]d with the problem of role conflic[redacted] individual is likely to encounter role [redacted]ithin his status-set and these incompatibiliti[redacted] conflict and strain. Biddle and Thomas viewed consensus regarding roles as varying from maximum disagreement (dissensus), through polarization (conflict), to virtually unanimous agreement (consensus). They defined consensus as the degree of agreement of individuals on a given topic. And in all cases, the agreement or disagreement was reckoned in terms of the degree of similarity of the behavior prescribed, described, evaluated or sanctioned.[42]

---

[41]Morton Deutsch and Robert M. Krauss, Theories in Social Psychology (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), p. 175.

[42]Biddle and Thomas, op. cit., p. 33.

Parsons pointe:
conflicting sets of le
not realistically be f.
Actor is exposed to ne
conflict in so far as
There are limited poss.
scended, essentially b
evasion of the requirer
tion of occasions.[43]
prescriptions, accordi
confusion, anxiety, an
dysfunction.[44]

Explaining his
suggested that:

> When social struct
> roles, social stabi
> function of (a) the
> ment of individuals
> Instead, dissensus
> of fulfilling role

The concern here was e
observable social beha
abstraction, social st
rests largely with the

---

[43]Talcott Par
The Free Press, 1951

[44]Biddle and T

[45]Goode, op c

that the term itself relates directly to an individual's behavioral repertoire in terms of position. Consequently, role may be best viewed in terms of the following three distinct conceptualizations:

1. The role consists of the system of expectations which exists in the social world surrounding the occupant of a position-exceptions regarding his behavior toward occupants of some other position. This may be termed as the prescribed role.
2. The role consists of a position perceived as applicable to his own behavior when he interacts with the occupant of some other position. This may be termed the subjective role.
3. The role consists of the specific overt behaviors of the occupant of a position when he interacts with the occupants of a position. This may be termed the enacted role.[41]

A number of writers have been concerned with the problem of role conflict and role strain. An individual is likely to encounter role incompatibilities within his status-set and these incompatibilities lead to conflict and strain. Biddle and Thomas viewed consensus regarding roles as varying from maximum disagreement (dissensus), through polarization (conflict), to virtually unanimous agreement (consensus). They defined consensus as the degree of agreement of individuals on a given topic. And in all cases, the agreement or disagreement was reckoned in terms of the degree of similarity of the behavior prescribed, described, evaluated or sanctioned.[42]

---

[41]Morton Deutsch and Robert M. Krauss, Theories in Social Psychology (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), p. 175.

[42]Biddle and Thomas, op. cit., p. 33.

Parsons pointed out that when actor is exposed to conflicting sets of legitimized role expectations both cannot realistically be fulfilled and compromise is necessary. Actor is exposed to negative sanctions and to internal conflict in so far as both sets of values are internalized. There are limited possibilities for conflict to be transcended, essentially by redefining the situation or through evasion of the requirements, as though secrecy or segregation of occasions.[43] The results of such conflicting prescriptions, according to Biddle and Thomas, may be personal confusion, anxiety, and ambivalence which can result in social dysfunction.[44]

Explaining his concept of role strain, Goode suggested that:

> When social structures are viewed as made up of roles, social stability is not explicable as a function of (a) the normative consensual commitment of individuals or (b) normative integration. Instead, dissensus and role strain--the difficulty of fulfilling role demands--are normal.[45]

The concern here was essentially with the linkage of observable social behavior to the less easily observable abstraction, social structure. The utility of this concept rests largely with the proposition that dissensus and role

---

[43]Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), p. 280.

[44]Biddle and Thomas, op. cit., pp. 23-45.

[45]Goode, op. cit., p. 483.

strain are normal and that the individual organizes his system and performs in role relationships through sequences of role bargains--an economic system. Additionally, this view holds that an individual's total role system is over-demanding, and since all demands cannot be fully satisfied, the individual, ". . . must move through the continuous sequence of role decisions and bargains, by which he attempts to adjust these demands."[46]

Secord and Backman referred to the anticipatory and normative qualities of role expectations within the interaction context. The anticipatory quality has to do with the inference of attitude made by one individual to another by ways in which he presents himself and by the situational context. The normative quality suggests that there are well-established patterns of behavior that are anticipated, many of which are obligatory in the normative sense.[47] Furthermore, these writers stated that ". . . only when one is able to anticipate consistently the behaviors of others can one maximize one's reward-cost outcomes."[48] Additionally, the difficulties of meeting the demands of one's role system or the occupancy of multiple role categories simultaneously within social systems, expose the individual to sanctions of

---

[46]Goode, op. cit., p. 495.

[47]P. F. Secord and C. W. Backman, Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), pp. 454-55.

[48]Ibid., p. 455.

others within his interactional context.[49] Thus, he might find himself under the strain of needing to meet simultaneously a number of expectations which are incompatible with the resources available to him, and the reward-cost outcome, or the sanctions of others as well as internal sanctions, intensify the internal conflict experienced by the actor.

In the social system context, the failure of the system to achieve its goals might frequently be a result of the failure of group members to hold expectations in common, or their failure to clearly specify the expectations they hold. This element of role interpretation, i.e., defining and interpreting the individual within the interactional setting, if continued out of balance or under conditions of ambiguity of dissonance may lead to individually deviant responses and result in misintegration of the social system.

The Professional-Nonprofessional Relationship

The existence of role relationships implies organizational structure, either of a formal or informal nature. The concern with the relationship between professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides leads to the concept of formal organization, particularly ways in which human conduct is socially organized and, consequently, to a

---

[49] W. J. Goode, "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role-Status Obligations," American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (1960), 246-58.

consideration of the professional-nonprofessional relationship within the organizational structure.

Social relations, according to Blau and Scott, consists of three elements: (1) patterns of social interaction, (2) sentiments of persons toward one another, and (3) the differential distribution of social relations in a group which defines its status structure.[50] A group member's status, for example, depends upon the sentiments toward him and their interaction with him. Consequently, organizations have their integrated members and those who are not so highly respected, and they have their leaders and their followers. Concern over the relations between individuals within groups frequently gives way to concern over relations between groups. Blau and Scott made the following statement:

> . . . relations that are a source of still another aspect of social status, since the standing of the group in the larger social systems becomes part of the status of any of its members. An obvious example is the significance that membership in an ethnic minority . . . has for an individual social status.[51]

The other dimension of social organization is a system of shared beliefs and orientations which serves as standards for human conduct. This they indicated by stating:

> In the course of social interaction common notions arise as to how people should act and interact and

---

[50] P. M. Blau and W. R. Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler, 1962), p. 3.

[51] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

> what objectives are worthy of attainment. First, common values crystalize, values that govern the goals for which men strive. Second, social norms develop that is, common expectations concerning how people ought to behave and social sanctions used to discourage violations of these norms. Finally, aside from the norms to which everybody is expected to conform, differential role expectations also emerge, expectations that become associated with various social positions.[52]

Relevant to the problem of relationships and to the concepts of behavioral norms, role expectations, and sanctioning behavior, were recent communication studies. Cohen's study had particular relevance as it demonstrated that upward communication seems to be more than merely serving as substitute upward locomotion but, more generally, as facilitation of need satisfaction. For example, low ranking persons with the freedom to move upward communicate in ways which protect and enhance their relations with those who exercise the control over need satisfaction and general status. On the other hand, low-ranking individuals for whom upward mobility is impossible appear to have less need to communicate to the upper level in equally friendly, promotive, and task-oriented fashion.[53] Thus, communications and interaction patterns may be determined by role and, conversely, role flexibility appears to be limited by hierarchical patterns of organizations.

---

[52] Ibid., p. 4.

[53] A. R. Cohen, "Upward Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies," Human Relations, XI (1958), 41-53.

While there were many relevant studies in communication and in organizational theory, it was not the purpose of this study to investigate those specific areas. Rather, it was believed that this provides a noteworthy connection between the discussion of role theory and the practical problems of interaction between professionals and nonprofessionals. It was against the background of organizational structure in its theoretical perspective that attention was directed to a consideration of the professional and nonprofessional role relationship.

Pearl and Reissman argued the case for hiring the poor to serve the poor, an approach which involves utilizing nonprofessional personnel in service programs to perform functions previously done by professionals. They suggested that this would provide for vastly improved services while reducing the manpower crisis in health, education, and welfare fields. It was further noted that there was a current trend in most of the human service areas for professionals to spend more time on consultation, supervision, and teaching, with less time spent on direct, individualized service. Thus, the indigenous low-income nonprofessional can fill a large void in the service-oriented occupations.[54]

Included in the service-oriented professions is education, in which, according to Pearl and Reissman, there

---

[54]Arthur Pearl and Frank Reissman, New Careers for the Poor (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 1-265.

is especially great potential for the development and utilization of the nonprofessional. They pointed out that education will ultimately become this nation's largest enterprise, but that presently there is only one occupational role in the classroom--that of the teacher. Consequently, they proposed that new roles be developed to improve services and permit the fullest utilization of the teacher's professional competence. The aide category was proposed as the entry position, with intermediate roles of assistant and associate.[55]

They further suggested that this concept would help toward reducing colonialism in the schools. Specifically, the school

> . . . can take on a different complexion; persons known to be friends and neighbors could also be known as teachers. The school would no longer have to be forbidding and awesome to parents. Within the school there would be persons who could be talked to . . .[56]

A number of prison systems have demonstrated the capacity for persons without professional preparation to perform research functions. Grant cited the work done in research, frequently using persons with less than high school education, at the Indiana Reformatory, the State Prison of Southern Michigan, and the California Medical Facility--a

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 38-63.

[56] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

prison facility.[57] In each of these programs, a substantial number of outside placements were made in data processing or some research related activity when the workers were paroled. Results of these prison experiences suggested the following conclusions:

1. Administrative support is essential if nonprofessional opportunities are to be opened and maintained, at both a local level and a central agency level.
2. Making an opportunity available is not enough. Nonprofessionals, as much as graduate students, need training, guidance, and supervision.
3. A great deal is still to be learned about the effective development and use of nonprofessionals. There must be a willingness to accept failures on the part of both the professional and administrative staff, especially in the early stages of these new programs.
4. A commitment to the job must be fostered. This is easier when the nonprofessional is in a job that has a future, in which he has reasonable certainty of recognition and advancement. Expectations for performance should be high . . . failure to meet expectations should result in the same sanctions imposed on the professional.
5. At the same time, attention must be given to the unique problems faced by the nonprofessional . . . (but) . . . not by lowering standards for work performance, but by adjunct training and/or therapeutic experience that help them in the management of those internal problems and external realities that interfere with job performance.[58]

Bank Street College of Education is conducting a study of auxiliary school personnel involving fifteen pilot

---

[57]Joan Grant, "The Industry of Discovery: New Roles for the Nonprofessional," New Careers for the Poor, ed. by Arthur Pearl and Frank Reissman (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 93-124.

[58]Ibid., pp. 114-15.

projects. In their report of Phase I of the study, Bowman and Klopf presented the following major findings concerning role development and relationships:

1. Low-income auxiliaries with minimum education appeared to be capable of assisting with the learning-teaching process in the classroom with benefits to pupils, particularly when the auxiliaries were carefully selected and trained.
2. This meaningful occupational role for low-income, educationally disadvantaged persons often appeared to have a positive impact upon their familial and community roles, as well as upon their self-concept.
3. Auxiliaries frequently established communication with pupils and parents of their own background in school situations and helped to reduce home-school alienation.
4. Auxiliaries often appeared to serve as role models for disadvantaged pupils--which might well be a significant motivational factor in the child's or youth's development.
5. Many teachers who participated in the program perceived their own roles in new perspective after working with aides in the classroom.
6. A salient outcome was that all concerned--administrators, supervisors, teachers, and ancillary personnel had to rethink their roles and relationships when aides were introduced into the school system, in order to develop viable, purposeful teams and integrate all available school services to meet the pupil needs.
7. In essence, the introduction of auxiliaries appeared to serve a catalytic function in the development of all roles in the school system.[59]

The authors of this report also pointed out that the inclusiveness and the goal-centered qualities of this broadened team approach did not eliminate the requirements for

---

[59]Bowman and Klopf, op. cit., pp. 136-37.

responsibility and accountability.[60] The classroom teacher is still the pivotal agent in organizing all the available resources into a continuing program of individualized education to meet the needs of each child. In the performance of this difficult and profoundly significant task, the teacher is accountable not only to the administration, but also to the pupils and their parents, and finally to himself. Accountability may be provided by evaluating the effectiveness of the utilization of various available and relevant inputs in the learning environment.

Formulations of Teacher Aide Role Descriptions

In certain situations an individual may find himself exposed to conflicting expectations: Some people expect him to behave in one way, others in another, and these expectations are incompatible.[61] It is often assumed in social theories that social stability depends on the accuracy with which roles are perceived. Thus, persons are presumed to be aware of, and to share, standards for behaviors that are appropriate for persons who are members of social position. Biddle, et al., stated that ". . . should people disagree, by chance, about what behaviors are appropriate, they must

---

[60] Ibid., pp. 145-46.

[61] Neal Gross, Alexander W. McEachern, and Ward S. Mason, "Role Conflict and Its Resolution," Role Theory: Concepts and Research, ed. by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 287.

at least be aware of the others' thinking in order to plan intelligent activity with those others.[62] There is need at most levels of education for determining those activities, responsibilities, tasks and behaviors that are necessary for the successful participation of teacher aides within the school setting.

A project under the instructorship of Stevens had as its purpose to identify the activities, tasks, and responsibilities that can be appropriately and effectively handled by a non-certified person. A study guide was compiled listing activities, tasks, and responsibilities under the following headings: (1) Setting the Classroom Environment for Learning, (2) Instructional Related Responsibilities for the Classroom Teacher Aide, (3) Administrative and Clerical Tasks of the Classroom Teacher Aide, and (4) Supervisory Activities and Responsibilities.[63]

Thomson began a discussion of the role of the teacher aide by stating ". . . the aide is neither clerk nor certified teacher, though she will do considerable typing and some teaching.[64] He went on to point out that the specific

---

[62]B. J. Biddle, et al., "Shared Inaccuracies in the Role of the Teacher," Role Theory: Concepts and Research, ed. by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 302.

[63]Jody L. Stevens, "The Classroom Teacher Aide," The Gulf School Researcher, XIV (February, 1967), 3.

[64]S. D. Thomson, "The Emerging Role of the Teacher Aide," The Clearing House, XXXVII (February, 1963), 326.

talents of the aide will be a determinant in the specific tasks assigned. As the aide gains confidence and competence, additional tasks may be assigned. Also, the teacher's competence and confidence in assigning duties becomes a determining factor. A list of typical duties are presented by the author. Teachers assisted by the alleviation of the suggested teacher aide duties can then concentrate on the unquestionably professional aspects of the job: planning and preparing the lesson, leading classroom learning, evaluating progress, and guiding the individual student in matters of subject and of self.[65]

A total of 229 school systems participated in a survey of Educational Research Service.[66] The checklist entitled, "How Teacher Aides Help," listed twenty-five duties, with an opportunity provided to list additional duties. Eighteen additional duties were listed by the respondents.

In his study of attitudes toward teacher aides, Hardaway divided activities into "outside classroom activities" and "inside classroom activities." Fourteen activities were listed in the former and fourteen in the latter. This investigation provided an opportunity for teachers to give miscellaneous comments concerning teacher aides. The teachers indicated that the teachers themselves rather than

---

[65] Ibid., p. 327.

[66] Educational Research Service Circular, American Association of School Administrators and Research Division, National Education Association, No. 2 (April, 1967).

administrators, should be directly responsible for directing and supervising the activities and functions of the teacher aides.[67]

In an editorial, Esbensen stated "can we reasonably maintain that the regular teacher is the only person qualified to (1) hear a child read Dolchs' list of the ninety-five most common nouns, (2) read to children, (3) help students locate materials, (4) repeat directions concerning assignments."[68] He went on to indicate that a competent teacher aide could do all of these things--each task clearly having the effect of "assisting with the teaching function." The distinguishing characteristic of a qualified teacher, in Esbensen's opinion, is his ability to analyze the instructional needs of his students, and to prescribe the elements of formal schooling that best meets those needs. In this view, it is altogether proper for the teacher aide to be more than a clerical aide. The usefulness of the teacher aide should be restricted only by his own personal limitations in whatever duties that may be assigned to him by his regular teacher.[69]

Lawson presented an effective argument for the auxiliary or teacher aide and presented a number of suggestions

---

[67]C. W. Hardaway, "Some Attitudes of Elementary Teachers Toward the Use of Teacher Aides," Teachers College Journal, XXVIII (November, 1956), 21.

[68]T. Esbensen, "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (January, 1960), 237.

[69]Ibid., p. 237.

concerning tasks and behaviors for that position. She maintained that since teaching goes on all the time and is not confined to a formal lesson in the classroom, everybody in the school is engaged in informal education of the most valuable kind.

> Demands that ancillary helpers "should not be engaged upon teaching duties" are unpractical and unrealistic. Ancillary helpers, nevertheless, must be ancillary. The qualified teacher will always have to be in charge of the class guiding and directing the activities of both children and auxiliary into fruitful fields of experience and learning. The mature intelligent person who has been given some training and who understands something of the principles underlying modern educational practice, who knows a little of the value of creative play and the importance of language in learning, will be unable to supplement and amplify the efforts of the teacher.[70]

Summary

The review of the literature provided a theoretical framework for the investigation of the role relationships between the professional teacher and the nonprofessional teacher aide. The role concept focused attention on ideas of central importance to this study. One of these was that human behavior is influenced to some degree by the expectations individuals hold for themselves or which other individuals hold for them. Another was that a person's locations or positions in social structures influence the kinds of

---

[70] E. M. Lawson, "Role of the Auxiliary: Teaching in the Truest Sense," Times Educational Supplement, MMDLXXXV (December 18, 1964), 1137.

social relationships in which he is involved and the evaluative standards he or others apply to his behavior. Derivative from these was the basic proposition that human behavior is in part a function of the positions an individual occupies and the expectations held for incumbents of these positions. Role research may be concerned with how one perceives his role obligations, how self and significant others evaluate both role and performance, and the degree of consensus and of functional integration within social systems.

The trend toward the use of nonprofessionals to perform certain duties and responsibilities previously done by professionals was well established in the literature. However, little specific attention has been given to the role relationships which have developed. Teacher aide programs provide the organizational structure or social system to study role relationships.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The major purpose of this study was to determine whether or not consensus existed between professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides when incumbents of such positions define their roles through application of evaluative standards. Additionally, the nonprofessional position was viewed to determine if consensus of role was affected by certain selected variables. This chapter contains information concerning the population, the development of the instruments, the data collecting procedures utilized, the hypotheses tested, and the treatment of the data.

Population

The population included all teacher aides and one supervising teacher for each teacher aide from four selected school systems. The school systems were selected because of their known interest in and utilization of teacher aides. Schools A and B were located in Texas and were known to have conducted teacher aide training programs. Schools C and D were located in Oklahoma and their teacher aides had not

participated in formal training programs. Other criteria used in selecting these schools were that they were somewhat similar in size and in some characteristics of their communities. Schools A and C were similar, with schools B and D being similar.

The population studied included sixty teacher aides and sixty professional teachers.

Instrumentation

According to Gross, Mason, and McEachern,[71] expectations held for incumbents of a particular position may be viewed in either the normative sense of the predictive sense. In this study they were viewed both normatively and predictively. Normative implies "oughtness" or what a person should do regarding expectations for division of labor. When subjects indicated their expectations for attributes and behaviors or incumbents of a position, the predictive dimension was being explored.

A "positioned" model, consisting of a focal position and a counter position, was used as a means of specifying expectations which members of either group held for either professional or nonprofessional positions. It is recognized that roles may be associated with more than one other position, but to deal impirically with the specific problems identified in this study, it was necessary to focus investigation on a

---

[71]Gross, Mason, and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 58-63.

single counter position. Gross, Mason, and McEachern consider such an approach to be a dyad model of relational specification.[72]

For the research worker in education, "testing" implies the necessity for attention to validity and reliability. Several authors, however, have pointed out basic differences between the psychometric test and the sociometric test. Pepinsky noted that sociometric ratings are not intended to be impersonal evaluations; instead, rater-ratee interaction is intended to play a large part in the ratings.[73] She further stated that the frame of reference of a psychometric test is not always applicable to a sociometric test. Gronlund, in reviewing the technical literature, pointed out in his chapter on reliability that internal consistency has tended to be high and stability over time tends to run high in sociometric tests.[74] He further indicated that sociometric results have been significantly related to behavior outside the sociometric testing situation.[75]

---

[72] Ibid., pp. 51-52.

[73] Pauline N. Pepinsky, "The Meaning of 'Validity' and 'Reliability' as Applied to Sociometric Tests," Educational Psychological Measurement, IX (1949), 39-49.

[74] N. E. Gronlund, Sociometry in the Classroom (New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 117-157.

[75] H. H. Remmers, "Rating Methods in Research on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching. ed. by N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963), p. 348.

The literature suggested a pattern for data gathering that could be adapted to the needs of the present study. In a comprehensive study, Gross, Mason, and McEachern used two instruments that had particular relevance for a role expectation investigation.[76] The "Superintendent's Attributes Instrument" contained a list of fifty-four items, each of which represented a quality or characteristic. A five point scale was used. The "Division-of-Labor Instrument" contained thirteen items with each item describing a general function and presented four alterantives for which the respondents could express a preference. To test three hypotheses, this instrument was categorized according to an assessment of the degree of technical competence required. The items were arranged into three groups; "most technical," "less technical," and "least technical."

For the present study, two basic instruments were developed for the assessment of role expectations. The "Division-of-Labor Inventory" focused upon the extent of consensus among role definers as to examples of specific tasks assigned. It required that respondents assign tasks to either the professional position or to the nonprofessional position, but a single task could not be assigned to both positions. (See Appendix B).

The second instrument, "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory," was developed for the purpose of determining the

---

[76]Gross, Mason, and McEachern, op. cit., pp. 95-175.

expectations held by role incumbents for attributes and behaviors of incumbents of their own position as well as the counter position. This inventory utilized a five point rating scale, with upper extreme identified as "very high" and the lower extreme as "very low." (Attached in Appendix B). Biddle, Twyman, and Rankin used this method in gathering data concerning teacher behavior.[77]

According to Kerlinger, content validation is basically judgmental.[78] The unique characteristics of teacher aide programs and difference among them led to the decision to use a panel of judges to select items to be included in the instruments. Ten were selected on the basis of their having had educational backgrounds, previous experience with and expressed interest in teacher aide programs. The panel included three university professors, three supervisors of teacher aide programs, one principal in a school utilizing teacher aides, one director of a training organization of nonprofessionals, one assistant director of a state Title III program, and a coordinator of instruction of an urban school system.

---

[77]B. J. Biddle, J. P. Twyman, and E. F. Rankin, Jr., "The Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice," The School Review, LXX (Summer, 1962), 195.

[78]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 447.

The judges were mailed an inventory developed from an extensive item pool. The item pool was developed by surveying relevant literature using such authorities as Ryans,[79] Dehart,[80] and Biddle, Twyman, and Rankin.[81] Sixty items were selected from the item pool and included in the "Division-of-Labor Inventory." This inventory was mailed to the judges with instructions to categorize the sixty items into "most technical," "less technical," and "least technical." An equal number of items in each category, as determined by frequency count, were included in the inventory. (See Appendix C). The instrument used contained a total of twenty-seven items. (See Appendix B).

The "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory" was developed through submitting to the judges twenty-five items selected from an item pool. The items were selected on the basis of their relation to the most commonly discussed behavior and attributes regarding (1) positive qualities of teachers and teacher aides, and (2) problem areas which exist in working relationships. The judges were asked to classify the twenty-five items into three categories: "very important," "important," and "less important." Originally, all items placed

---

[79] D. G. Ryans, Characteristic of Teachers (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960), p. 82.

[80] Ruth Dehart, Parameters of the Teacher Aide Role (Houston: Gulf School Research Development Association, 1968), pp. 11-45.

[81] Biddle, Twyman, and Rankin, op. cit., 191-206.

in the "less important" category were to be eliminated from the instrument. However, the judges were unanimous in placing all items in either the "very important" or "important" category. All twenty-five items were placed in the final instrument. The design of this instrument was such that either the teacher or the teacher aide position could be rated by either group on the same form by checking which position was being rated and by indicating the position of the rater.

Data Collecting Procedures

The selected schools were contacted by mail requesting their cooperation in the study. (See Appendix A). Each of the originally selected schools responded positively.

A letter of procedure was first mailed to each teacher aide program supervisor prior to the mailing of the packets. (See Appendix A). The following day, sixty packets marked "teacher aide" and sixty marked "teacher" were mailed to the participating schools. Each packet was coded by color for each school. Each packet contained a letter of explanation to each participant (See Appendix A); a questionnaire (See Appendix B); one copy of the "Division-of-Labor Inventory;" two copies of the "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory;" and a stamped, addressed envelope. Each supervisor was asked to distribute the packets to the appropriate participants. The participants were requested to complete

the inventories according to directions, place in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope, seal, and return to the program supervisor. The program supervisor was asked to deposit all envelopes in the mail. Fifty-seven teachers and fifty-seven teacher aides responded to the instrument for a ninety-five percent return of the data.

The Hypotheses

The study required testing several null hypotheses. They were:

H_{o1} -- Incumbents of both the professional and the nonprofessional positions will specify a division of responsibility such that there is no statistically significant difference between task functions assigned to their own position and to the counter position.

H_{o2} -- There is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "least technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

H_{o3} -- There is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "most technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

H_{o4} -- There is no statistically significant difference

between the assignments of the "less technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

H_{o5} -- There is no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional and nonprofessional subjects for the nonprofessional position.

H_{o6} -- There is no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional subjects and the nonprofessional subjects for the professional position.

H_{o7} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to race.

H_{o8} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous training.

H_{o9} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to age.

H_{o10} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to educational level.

H_{o11} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals

according to previous experience.

H_{o12} -- There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to economic status.

Treatment of the Data

Siegel proposed that two important questions should be considered when determining the treatment to be applied to the data. They were: (a) Which approach uses the information in the sample most appropriately? (b) How important is it that the conclusions from the research apply generally rather than only to populations with normal distributions?[82] In response to these questions, the Mann-Whitney U was selected as suitable for analyzing the data to determine whether a significant difference existed between the expectations of the nonprofessional subjects by selected variables. The chi-square test was used to determine significant differences by items and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to determine significant differences existing between the two groups.

The responses of the "Division-of-Labor Inventory" consisted of frequencies in "own position" or "counter position" categories. The responses of the "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory" were dichotomized into "high" and

---

[82]Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 32.

"low" categories since there was a tendency on the part of the subjects to avoid low placement categories. Those placements of "average" or below were assigned to the "low" category and those placements of "high" or "very high" were assigned to the "high" category.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine whether significant differences existed between the nonprofessional subjects by selected variables. Siegel pointed out that this does not assume normality; it does assume discrete data, uses ordinal measurement, requires two independent samples, and may be used to test whether the two groups have been drawn from the same population.[83] The results obtained by this test are similar to those obtained by the "t" test of significance of difference between means. The following formula was used:

$$U = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1 (n_1 + 1)}{2} - R_1$$

Siegel further explained that as n_1 and n_2 increase in size the sampling distribution of U rapidly approaches the normal distribution.[84] If n_2 is greater than 20, we may determine statistical significance by the following formula:

$$z = \frac{U - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1)(n_2)+(n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}}}$$

---

[83] Ibid., p. 121.

[84] Ibid

For the level of significance of the observed U converted to z, refer to table A in Siegel.[85]

Siegel further stated that "when the data of research consists of frequencies in discrete categories, the χ^2 test may be used to determine the significance of differences between two independent groups."[86] This test was chosen as suitable to test item by item to determine the locations of differences that might exist. The following formula was used:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(Oij - Eij)^2}{Eij}$$

Where Oij = observed number of cases categorized in the ith row of jth column.

Eij = number of cases expected under H_o to be categorized in the ith row of jth column.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was selected as being appropriate for testing the significance of difference between the total responses of teachers and teacher aides. This test seemed to be affected less by the large number of ties found in the data dealing with the first six null hypotheses. According to Siegel, this test is appropriate for a two-sample case when the samples are independent

---

[85] Ibid., p. 247

[86] Ibid., p. 104.

and the level of measurement is at least ordinal in nature.[87] The following formula was used:

$$\chi^2 = 4D^2 \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

Where D = maximum observed difference between ranks. Table C, in Siegel, was used to determine level of significance for both the χ^2 test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test.[88]

Summary

The study was designed to determine whether or not consensus of role existed between professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides when evaluative standards are applied. Additionally, the nonprofessional position was examined for evidence of consensus by selected variables.

The population consisted of sixty teacher aides and one supervising teacher for each aide. The population included all teacher aides from four selected school systems.

Two instruments were developed by the researcher with the assistance of ten judges. One instrument focused upon specific tasks and the second instrument dealt with attributes and behaviors. The instruments were mailed to the supervisor of the teacher aide program in each school for administration.

---

[87] Ibid., p. 127.

[88] Ibid., p. 249.

Twelve hypotheses were developed regarding role consensus according to the role theory presented in the review of literature. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The statistical tools identified as appropriate, according to the data, were the Mann-Whitney U test, the chi-square for two independent samples, and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present, compare, and analyze data obtained from fifty-seven teachers and fifty-seven teacher aides. The raw data were presented in Appendix D. The data were obtained by a "Division-of-Labor Inventory" and an "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory." The "Division-of-Labor Inventory" represented "oughtness" of tasks assigned. The "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory" represented anticipations by participants for characteristics and behaviors of both the position incumbent and the counter position. (See Appendix B).

The sample of this study consisted of fifty-seven teacher aides and fifty-seven teachers. Forty-two of the teacher aides were caucasian, twenty-nine had received some formal training, thirty-nine were below forty years of age, twenty-four had a high school education or below, twenty-one had less than one year of experience and forty-eight were previously unemployed or below the $3,000 salary level. Fifty-three teachers and teacher aides were employed in elementary schools.

Division-of-Labor

The "Division-of-Labor Inventory" was developed to focus on the extent of consensus among role definers on specific tasks to be assigned. It required that subjects assign tasks to either the teacher or the teacher aide position, but a single task could not be assigned to both positions. The instrument was subdivided, for the purpose of determining the categories of greater consensus, into "most technical," "less technical," and "least technical" items. The subjects were unaware of the subdivisions. (See Appendix C). This instrument was used to gather data for H_{o1} through H_{o4} and to contribute data for H_{o7} through H_{o12}.

The data gathered were of a two-sample nature; they were independent samples, nonparametric in nature, and could be arranged into a cumulative frequency. The number of subjects in both samples was equal. Given this information about the population, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as discussed by Siegel,[89] was determined as being appropriate to test the significance of difference. It was arbitrarily determined that a two-tailed test, at the 0.05 level of significance, would be used to test the hypotheses.

The requirement of the hypotheses made it necessary to statistically test between professional and nonprofessional frequencies in regard to their responses for only one position

---

[89]Siegel, op. cit., pp. 127-136.

since, by the nature of the original measure, one position is the reverse of the other. That is, subjects could assign tasks to either professionals or nonprofessionals, but not to both; consequently, the frequency of one position determines the frequency of the other. It was arbitrarily determined that the response frequencies when evaluating the professional position would be the basis of analysis.

The first hypothesis relating to task functions assigned was: H_{o1} -- incumbents of both the professional and the nonprofessional positions will specify a division of responsibility such that there is no statistically significant difference between task functions assigned to their own position and to the counter position.

To test the significance of difference between the two distributions, a cumulative frequency was compiled and a maximum difference (D) was computed. Table M, in Siegel,[90] was used to determine the probability of chance occurance.

Table I contains the cumulative frequencies, the computed D and the level of significance. As shown in Table I, teachers assigned a significantly greater number of tasks to their own position than the teacher aides assigned to the teacher position. When Table M was applied to the computed D, it was found that the difference was at the 0.005 level of significance which indicated rejection of H_{o1}.

---

[90] Ibid., p. 279.

TABLE I

CUMULATIVE FREQUENCIES FOR ALL TASKS ASSIGNED TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals								
	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25
Teachers	10	28	38	46	56	56	57	57	57
Teacher Aides	1	9	20	39	48	55	56	56	57

$D = 0.3333$ $n_1 = 57$

$P < 0.005$ $n_2 = 57$

The second hypotheses relating to "least technical" functions assigned was: H_{o2} -- there is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "least technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the professional position and incumbents of the nonprofessional position.

TABLE II

CUMULATIVE FREQUENCIES FOR "LEAST TECHNICAL" TASKS ASSIGNED TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Teachers	18	38	48	53	56	56	57
Teacher Aides	19	34	47	53	55	57	57

$n_1 = 57$ $D = 0.0701$ No significant difference

$n_2 = 57$

As shown in Table II, the maximum difference was 0.0701. Again applying Table M,[91] it was found that this D was not significant. The disagreement between teachers and teacher aides in assigning the "least technical" tasks was not significant which indicated acceptance of H_{o2}.

The third hypothesis relating to "most technical" functions assigned was: H_{o3} -- there is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "most technical" functions to the professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

TABLE III

CUMULATIVE FREQUENCIES FOR "MOST TECHNICAL" TASKS ASSIGNED TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals				
	5	6	7	8	9
Teachers	0	0	0	2	57
Teacher Aides	1	2	4	21	57

$n_1 = 57$ D = 0.3333

$n_2 = 57$ P < 0.005

Teachers assign a significantly greater number of the "most technical" tasks to their own position than the teacher aides assign to the teacher position. An examination of the data in Table III reveals a maximum difference

[91] Ibid.

of 0.3333. Table M[92] specifies that a D of 0.3333 is significant at the 0.005 level of significance which indicated rejection of H_{o3}.

The fourth hypothesis relating to "less technical" functions assigned was: H_{o4} -- there is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "less technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

TABLE IV

CUMULATIVE FREQUENCIES FOR "LESS TECHNICAL" TASKS ASSIGNED TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Teachers	2	3	9	23	36	42	45	49	54	57
Teacher Aides	10	24	36	39	46	50	55	56	57	57

$D = 0.4736$ $\quad n_1 = 57$

$P < 0.001$ $\quad n_2 = 57$

A greater dissensus existed for "less technical" functions, as teachers assigned a significantly greater number of these functions to the teacher position than did the teacher aides. As shown in Table IV, there was a maximum difference of 0.4736. Referring to Table M,[93] this D

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid.

was found to be significant at the 0.001 level of significance. H_{o4} was rejected.

It was determined that a single statistical test involving totals would not be adequate, even if the hypotheses were supported. The location of difference that might exist would not be revealed. The chi-square test was used to determine the statistically significant difference in the number of responses assigned to either the professional or nonprofessional position by items. Each item was cast into a 2 X 2 contingency table. Chi-square was computed and the significance level was determined by the use of Siegel's Table C.[94] The results were reported in Table V.

TABLE V

CHI-SQUARES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR DIVISION-OF-LABOR ASSIGNMENTS TO OWN POSITION AND COUNTER POSITION

Item (Brief Description)	Group	Chi-Square	P <
1. Lesson plans	tie	0.00	1.00
2. Presenting lessons	pro	0.0008	0.99
3. Grading papers	pro	11.564	0.001
4. Typing	nonpro	0.0008	0.99
5. Assigning grades	pro	4.06	0.05
6. Duplicating	tie	0.00	1.00
7. Recording	pro	0.8948	0.50

[94] Ibid., p. 249.

TABLE V -- CONTINUED

Item (Brief Description)	Group	Chi-Square	P <
8. Developing tests	pro	7.001	0.01
9. Administering discipline	pro	4.30	0.05
10. Stopping fighting	pro	5.05	0.05
11. Contributing ideas to planning	pro	18.7692	0.001
12. Tutoring	pro	2.856	0.10
13. Large group discussions	pro	6.3332	0.02
14. Diagnosing	pro	2.442	0.20
15. Small group activities	pro	2.0274	0.20
16. Collecting money	nonpro	4.5236	0.05
17. Passing out materials	pro	0.3724	0.70
18. Inventorying	nonpro	0.766	0.50
19. Arrangements for equipment	tie	0.000	1.00
20. Classroom leadership	tie	0 000	1.00
21. Providing Teacher-Parent Conferences	pro	0.0008	0.99
22. Assisting supervision	pro	12.1194	0.001
23. Individualized study	pro	5.3610	0.05
24. Cleaning up and putting away materials	pro	0.2908	0.90
25. Filing	tie	0.0000	1.00
26. Assisting in community resources	pro	1.8294	0.10

TABLE V -- CONTINUED

Item (Brief Description)	Group	Chi-Square	P <
27. Interesting a restless student	pro	3.085	0.10

The data in Table V supported a statistically significant lack of consensus on ten of the twenty-seven items. Five items were significant at the 0.10 level of significance. The professionals assigned more tasks to their own position on seventeen of the items. Perfect consensus existed on five of the items. The greater consensus was on the items that were judged clearly teacher tasks or teacher aide tasks. The area between "most technical" and "least technical" contained the greatest dissensus.

On-The-Job Expectations

The "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory" was developed to determine the expectations held by the subjects for characteristics and behaviors considered important to the work situation. This instrument required that each subject rate their own position and the counter position as to how they thought that group would perform. A five-point scale was used. This instrument was used to gather data for H_{o5} and H_{o6}, and to contribute data for H_{o7} through H_{o12}.

Since there was a tendency on the part of the respondents to avoid the "very low" placement category, the subjects

were cast into frequencies by a high-low dichotomy. Consequently, all "low" and "average" placements were cast into a "low" category, and all "high" and "very high" into a "high" category.

The hypotheses required testing assignments of the professional and the nonprofessional subjects for both positions. It was arbitrarily determined to use the "high" category as only one of the categories was necessary for this analysis. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was found to be appropriate for testing significance of difference of the data. A two-tailed test of significance of difference, at the 0.05 level, was chosen for testing these hypotheses.

The fifth hypothesis relating to on-the-job expectations for the professional position was: H_{o5} -- there are no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional and the nonprofessional subjects for the professional position.

The cumulative frequencies of the "highs" assigned by both groups to the nonprofessional position are presented in Table VI. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test produced a maximum difference between the two cumulative distributions of 0.1228. Table M^{95} revealed that this D was not significant. The hypothesis of no difference was accepted.

---

[95] Ibid., p. 279.

TABLE VI

"HIGH" ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS ASSIGNED TO THE NONPROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals								
	0-2	3-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-20	2]-23	24-26
Teachers	2	2	4	13	18	25	35	46	57
Teacher Aides	2	4	9	12	18	26	32	39	57

$n_1 = 57$ D = 0.1228

$n_2 = 57$ No significant difference

The sixth hypothesis relating to on-the-job expectations for the professional position was: H_{o6} -- there are no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional subjects and the nonprofessional subjects for the professional position.

TABLE VII

"HIGH" ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS ASSIGNED TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

	Frequency Intervals								
	0-2	3-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-20	2]-23	24-26
Teachers	0	2	4	6	15	23	32	40	57
Teacher Aides	1	2	6	10	13	19	24	31	57

$n_1 = 57$ D = 0.1578

$n_2 = 57$ No significant difference

As presented in Table VII, the maximum difference is somewhat larger for the professional position. However, the

value of D is not great enough to be significant, according to Table M.[96] According to the data, there is no significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional subjects and the nonprofessional subjects for the professional position. H_{o6} was accepted.

Since there was apparently overall consensus regarding on-the-job expectations, it was decided to analyze for differences by items. The chi-square test was selected for this analysis. All of the "high" frequencies were cast into an own position-counter position dichotomy for both teachers and teacher aides. A 2 X 2 contingency table was then arranged for each item. Table C, in Siegel,[97] was used to determine the level of significance. The data are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

CHI-SQUARES AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS BY BOTH GROUPS FOR INCUMBENTS OF PROFESSIONAL AND NONPROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

Item (Brief Description)	Professional Position			Nonprofessional Position		
	Group	Chi-Square	P <	Group	Chi-Square	P <
1. Physical health	nonpro	0.69	0.50	nonpro	1.51	0.20
2. Pleasing voice	nonpro	3.16	0.10	nonpro	0.04	0.90

[96] Ibid.

[97] Ibid., p. 249.

TABLE VIII -- CONTINUED

Item (Brief Description)	Professional Position			Nonprofessional Position		
	Group	Chi-Square	P <	Group	Chi-Square	P <
3. Self controlled	tie	0.00	1.00	nonpro	0.15	0.80
4. Good student relationships	pro	0.24	0.70	pro	0.48	0.90
5. Promptness	nonpro	0.06	0.90	pro	0.76	0.50
6. Cooperative	pro	0.27	0.70	pro	1.16	0.30
7. Integrity	nonpro	2.38	0.20	tie	0.00	1.00
8. New ideas	pro	0.65	0.50	pro	14.80	0.0001
9. Helps students	nonpro	0.80	0.50	pro	2.50	0.20
10. Dependable	nonpro	0.37	0.70	nonpro	0.37	0.70
11. Accurage	nonpro	0.18	0.70	tie	0.00	1.00
12. Neat	nonpro	1.82	0.20	pro	0.05	0.90
13. Plans effectively	nonpro	2.99	0.10	nonpro	0.89	0.50
14. Ability to adapt	nonpro	0.07	0.80	pro	0.97	0.50
15. Loyalty	nonpro	0.26	0.70	nonpro	1.33	0.30
16. Enthusiasm	pro	2.78	0.10	nonpro	0.04	0.90
17. Ability to organize	nonpro	5.44	0.02	pro	0.65	0.50
18. Communicates well	tie	0.00	1.00	pro	0.14	0.80
19. Friendly	pro	0.06	0.80	nonpro	0.49	0.50
20. Sense of humor	pro	2.89	0.10	nonpro	1.20	0.30
21. Patient	nonpro	0.44	0.70	pro	0.38	0.70

TABLE VIII -- CONTINUED

Item (Brief Description)	Professional Position			Nonprofessional Position		
	Group	Chi-Square	P <	Group	Chi-Square	P <
22. Accepts criticism	nonpro	0.04	0.90	pro	1.74	0.20
23. Admits mistakes	pro	0.34	0.70	nonpro	2.93	0.10
24. Encourages students	pro	1.30	0.30	pro	0.05	0.90
25. Helps willingly	nonpro	1.23	0.30	nonpro	1.40	0.30

According to the data presented in Table VIII, little difference existed item by item. For the professional position, only item seventeen, concerning the ability to organize, was there a difference at the 0.05 level of significance. On fifteen of the items the nonprofessionals held greater expectations for the professionals than did the incumbents of that position.

For the nonprofessional position, the professionals held greater expectations for the nonprofessionals on twelve of the twenty-five items. Item 8 produced a difference at the 0.001 level of significance. The professionals expected the nonprofessionals to contribute new ideas at a much higher level than the incumbents of that position. The nonprofessionals held greater expectations for themselves on eleven of the items than did the professionals for the nonprofessional position.

Analysis of the Nonprofessional Position by Selected Variables

The nonprofessional position was investigated to determine if role consensus was affected by certain selected variables. The variables selected were race, previous training, age, educational level, previous experience, and economic level. All variables were cast into dichotomies and ranked according to the total frequencies assigned to the professional position. Since there were unequal numbers and the data could be ranked, the Mann-Whitney U test was considered appropriate to test the significance of difference between the two groups. A two-tailed test at the 0.05 level of significance was used.

Response patterns for role expectations of the nonprofessionals categorized by selected variables are presented in Table IX. The direction of the lack of consensus can be determined by an examination of the table. Previous training, economic status, and educational level present a variance in response patterns. Those nonprofessionals who had participated in formal training programs assign fewer functions to the professionals than those who had not received training. The nonprofessionals who had higher levels of education assigned fewer of the tasks to the professional position. The nonprofessionals from the unemployed ranks of the below $3,000 income bracket assigned fewer of the tasks to the professional position than did those employed with previous

salaries that were above $3,000. Race, age, and previous experience did not relate to dissensus.

TABLE IX

ASSIGNMENTS BY NONPROFESSIONALS BY SELECTED VARIABLES TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

Variable	Categories	Number	Total Frequencies	Average
Race	Caucasian	42	1603	38.2
	Other	15	562	37.7
Previous Training	Little or none	28	1116	39.5
	Some	29	917	31.6
Age	Below 40	39	1461	37.5
	Above 40	18	634	35.2
Educational Level	H.S. and below	24	1030	46.3
	Above H.S.	33	1142	34.6
Previous Experience	1 yr. or less	21	787	37.5
	More than 1 yr.	36	1358	37.7
Economic Status	$3,000 or less	48	1775	36.9
	More than $3,000	9	399	44.3

The seventh hypothesis relating to difference by race was: H_{o7} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to race.

Race was dichotomized into "caucasian" and "others." Included in the "others" category was Mexican-American, American-Indian, and Negro. The results of this examination

were shown in Table X. The "others" category was n_1. A z of 0.0996 was found to be a difference that could occur by chance when using the 0.05 level of significance. The hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE X

DATA BY SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG NONPROFESSIONALS

Variables	n_1	n_2	u	z	Significance
Race	15	42	320	0.0996	ns
Previous Training	28	29	393.5	1.9 corrected	0.05
Age	18	39	325	0.4463	ns
Educational Level	24	33	533	2.6506	0.008
Previous Experience	21	36	430	0.4135	ns
Economic Status	9	48	316	2.1884	0.04

The eighth hypothesis relating to difference by training was: H_{o8} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous training. Training was categorized into "little or no" training and "some" formal training.

The "little or no" category contained frequencies of those who reported less than a week of formal training. The "some" category included those who indicated one week or

more of formal training. Those who indicated previous training were n_1. As shown in Table X, the hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 level of significance after the correction for ties was applied.

The ninth hypothesis relating to difference according to age was: H_{o9} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals a according to age.

Age was arbitrarily categorized into "below 40" and "above 40." The "above 40" category was n_1. As shown in Table X, there was no statistically significant difference so the hypothesis was accepted.

The tenth hypothesis relating to difference according to educational level was: H_{o10} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to educational level.

Educational level was dichotomized into "high school and below" and "above high school." "High school and below" were n_1. A difference in role expectations existed for this variable at the 0.008 level of significance. The hypothesis was rejected.

The eleventh hypothesis relating to difference according to previous experience was: H_{o11} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous experience.

Previous experience was dichotomized into "one year or less" and "more than one year." The smaller n_1 belongs to the "one year or less" category. This hypothesis was accepted. (See Table X).

The twelfth hypothesis relating to difference according to economic status was: H_{o12} -- there is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to economic status.

Economic status was categorized into "below $3,000" and "above $3,000." The "above $3,000" category was n_1. The hypothesis was rejected at the 0.04 level of significance. (See Table X).

The raw data for this section, as well as the preceding sections, were presented in Appendix D.

Summary

In order to test the general hypothesis of whether or not consensus of role expectations existed between professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides, six null hypotheses were formulated and tested. Additionally, to determine if consensus existed among the nonprofessional teacher aides by selected variables, six null hypotheses were formulated and tested. Two instruments were developed and administered for the purpose of gathering data.

In summary, H_{o1}, H_{o3}, H_{o4}, H_{o8}, H_{o10}, and H_{o12} were rejected. H_{o2}, H_{o5}, H_{o6}, H_{o7}, H_{o9}, and H_{o11} were accepted.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to present a summary of the purposes, need, and methods and procedures of this study. Also, statements regarding the findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on the study and related literature were presented. The chapter was organized into four sections: summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine role expectations of professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides as perceived by role incumbents. Additionally, the nonprofessional teacher aide position was examined to determine if dissensus was indicated by selected variables.

The need for such a study was established by pointing out the failure in behavioral science to bring together the empirical methodologies of role theory and the problems of role consensus and conflict presumed to exist when nonprofessionals are employed as team members along with

professional personnel. It was pointed out that the rapid growth of such relationships have not been accompanied by systematic investigations of interpersonal and intergroup relations that have resultant implications for organizational effectiveness and individual job satisfaction.

The population included all teacher aides and one supervising teacher for each aide from four selected school systems. Two school systems were selected in Texas because it was known that they had participated in a formal teacher aide training program. The two Oklahoma schools were selected as being comparable to those chosen in Texas. A ninety-five percent return was obtained from the population.

Responses concerning role relationships were elicited by means of two instruments developed for this study. Judges were utilized in selecting the items to be included in the study. A division-of-labor instrument was developed for assessing expectations for tasks and functions performed. An on-the-job expectations instrument was developed for assessing expectations for attributes and behaviors of the incumbents of both positions. The division-of-labor instrument included three sub-measures, one for the "most technical" tasks, one for the "less technical" tasks, and one for the "least technical" tasks. These tasks were classified by the judges according to the degree of professional competence required for each group.

The following null hypotheses were formed to test the major hypothesis of this study:

1. Incumbents of both the professional and the nonprofessional positions will specify a division of responsibility such that there is no statistically significant difference between task functions assigned to their own position and the counter position.

2. There is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "least technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

3. There is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "most technical" functions to the professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

4. There is no statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "less technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

5. There are no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional and nonprofessional subjects for the nonprofessional position.

6. There are no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professional and nonprofessional subjects for the professional position.

7. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to race.

8. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous training.

9. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to age.

10. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to educational level.

11. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous experience.

12. There is no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to economic status.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to test the significance of difference for H_{o1} through H_{o6}. The Mann-Whitney U test was applied to H_{o7} through H_{o12}. Additionally, an item by item analysis was made to determine location of differences. The chi-square test was used for this analysis. A two-tailed test was used throughout the analysis at the 0.05 level of significance.

Findings

An analysis of the data collected for the study resulted in the findings enumerated below.

1. Incumbents of both the professional and nonprofessional position specified a division such that there was a statistically significant difference between task functions assigned to their own position and to the counter position.

2. There was no statistically significant difference between the assignments of "least technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

3. There was statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "most technical" functions to the professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

4. There was statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "less technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the nonprofessional position and incumbents of the professional position.

5. There was no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professionals and nonprofessionals for the nonprofessional position.

6. There was no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professionals and nonprofessionals for the professional position.

7. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to race.

8. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous training.

9. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to age.

10. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to educational level.

11. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to previous experience.

12. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of nonprofessionals according to economic status.

Conclusions

The major purpose of this study was to determine whether or not consensus of role expectations existed between professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides. Additionally, a secondary purpose was to determine if consensus among nonprofessional teacher aides was affected by selected variables. Conclusions drawn from this study

are applicable only to the population previously described.

An analysis of the data supports the contention that consensus cannot be presumed. The results of the inquiry clearly indicated that occupants of different positions did not hold the same expectations. Additionally, the location of conflict areas indicated that expectations for the assumption of responsibilities and tasks were critical enough to warrant attention. Nonprofessionals expected to acquire a number of meaningful functions to perform, and the professionals did not perceive them as performing those functions. Significant differences were found between the two groups to the extent that interrole conflict might exist in sufficient intensity to unnecessarily limit the effective attainment of the organizations' goals as well as the personal satisfaction of individual members of the organizations.

The expectations for the attributes and behaviors results raised the question of whether or not the subjects' expectations were normative or predictive. However, this area of agreement may be of particular significance in terms of actual role relationships which were negotiated between members of the two groups in their routine contacts. The professional appeared to exhibit an attitude toward the nonprofessional such that he expected far more from him than he was willing to allow him to contribute. The interpretation of the cause of such phenomena remains a matter of conjecture within the limitations of the present study.

The analysis of the data supports the contention that there was need for identification and development of a variety of roles within the social setting of the classroom. Nonprofessionals with some training, higher educational level, and higher economic status had greater expectations for themselves than their counterparts. The proposed aide level entry position, with intermediate roles of assistant and associate, would provide this higher expectation and at the same time defend "professional marginality." The upward communication need is then enhanced in friendly, promotive, and task-orientated fashion.

According to the data, the nonprofessional role is perceived as being one in which only the menial, non-pupil contact tasks were to be performed by the nonprofessional. It has been proposed that because of his unique position, the nonprofessional may bridge the cultural gap, may assist the child in identifying and building upon strengths, fill communication gaps, and assist in developing relevance for the child. Contribution to the teaching-learning process requires opportunity for relevant inputs into the learning environment. The results from the data of this study support the contention that opportunity for input was hampered by the role perception of the nonprofessional position, as was apparent by the tasks assigned to that position.

The results of the data would seem to support the concept that group behavior may be construed as being

characterized by standards or norms by which individual perceptions are made, and which involves the anticipation of roles of others and responding to those as anticipated by others. The involvement of those that influenced standards or norms of the groups was apparent by the variation of responses of the selected groups. Those groups that had been actively involved in teacher aide training programs, tended to have higher expectations than those that had not participated. This would support the concept that the role consists of the system of expectations which exist in the social world surrounding the occupant of a position. The implications are that the system within which a teacher aide functions is controlling, in a sense, the contributions of that position to the system.

Recommendations

Findings and conclusions of this study support the following recommendations:

1. Since this study was limited to four selected school systems, it is recommended that future research be representative of regional or national groups.

2. Future research should expand upon the behaviors and attributes area of role relationships.

3. It is recommended that attention be given to developing more elaborate instruments for locating conflict areas between teachers and teacher aides.

4. Future research should pay particular attention to teacher and teacher aide variables that affect or influence role consensus.

5. It is recommended that attention be given to the effects of role consensus or dissensus upon educational systems.

6. Explorations should be conducted to determine how role perceptions among professionals are changed.

7. Future research should give attention to whether or not there are optimal degrees of consensus that are subject to empirical investigation.

8. It is recommended that attention be given to the training of teachers, as well as teacher aides, on the role of teachers and teacher aides.

9. Future research should utilize the role studies of various human services fields concerning professional-nonprofessional relationships to develop a model for the education field.

10. It is recommended that individual role tasks of the professional in education be researched to determine the level of training necessary to perform those individual tasks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bales, R. F. "Task Roles and Social Roles in Problem-Solving Groups." Readings in Social Psychology. Edited by Eleanor MacCoby, R. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley. 3d. ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Biddle, B. J.; Rosencranz, A.; Tomich, Edward; and Twyman, J. P. "Shared Inaccuracies in the Role of the Teacher." Role Theory: Concepts and Research. Edited by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

_____, and Thomas, E. J. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Blau, P. M., and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bowman, Garda W., and Klopf, Gordon J. "Auxiliary School Personnel." Up From Poverty. Edited by Frank Riessman and Hermine I. Popper. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Brager, George. The Low-Income Non-Professional. New York: Mobilization for Youth, 1964a.

Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr. "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles." Readings in Social Psychology. Edited by Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1947.

Deutsch, Morton, and Krauss, Robert M. Theories in Social Psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Grant, Joan. "The Industry of Discovery: New Roles for the Nonprofessional." New Careers for the Poor. Edited by Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S.; McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies in the School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Gross, Neal; McEachern, Alexander W.; and Mason, Ward S. "Role Conflict and Its Resolution." Role Theory: Concepts and Research. Edited by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

McCall, C. J., and Simmons, J. L. Identities and Interactions. New York: MacMillan Co., 1966.

Nadel, S. F. The Theory of Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Newcomb, Theordore M. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.

_____, and Shils, Edward A. "The Content of Roles." Role Theory: Concepts and Research. Edited by B. J. Biddle and E. J. Thomas. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966

Pearl, Arthur, and Riessman, Frank. New Careers for the Poor. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Remmers, H. H. "Rating Methods in Research on Teaching." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Sarbin, T. R. "Role Theory." Vol. I: Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by G. Lindzey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Sargent, S. S. "Conceptions of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology." Social Psychology at the Cross-Roads. Edited by J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif. New York: Harper and Bros., 1951.

Secord, P. F., and Backman, C. W. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Thibaut, J. W., and Kelley, H. H. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Periodicals

Biddle, B. J.; Twyman, J. P.; and Rankin, E. F., Jr. "The Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice." The School Review, LXX (Summer, 1962), 191-206.

Cohen, A. R. "Upward Communication in Experimentally Created Hierarchies." Human Relations, XI (1958), 41-53.

Cohen, Wilbur J. "Revitalizing the Schools." Congressional Record House, CXIII (October, 1967), H12921.

Esbensen, Thorwald. "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (January, 1960), 237.

Goode, W. J. "A Theory of Role Strain." American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), 483-496.

_____. "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role Status Obligations." American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (1960), 246-48.

Hardaway, C. W. "Some Attitudes of Elementary Teachers Toward the Use of Teacher Aides." Teachers College Journal, XXVIII (November, 1956), 20-22.

Lawson, E. M. "Role of the Auxiliary: Teaching in the Truest Sense." Times Educational Supplement, MMDLXXXV (December 18, 1964), 1137.

Oeser, O. A., and Harary, F. "A Mathematical Model for Structural Role Theory." Human Relations, IV (May, 1962), 89-109.

Pepinsky, Pauline N. "The Meaning of 'Validity' and 'Reliability' as Applied to Sociometric Tests." Educational Psychological Measurement, IX (1949), 39-49.

Rioux, J. William. "Here Are Fourteen Ways to Use Non-Teachers in Your School District." Nations Schools, LXXVI (December, 1965), 42.

Stafford, Curt. "Teacher Time Utilization with Teacher Aides." Journal of Educational Research, LVI (October, 1962), 82-88.

Stevens, Jody L. "The Classroom Teacher Aide." The Gulf School Researcher, XIV (February, 1967), 1-4.

_____. "The Need for Teacher Aides." The Texas Outlook, (May, 1967), 54-55.

Thomson, S. D. "The Emerging Role of the Teacher Aide." The Clearing House, XXXVII (February, 1963), 326-30.

Other Sources

Bowman, Garda W., and Klopf, Gordon J. New Careers and Roles in the American School: A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education. A Report Prepared by Bank Street College of Education. New York: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

Dehart, Ruth. Parameters of the Teacher Aide Role. A Final Report Prepared for the Study Commission. Houston: Gulf School Research Development Association, 1968.

Educational Research Circular. American Association of School Administration and Research Division: National Education Association, 1967.

Pearl, Arthur. "New Careers." Paper Presented at a New Careers Conference, New York, N. Y., January, 1968.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THIS STUDY

Item One: Letter to Judges

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Dear _____:

Your educational background, experience and interest in teacher aides are the dominant factors that led to selecting you to provide the information in the enclosed inventory. The information you provide will be utilized in developing an instrument to be administered in a research project being conducted for the College of Education, University of Oklahoma. The research topic is: An Analysis of Role Expectations of Professional Teachers and Nonprofessional Teacher Aides.

If you will please fill out the enclosed inventory and return immediately, I will be most grateful.

Sincerely,

Garland W. McNutt

Item Two: Permission Request Letter to Program Supervisors

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Dear _____:

Your school has been highly recommended to participate in a teacher-teacher aide role study conducted for the College of Education, The University of Oklahoma. The title of the study is, "An Analysis of Role Expectations of Professional Teachers and Nonprofessional Teacher Aides."

Should your school be willing to participate in this early endeavor to study the role relationships between teachers and teacher aides, you will be sent two brief questionnaires to be administered. The two questionnaires will require less than thirty minutes to complete. All information will be identified by number rather than by name. The study will be limited to teacher aides who are directly assigned to teachers for the purpose of supporting instruction and their supervising teachers. A copy of the study will be available to you upon request.

Please indicate your interest in this project, along with the total number of aides and supervising teachers, on this letter and return in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

Garland W. McNutt

Item Three: Procedure Letter to Program Supervisors

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Dear _____:

Thank you for your willingness to assist in securing data for my research concerning role expectations of teachers and teacher aides. Your participation will involve distributing the packets to the subjects and collecting them. Each packet is appropriately marked teacher or teacher aide. A packet contains three inventories and a stamped envelope for each subject. One packet marked teacher aide should be given to each teacher aide and one packet marked teacher to only one supervising teacher of each aide. The subjects should be instructed to complete the inventories as soon as possible, fold, place in the stamped envelope and return to you. Upon receipt of all envelopes, please deposit them in the mail.

Your assistance in this endeavor is appreciated so much. If there are questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Cordially,

Garland W. McNutt

Item Four: Procedure Letter to Teachers and Teacher Aides

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Dear _____:

You have been highly recommended to participate in a research project conducted for the College of Education, The University of Oklahoma. The purpose of the study is to determine the role expectations of teachers and teacher aides.

Your packet contains a questionnaire, a "Division-of-Labor Inventory," two "On-The-Job Expectations Inventory" forms, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Please read the directions carefully before marking the form. Upon completion, fold the forms, place in the stamped envelope and return to the director of your teacher aide program.

Please do not place your name on the instruments. All information will be confidential, so please feel free to respond openly and honestly. Please respond to each item. Your contribution to this project is very significant.

For your assistance and cooperation in this study, I am deeply grateful.

Sincerely,

Garland W. McNutt

Item Five: Follow-up Letter to Program Supervisors

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Dear _____:

Please accept this letter as an expression of my gratitude to you and to the staff who participated in my research project. Hopefully, the findings of this study will make the efforts expended worthwhile.

If you would like a copy of this study, I shall be happy to send you one. Again, thank you for your support.

Cordially,

Garland W. McNutt

APPENDIX B

COPY OF DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS

Item One: Instruments Mailed to Judges

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

Research Topic: An Analysis of Role Expectations of Professional Teachers and Nonprofessional Teacher Aides

Introduction: The purpose of this inventory is to gather information which will assist in developing instruments to be administered in the research project named above. The items have been derived from a review of pertinent literature. You are encouraged to add other items which you consider important.

"DIVISION OF LABOR" INVENTORY

Directions: Please indicate by an "X" on the "most technical" space the tasks which you feel should require the skills and training of a professional teacher. Those tasks which should or could be assigned to nonprofessional teacher aides are to be marked by placing an "X" on the "least technical" space. If you feel that the task is difficult to clearly assign either professional or nonprofessional, then mark the middle space, "less technical." Professional teacher, as used in this context, refers to a fully certified teacher. The nonprofessional aide is meant to refer to those people, with less than certification, assisting the teacher.

	Most Technical	Less Technical	Least Technical
Example: Helping with children's wraps.	_____	_____	__x__
1. Developing daily lesson plans.	_____	_____	_____

		Most Technical	Less Technical	Least Technical
2.	Preparing visual aids.	_____	_____	_____
3.	Supervising during test	_____	_____	_____
4.	Supervising field trips.	_____	_____	_____
5.	Presenting subject matter	_____	_____	_____
6.	Arranging classroom. .	_____	_____	_____
7.	Administering first aid.	_____	_____	_____
8.	Grading student papers	_____	_____	_____
9.	Typing	_____	_____	_____
10.	Organizing group for educational television	_____	_____	_____
11.	Designing activities .	_____	_____	_____
12.	Assigning student evaluations.	_____	_____	_____
13.	Duplicating.	_____	_____	_____
14.	Assisting during library period	_____	_____	_____
15.	Planning support materials.	_____	_____	_____
16.	Making progress charts	_____	_____	_____
17.	Recording Information.	_____	_____	_____
18.	Supervising students in halls, playground, etc.	_____	_____	_____
19.	Preparing evaluation instruments.	_____	_____	_____

		Most Technical	Less Technical	Least Technical
20.	Administering disciplinary decisions. . .	_____	_____	_____
21.	Talking with upset student.	_____	_____	_____
22.	Stopping students from fighting	_____	_____	_____
23.	Contributing ideas to planning	_____	_____	_____
24.	Tutoring students. . .	_____	_____	_____
25.	Conducting large group discussion	_____	_____	_____
26.	Explaining assignments.	_____	_____	_____
27.	Helping students change from one activity to another.	_____	_____	_____
28.	Helping students look up information	_____	_____	_____
29.	Explaining school rules to students.	_____	_____	_____
30.	Diagnosing areas of student difficulty . .	_____	_____	_____
31.	Listening to student reports.	_____	_____	_____
32.	Assisting small group activities	_____	_____	_____
33.	Sponsoring academic organizations.	_____	_____	_____
34.	Establishing enthusiasm for subject.	_____	_____	_____
35.	Planning and directing recess period. . . .	_____	_____	_____

		Most Technical	Less Technical	Least Technical
36.	Encouraging attitude improvement.	____	____	____
37.	Ordering materials and supplies	____	____	____
38.	Collecting money	____	____	____
39.	Providing a liaison between student and teacher.	____	____	____
40.	Supervising the learning activity	____	____	____
41.	Disseminating materials.	____	____	____
42.	Home visits.	____	____	____
43.	Inventorying supplies.	____	____	____
44.	Conducting planning conferences.	____	____	____
45.	Providing a liaison service between home and school	____	____	____
46.	Establishing learning environment.	____	____	____
47.	Making arrangements for use of equipment	____	____	____
48.	Providing classroom leadership	____	____	____
49.	Providing Teacher-Parent conference.	____	____	____
50.	Assisting with supervision in the classroom.	____	____	____
51.	Making unique arrangements for the day.	____	____	____

		Most Technical	Less Technical	Least Technical
52.	Assisting individualized study.	_____	_____	_____
53.	Serving on instructional committees	_____	_____	_____
54.	Cooperating in identifying individual problems	_____	_____	_____
55.	Showing students how to clean up and put away materials.	_____	_____	_____
56.	Selecting reference materials.	_____	_____	_____
57.	Filing	_____	_____	_____
58.	Assisting in identifying community resources. .	_____	_____	_____
59.	Interesting a restless student in an available activity	_____	_____	_____
60.	Monitoring	_____	_____	_____

Please list any other tasks which you feel should be included in this inventory.

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

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS INVENTORY

Directions: Below are listed a number of important teacher and/or teacher aide characteristics and behaviors. Please read the list carefully. Add other characteristics and behaviors that you consider important to a teacher and/or a teacher aide.

		Very Important	Important	Less Important
1.	An abundance of physical energy and good health.	_____	_____	_____
2.	Pleasing voice . . .	_____	_____	_____
3.	Self controlled; not easily upset	_____	_____	_____
4.	Establishes good relationship with students	_____	_____	_____
5.	Exhibits promptness by being on time and in doing tasks.	_____	_____	_____
6.	Cooperative.	_____	_____	_____
7.	Exhibits integrity (moral excellence) .	_____	_____	_____
8.	Offers new and useful ideas.	_____	_____	_____
9.	Seeks ways to help students	_____	_____	_____
10.	Dependable	_____	_____	_____
11.	Accurate	_____	_____	_____
12.	Neat in appearance .	_____	_____	_____
13.	Plans effectively. .	_____	_____	_____
14.	Ability to adapt to different situations	_____	_____	_____

		Very Important	Important	Less Important
15.	Displays loyalty to the school	_____	_____	_____
16.	Displays enthusiasm.	_____	_____	_____
17.	Ability to organize.	_____	_____	_____
18.	Ability to communicate.	_____	_____	_____
19.	Is friendly and courteous.	_____	_____	_____
20.	Displays patience. .	_____	_____	_____
21.	Displays sense of humor.	_____	_____	_____
22.	Ability to accept criticism.	_____	_____	_____
23.	Recognizes and admits own mistakes	_____	_____	_____
24.	Encourages students to do their best . .	_____	_____	_____
25.	Gives help willingly	_____	_____	_____
26.		_____	_____	_____
27.		_____	_____	_____
28.		_____	_____	_____
29.		_____	_____	_____
30.		_____	_____	_____

Item Two: Questionnaire Mailed to Teacher Aides

QUESTIONNAIRE-TEACHER AIDES

1. Grade level of assignment_____.

2. Amount of specific training for present position: None____; 1-2 wks____; 2-8 wks____; Other____.

3. Race: Mexican-American____; American-Indian____; Negro____; Caucasian____; Other____.

4. Age: 30 or below____; 30-40____; 40-50____; 50-above_____.

5. Previous experience: 1 yr or less____; 1-2 yrs____; 2-3 yrs____; 3 yrs-above____.

6. Education: Less than High School____; High School____; High School plus____; College Graduate____.

7. Previous salary: Unemployed____; Below $3,000____; $3,000-$4,000____; $4,000-above____.

8. Member of community where your school is located: No____; 1-2 yrs____; 2-3 yrs____; 3 yrs or more____.

9. Would like to become a certified teacher? Yes____; No____.

10. Number of hours employed per day: 1-2____; 2-3____; 4-5____; 6 or more____.

11. Training preferred: One or two day workshops____; One or two week short courses____; College credit____; None____.

Item Three: Instruments Mailed to Teachers and Teacher Aides

DIVISION-OF-LABOR INVENTORY

Directions: Listed below are duties and responsibilities which may be performed by teachers or teacher aides. Please decide for yourself whether you think the job function ought to be that of the teacher or the teacher aide. If you believe a given function to be the responsibility of both groups, make your decision on the basis of which group you would prefer to have that function. Indicate your decision by placing an "X" in the appropriate space.

	Teacher	Teacher Aide
Example: Helping with children's wraps	_____	x
1. Developing daily lesson plans. .	_____	_____
2. Presenting subject matter. . . .	_____	_____
3. Grading student papers	_____	_____
4. Typing	_____	_____
5. Assigning student grades	_____	_____
6. Duplicating.	_____	_____
7. Recording Information.	_____	_____
8. Developing evaluation instruments.	_____	_____
9. Administering disciplinary decisions.	_____	_____
10. Stopping students from fighting.	_____	_____
11. Contributing ideas to planning .	_____	_____
12. Tutoring students.	_____	_____

		Teacher	Teacher Aide
13.	Conducting large group discussion	_____	_____
14.	Diagnosing areas of student difficulty	_____	_____
15.	Assisting small group activities	_____	_____
16.	Collecting money	_____	_____
17.	Passing out materials.	_____	_____
18.	Inventorying supplies.	_____	_____
19.	Making arrangements for use of equipment.	_____	_____
20.	Providing classroom leadership .	_____	_____
21.	Providing Teacher-Parent conference	_____	_____
22.	Assisting with supervision in the classroom.	_____	_____
23.	Assisting individualized study .	_____	_____
24.	Showing students how to clean up and put away materials	_____	_____
25.	Filing	_____	_____
26.	Assisting in identifying community resources.	_____	_____
27.	Interesting a restless student in an available activity . . .	_____	_____

ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS INVENTORY

Directions: This form requires you to rate someone as to how you expect they will perform on the job. Listed are a number of statements about job behavior and personal characteristics. Note that you can assign a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, where number 1 is considered a "very low" evaluation and number 5 is considered a "very high" evaluation.

Please rate the group, which you check below, on the scale provided. Place an "x" along the line at the point which most nearly describes the level at which you think the members of the group will perform. Rate this group as you honestly think they will perform on the job. Your first impression may be your best. Please do one inventory form for teachers and one for teacher aides.

Subject: Indicate the group you are rating by placing an "x" in the appropriate space.

Teacher_____ Teacher Aide_____

Example: Making good decisions. . . .

			x	
1	2	3	4	5
Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High

1. An abundance of physical energy and good health

1	2	3	4	5

2. Pleasing voice . . . .

1	2	3	4	5

3. Self controlled; not easily upset . . . . .

1	2	3	4	5

4. Establishes good relationship with students . .

1	2	3	4	5

5. Exhibits promptness by being on time and in doing tasks. . . . . .

1	2	3	4	5

	1 Very Low	2 Low	3 Average	4 High	5 Very High
6. Cooperative					
7. Exhibits integrity (moral excellence)					
8. Offers new and useful ideas					
9. Seeks ways to help students					
10. Dependable					
11. Accurate					
12. Neat in appearance					
13. Plans effectively					
14. Ability to adapt to different situations					
15. Displays loyalty to the school					
16. Displays enthusiasm					
17. Ability to organize					
18. Ability to communicate					
19. Is friendly and courteous					

	1 Very Low	2 Low	3 Average	4 High	5 Very High
20. Displays sense of humor	1	2	3	4	5
21. Displays patience	1	2	3	4	5
22. Ability to accept criticism	1	2	3	4	5
23. Recognizes and admits own mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
24. Encourages students to do their best	1	2	3	4	5
25. Gives help willingly	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

TASKS AND FUNCTIONS JUDGED "MOST TECHNICAL," "LESS TECHNICAL," AND "LEAST TECHNICAL"

DIVISION-OF-LABOR INVENTORY

"Most Technical" Items

1. Developing daily lesson plans
2. Presenting subject matter
5. Assigning student grades
8. Developing evaluation instruments
9. Administering disciplinary decisions
13. Conducting large group discussions
14. Diagnosing areas of student difficulty
20. Providing classroom leadership
21. Providing teacher-parent conference

"Less Technical" Items

3. Grading student papers
10. Stopping students from fighting
11. Contributing ideas to planning
12. Tutoring students
15. Assisting small group activities
22. Assisting with supervision in the classroom
26. Assisting in identifying community resources
27. Interesting a restless student in an available activity

"Least Technical" Items

4. Typing
6. Duplicating
7. Recording information
16. Collecting money
17. Passing out materials
18. Inventorying supplies
19. Making arrangements for use of equipment
24. Showing students how to clean up and put away materials
25. Filing

APPENDIX D

DATA OF THIS STUDY

Item One: Item-by-Item Data From The Division-of-Labor Inventory

DIVISION-OF-LABOR INVENTORY

Item	Teacher Aide		Teacher	
	Own Position	Counter Position	Own Position	Counter Position
1	0	57	57	0
2	1	56	57	0
3	47	10	27	30
4	56	1	0	57
5	4	53	57	0
6	57	0	0	57
7	35	22	27	30
8	9	48	56	1
9	3	54	57	0
10	26	31	43	14
11	37	20	43	14
12	35	22	31	26
13	6	51	57	0
14	4	53	57	0
15	49	8	14	43
16	37	20	10	47
17	52	5	7	50
18	49	8	7	50
19	45	12	12	45
20	1	56	56	1
21	1	56	57	0
22	51	6	22	35
23	47	10	21	36
24	50	7	9	48
25	56	1	1	56
26	39	18	25	32
27	41	16	25	32

Item Two: Data From the Division-of-Labor Instrument by Subject

DIVISION-OF-LABOR ASSIGNMENTS TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION BY SUBJECTS

SUBJECT	PROFESSIONAL POSITION		SUBJECT	PROFESSIONAL POSITION	
	Teacher	Teacher Aide		Teacher	Teacher Aide
1	11	16	30	15	11
2	14	16	31	13	11
3	15	9	32	13	10
4	11	14	33	14	11
5	17	11	34	17	8
6	18	15	35	14	16
7	16	17	36	14	13
8	19	16	37	9	11
9	19	11	38	13	10
10	17	10	39	24	11
11	17	20	40	14	13
12	15	10	41	14	10
13	11	14	42	14	8
14	20	14	43	19	8
15	13	13	44	16	9
16	11	14	45	14	15
17	13	16	46	13	12
18	13	8	47	19	11
19	12	9	48	14	16
20	15	11	49	15	13
21	14	9	50	17	16
22	11	12	51	13	10
23	18	17	52	15	9
24	11	14	53	13	13
25	14	10	54	14	13
26	18	12	55	15	15
27	16	11	56	10	9
28	13	12	57	10	17
29	17	11			

Item Three: Data From the Division-of-Labor Instrument by Technical Categories

ASSIGNMENTS ON DIVISION-OF-LABOR ITEMS WHEN EVALUATING THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

SUBJECT	"MOST TECHNICAL"		"LESS TECHNICAL"		"LEAST TECHNICAL"	
	Teacher	Teacher Aide	Teacher	Teacher Aide	Teacher	Teacher Aide
1	9	8	2	7	0	2
2	9	9	3	6	2	1
3	9	9	5	0	1	0
4	8	9	2	5	1	1
5	9	9	8	1	0	1
6	9	9	8	6	1	0
7	9	9	7	6	0	2
8	9	9	8	5	2	2
9	9	9	9	2	1	0
10	9	9	8	1	0	0
11	9	9	7	8	1	3
12	9	6	6	4	0	0
13	9	9	2	5	0	0
14	9	9	7	4	4	1
15	9	9	4	2	0	2
16	9	9	2	3	0	0
17	9	9	4	2	0	5
18	9	8	3	0	1	0
19	9	8	3	1	0	1
20	9	8	6	2	0	1
21	9	8	4	1	1	0
22	9	9	2	2	0	1
23	9	9	8	6	1	2
24	8	9	3	4	0	1
25	9	9	3	1	2	0
26	9	8	7	4	2	0
27	9	9	4	0	3	2
28	9	8	3	2	1	2
29	9	9	5	2	3	0
30	9	9	4	1	2	1
31	9	8	3	1	1	2
32	9	9	3	1	1	0
33	9	8	3	1	2	2
34	9	8	4	0	4	0
35	9	8	4	3	1	5
36	9	8	4	2	1	3
37	9	9	0	1	0	1

SUBJECT	"MOST TECHNICAL"		"LESS TECHNICAL"		"LEAST TECHNICAL"	
	Teacher	Teacher Aide	Teacher	Teacher Aide	Teacher	Teacher Aide
38	9	9	3	1	1	0
39	9	8	9	1	6	2
40	9	9	2	1	3	3
41	9	9	5	0	0	1
42	9	7	4	0	1	1
43	9	7	6	0	4	1
44	9	9	5	0	2	0
45	9	9	3	4	2	2
46	9	9	3	0	1	3
47	9	5	9	2	1	4
48	9	9	4	4	1	3
49	9	9	4	2	2	2
50	9	8	5	5	3	3
51	9	8	4	2	0	0
52	9	8	5	0	1	1
53	9	9	4	4	0	0
54	9	9	3	3	2	1
55	9	9	3	6	3	2
56	9	8	0	1	1	0
57	9	9	1	2	0	4

Item Four: Item-by-Item Data From the On-The-Job Expectations Instrument

ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS INVENTORY

	Nonprofessional Position - Highs - Professional Position			
	Teacher Aide	Teacher	Teacher Aide	Teacher
Item				
1	43	37	43	39
2	36	35	42	33
3	37	35	38	38
4	43	44	46	48
5	31	45	47	46
6	47	51	47	49
7	47	47	51	45
8	15	35	37	41
9	33	35	42	46
10	52	50	52	50
11	41	41	43	41
12	43	44	49	39
13	35	30	42	39
14	35	40	42	39
15	49	46	49	47
16	40	39	37	45
17	29	31	44	34
18	31	33	41	41
19	47	44	48	49
20	37	42	38	46
21	39	42	45	42
22	35	28	35	34
23	38	29	34	37
24	42	43	48	52
25	49	45	50	49

Item Five: Data From the On-The-Job Expectations Instrument for the Professional Position

ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS "HIGH" ASSIGNMENTS TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION

SUBJECT	PROFESSIONAL POSITION		SUBJECT	PROFESSIONAL POSITION	
	Teacher	Teacher Aide		Teacher	Teacher Aide
1	23	25	30	3	25
2	25	25	31	13	25
3	15	16	32	24	25
4	15	24	33	24	25
5	16	24	34	12	25
6	12	24	35	20	21
7	11	5	36	23	16
8	20	21	37	24	20
9	25	13	38	25	25
10	25	24	39	24	24
11	14	12	40	13	24
12	12	19	41	16	24
13	7	16	42	18	25
14	19	23	43	24	21
15	23	25	44	24	25
16	23	6	45	15	12
17	25	9	46	7	11
18	16	25	47	25	11
19	10	25	48	12	6
20	20	24	49	24	18
21	16	0	50	19	23
22	25	25	51	22	20
23	14	7	52	23	9
24	12	24	53	25	25
25	25	15	54	18	16
26	5	20	55	15	8
27	24	25	56	20	24
28	19	23	57	23	22
29	23	17			

Item Six: Data From the On-The-Job Expectations for the Nonprofessional Position

ON-THE-JOB EXPECTATIONS "HIGH" ASSIGNMENTS TO THE NONPROFESSIONAL POSITION

SUBJECT	NONPROFESSIONAL POSITION		SUBJECT	NONPROFESSIONAL POSITION	
	Teacher	Teacher Aide		Teacher	Teacher Aide
1	13	25	30	7	20
2	22	24	31	10	21
3	20	25	32	23	25
4	20	24	33	25	24
5	0	25	34	10	16
6	21	23	35	12	23
7	14	5	36	23	0
8	22	18	37	10	17
9	18	15	38	25	14
10	19	25	39	19	21
11	19	7	40	11	19
12	12	12	41	25	21
13	0	10	42	17	25
14	16	19	43	24	13
15	11	25	44	25	24
16	25	7	45	10	18
17	20	5	46	24	12
18	16	25	47	12	23
19	18	25	48	8	9
20	16	24	49	24	25
21	17	2	50	25	8
22	17	25	51	22	12
23	10	17	52	22	12
24	9	22	53	25	7
25	18	15	54	21	25
26	18	16	55	23	8
27	24	25	56	15	11
28	11	16	57	23	15
29	23	19			

Item Seven: Data For the Nonprofessional Position by Selected Variables

ASSIGNMENTS BY NONPROFESSIONALS TO THE PROFESSIONAL POSITION BY CATEGORIES ACCORDING TO SELECTED VARIABLES

	CATEGORIES					
VARIABLES	Pro	Most Tech	Less Tech	Least Tech	Low Pro	Low Nonpro
RACE						
Caucasian	349	361	104	47	248	330
Other	189	124	36	30	79	102
PREVIOUS TRAINING						
Little or None	366	241	87	41	162	200
Some	335	245	51	36	165	232
AGE						
Below 40	476	335	98	44	196	306
Above 40	225	150	42	31	131	126
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL						
H.S. or below	310	207	75	43	171	209
Above H.S.	378	278	65	34	156	223
PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE						
1 yr. or less	275	181	63	33	86	157
More than 1 yr.	417	295	77	44	190	275
ECONOMIC STATUS						
$3,000 or less	581	408	102	67	266	347
More than 3,000	125	77	38	10	62	85