

THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF THE
GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
James Leo McNally
1966



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT
AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

presented by

JAMES LEO MCNALLY

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Edward B. Blackman
Major professor

Date June 13, 1966

ABSTRACT

THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

by James Leo McNally

The Problem

The major null hypothesis in the study was:

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

The minor null hypothesis was:

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants from different areas of general academic orientation hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

Methods and Procedures

A random sample was chosen of undergraduates taking courses in one of seven departments and a college of Michigan State University (180 undergraduates were selected). A sample of graduate teaching assistants who had responsibility for a discussion or recitation section of a multiple-section course were chosen from the same seven departments and the college of the University (180 graduate teaching

assistants were chosen). The departments and the college in question were grouped according to general areas of academic orientation, namely, behavioral sciences, humanities, and natural sciences (mathematics).

An instrument concerning various expectations for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant was constructed. The instrument contained three sub-scales of nineteen, thirteen, and eleven items respectively, and the last item on the questionnaire was of a free response type. There was a total of 44 items on the questionnaire. The sub-scales were:

1. Instruction--The items refer to classroom procedures and classroom conduct of the graduate teaching assistant.
2. Advisement --The items refer to the assistance that a graduate teaching assistant might render (outside of the classroom situation) in all matters pertaining to a student's academic program and progress.
3. Counseling-Personal Relations --The items refer to interpersonal relations between a graduate teaching assistant and his students in matters not strictly academic.

One of five responses was possible for each item of the questionnaire except the last one. The responses and their assigned numerical weights were:

Absolutely Must (5), Preferably Should (4),
May or May Not (3), Preferably Should Not (2)
and Absolutely Must Not (1).

The instrument was submitted to the total sample of 360 persons in the winter term, 1966. A total of 78% of the population answered and returned the questionnaires.

Analysis of the Data

The initial application of the chi square statistic to the data indicated that a collapsing of response categories was necessary. Consequently, the new response categories showed that one of three possible responses could be given. The new response categories and their assigned numerical weights were:

"Preferably Should" or "Agree" (4), "May or May Not," (3) and "Preferably Should Not" or "Disagree" (2).

The chi square statistic when applied to the major hypothesis revealed significant differences in expectations on eight of the nineteen items of sub-scale one (a weakness in frequencies for the chi square cells of two of the items was noted), on three of the thirteen items of sub-scale two (a weakness in frequencies for the chi square cells of one of the items was noted), and on four of the eleven items of sub-scale three. The .05 level of significance was used. A total of fifteen of the forty-three items indicated significant differences by the use of the chi square statistic. Frequency and percentage of observation were also reported for each item.

The minor hypothesis could not be tested in terms of chi square analysis. The small sample size and erratic distribution of responses distorted any chi square significance. The findings of this hypothesis were consequently reported in terms of frequency and percentage of responses to each item. Consequently, subjective observational findings were reported.

Conclusions

1. For the major hypothesis, there were significant differences in expectations held by graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.
2. For the major hypothesis, there were more significant differences expressed for expectations concerning the sub-scale "Instruction" than for the other two sub-scales.
3. The graduate teaching assistant is not viewed primarily as a student by undergraduates.
4. For the minor hypothesis, graduate teaching assistants from different areas hold differences of opinion for some aspects of their instructional role.
5. Graduate teaching assistants preferred to be viewed both as faculty and students.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING
ASSISTANT AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

James Leo McNally

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1966

9-12-60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the result of the consideration and cooperation of many individuals. To these people the writer is particularly grateful.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the members of his Guidance Committee. He is especially grateful to his major advisor, Dr. Edward B. Blackman, for his wise counsel and patience throughout the course of the study. The writer extends to him deepest appreciation. The writer is also grateful to Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker for his interest and assistance in the development of the dissertation. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Walter F. Johnson for his suggestions and commentaries on certain aspects of the study. The writer also wishes to acknowledge Dr. John Useem of the Sociology Department.

Finally, the writer is greatly indebted to his wife Shirley for her love, understanding, encouragement and assistance during the writing of this dissertation and throughout the course of the doctoral program. To her he expresses his deepest gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. THE PROBLEM: ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE. . .	1
Statement of the Problem.	7
Importance of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	9
Limitations of the Study.	10
Overview.	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Graduate Teaching Assistants.	12
Studies on graduate teaching assistants	12
Teaching and Instructional rank.	14
Occurrence of the graduate teaching experience	16
Role.	17
Literature on role theory.	17
Studies on role analysis	21
Socialization in graduate school departments.	23
Summary	24
III. SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES.	26
Sample.	26
Selection of undergraduates.	27
Selection of graduate teaching assistants	28
Instrumentation	29
Statistical Hypotheses.	32
Analysis of the Data.	32
Summary	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

CHAPTER	Page
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	35
Major Hypothesis	35
Sub-scale 1: Instruction	35
Summary: Sub-scale 1	42
Sub-scale 2: Advisement	43
Summary: Sub-scale 2	48
Sub-scale 3: Counseling-Personal Relations	49
Summary: Sub-scale 3	53
Minor Hypothesis	53
Sub-scale 1: Instruction	54
Summary: Sub-scale 1	61
Sub-scale 2: Advisement	63
Summary: Sub-scale 2	67
Sub-scale 3: Counseling-Personal Relations	69
Summary: Sub-scale 3	73
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	75
The Problem	75
The Design and Procedure of the Study	76
Analysis	76
Conclusions	79
Discussion	80
Recommendations	91
Implications for Further Research	92
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDICES	100

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Traditional areas of study and respective departments.	26
2. Departments and courses from which the undergraduate population was drawn.	27
3. Nature of the sample and percent of sample returning the questionnaire.	30
4. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on sub-scale 1, "Instruction" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants.	37
5. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on sub-scale 2, "Advisement" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants.	45
6. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on sub-scale 3, "Counseling-Personal Relations" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants . .	50
7. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 1, "Instruction" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general-academic orientation	55
8. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 2, "Advisement" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general-academic orientation	64
9. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 3, "Counseling-Personal Relations" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general-academic orientation	70

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A Trend in the Use of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Paid from the General Fund.	101
B Letter to Graduate Teaching Assistants.	103
C Letter to Undergraduates.	105
D Questionnaire to Determine the Instructional Role of the Graduate Teaching Assistant	107

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE

The American college and university finds itself in a period of unprecedented growth. In the last five years enrollments have risen dramatically, and the projections to 1970 indicate a continuation of this growth pattern.¹ Michigan State University has been no exception to this pattern. Since 1961 the University's undergraduate enrollment has increased by 10,300 students, a 55 percent increase.² Growth of this nature necessitates an increase in staff and teaching faculty. Herein lies a major concern. A current problem facing higher education today is the shortage of "qualified" teaching faculty in light of increased enrollments. The term "qualified," according to those in academic circles implies possession of the Ph.D. degree. Many educational journal articles have been written about the faculty

¹There were 3,474,000 students enrolled in American colleges and universities in 1961. There were 4,857,000 enrolled in 1965 and 6,391,000 projected for 1970 (undergraduate totals). The figures were taken from, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1973-74, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965 edition.

²The undergraduate on-campus enrollment for fall term 1961 listed 18,730 students in attendance. For fall term 1965 the figure was 29,030. Annual Report, Office of the Registrar, Michigan State University, 1961-62 and fall term 1965.

shortage to the point that it has become common knowledge.³

Faced with such a shortage, administrators have sought better utilization of teaching resources. Attention has been given to independent study programs, teaching machines, television, films, and increased use of teaching assistants.⁴ The use of teaching assistants has long been employed by many larger colleges and universities. (At Michigan State graduate students are almost exclusively used as teaching assistants as opposed to undergraduates.)

Teaching assistants are also used for other purposes such as relieving faculty of routine chores, providing financial assistance for graduate students, and training prospective teachers.⁵

At the outset of the school year 1957-58, the full time equivalent of "B" faculty paid from the general fund at Michigan State University was 204.9.⁶ For the school year 1961-62 the figure was 364.2, while at the outset of fall term 1965 the figure had risen to 550.3. Since the majority

³One of the more recent is by David G. Brown and Jay Tontz, "The Present Shortage of College Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, 8:435-36, April, 1966.

Russell Cooper notes that ". . . 75 percent of those entering the teaching profession are short of the doctorate." See his article, "The College Teaching Crisis," Journal of Higher Education, 35:6-11, January, 1964.

⁴See Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources, The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1959.

⁵Ibid., p. 45.

⁶Full time equivalent is thus defined by the Office of Institutional Research at the University: "The percentage of

of "B" faculty appointments are for half time, it would be necessary to multiply by two to get an idea of the total head count. Such a figure would be in the neighborhood of 1,000 individuals. Furthermore, the magnitude of this number has even greater importance when one considers the fact that in a discussion or recitation section, a "B" faculty member may be responsible for at least twenty-five students per section. One need not elaborate on the point that such faculty members interacting with students consequently loom as a significant force in undergraduate education. Moreover, the number of "B" faculty alone at Michigan State University exceeds the enrollment of many small colleges.

The administration at Michigan State University is not unmindful of the increased use of this type of faculty member. A recent study by the Educational Development Program at the University on departments making use of assistant instructors and graduate students as teachers found some confusion existing in this general area.⁷ It was noted that,

full time equivalent salary paid from the general fund budget of the 'department' is recorded for each individual appointed to that 'department.' Total full time equivalent counts are the sums of the percentages divided by 100%." "B" faculty includes faculty members not under the tenure system. Included in this category are lecturers, assistant instructors, and graduate teaching assistants. See Appendix A for a general trend in the use of full time equivalent "B" faculty over the past several years.

⁷Educational Development Program, "A Study of Departments Making Major Use of Assistant Instructors and Graduate Students as Teachers," October, 1964.

from department to department, "extreme variations" existed in the definition of the rank assistant instructor, the amount of responsibility assigned to the teaching assistant, the coordination of multiple section--multiple instructor courses, and the degree of supervision given to graduate teaching assistants. Several recommendations were subsequently enumerated among which the following were listed:⁸

The University should redefine the ranks below the level of Instructor (not within the tenure system) to differentiate among those with different levels of experience and qualifications.

The University and College should define the amount and kind of responsibility to be given teaching assistants.

The University should develop a set of standards to assure balanced development between undergraduate enrollments, graduate enrollments, graduate teaching assistants, and senior faculty graduate advisors.

In light of the preceding, a study of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant would be most appropriate for the further examination of the graduate teaching assistant within the University community. Moreover, a study of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant is prompted by other considerations.

Graduate teaching assistants are becoming more and more responsible for undergraduate education, for it is in this

⁸The recommendations were contained in a memorandum to Provost Howard R. Neville from the Educational Policies Committee concerning "The Use of Teaching Assistants at Michigan State University," November 13, 1964.

area that they are primarily used. However, the shortage of "qualified" faculty is not the only consideration in using graduate teaching assistants for instruction. Some full time faculty members are reluctant to teach undergraduates, while others find research more appealing than teaching. As things turn out, the graduate teaching assistant may well be the undergraduate's main source of contact with the academic side of the University especially in his first two years. In this connection, concern has been raised by the administration when instruction by the graduate teaching assistant is not closely supervised. Furthermore, the graduate teaching assistant himself is in a rather awkward position. The nature of his activities may find him viewed primarily as a faculty member under some circumstances and as a student under others. The extent to which the undergraduate is sensitive to the graduate teaching assistant's position may well influence the undergraduate's attitude toward the classroom situation.

The graduate teaching assistant, in the final analysis, is in pursuit of a degree himself. He is subject to various pressures such as his teaching obligations, his own course work, and a limited income.⁹ In many cases the progress

⁹See James A. Davis, Stipends and Spouses: The Finances of American Arts and Science Graduate Students, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

toward his own degree is very slow.¹⁰ In reality, his teaching experience could well be very meaningful, especially if it were viewed as an internship. However, some feel that they are being "used" by the department or the University as a form of cheap labor. In many instances their status and role are poorly defined. A by-product of such a condition is often discontent and unrest, and there is evidence that these, in extreme forms, can have provocative results. Graduate teaching assistants were particularly active in the recent Berkeley disturbances:

Less publicized but in many ways more important than the sit-ins was the student strike which followed it. The strike was organized by graduate teaching assistants, and, though no numbers are entirely trustworthy, it appears to have had the support of enough undergraduates and faculty members to bring between 60 and 85 percent of Berkeley's classes to a halt for two days. . . . A union of graduate teaching and research assistants, affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers is one of the most significant results of the fall's events. The union, which has roughly 500 members, is preparing to negotiate with faculty departments on a wide range of bread and butter issues affecting working conditions, and may continue action on political fronts as well.¹¹

Undergraduates are not satisfied with the present situation either. In reacting to the "multiversity" drift of higher education, they lament the fact that in many

¹⁰See Benjamin F. Wright, "The Ph.D. Stretch-Out and the Scholar-Teacher," in Arthur Traxler (ed.) Vital Issues in Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1957.

¹¹See Elinor Langer, "Crisis at Berkeley (1) The Civil War," Science, 148:199-200.

instances they do not have regular faculty as instructors, but rather are subject to graduate teaching assistants whose major concern, the undergraduates believe, is their own progress toward their own degrees. One particular undergraduate was apparently affected by a graduate teaching assistant when she wrote:

I doubt that the records have been changed but I am not in _____ any longer. It also might interest you to know that the reason I am not is partly because of an extremely inadequate graduate student I had for my recitation section of _____.¹²

It would seem, therefore, to be in the best interests of the University to define carefully the role of graduate teaching assistant. A study of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant could be utilized by the University in the formulation of a campus-wide definition of the role of the graduate teaching assistant. Undergraduate instruction, the graduate teaching assistant, and the University stand to gain from such an action.

Statement of the Problem

The general problem of this study is to examine the nature of the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant at Michigan State University.

¹²These unsolicited comments were written on the back of a questionnaire that was used in collecting data for this dissertation.

The general assumption involved is that the two groups have different expectations for some dimensions of the role and, consequently, some confusion and misunderstanding exist. The main hypothesis is:

Graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold different expectations for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

A minor hypothesis is:

Graduate teaching assistants, depending upon their general area of academic orientation, hold expectations for their instructional role which are different from those of graduate teaching assistants in other areas.¹³

Importance of the Study

Because of the differences in expectations as to the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant and lack of definition of it by the University, it is suggested that undergraduates may not be receiving the kind of instruction that they might be given if the role of the graduate teaching assistant were explicitly defined. Inadequate definition of the role and the divergence of expectations between the groups engender an environment which does not enhance the instructional process. In addition, it is suggested that the graduate's teaching experience is not as meaningful as it could be to the graduate assistant because of inadequate definition of the role. Consequently, what

¹³The hypotheses will be stated in terms for statistical analysis in Chapter III.

could be a profitable internship experience turns out to be something much less in most instances.

There is no attempt to solve problems in this study. Rather, an attempt is made to provide more information and insight into areas of agreement and difference regarding the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant as perceived by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants themselves.

Definition of Terms

1. Undergraduate--A freshman, sophomore junior, or senior student enrolled full time on campus in a degree program at Michigan State University during the fall term, 1965.
2. Graduate Teaching Assistant-- A student who is pursuing the master's degree or the doctor's degree and has or had teaching responsibility for recitation or discussion sections in a multiple section course. (This group also includes those with the titled rank of Assistant Instructor.)
3. Role-- Set of expectations applied to an occupant in a particular social position.
4. Expectation-- An evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position.
5. Consensus-- Refers to the degree of similarity or agreement of expectations.
6. Conflict-- A condition in which the incumbent of a position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations within a system of social relationships.

Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations to the study that should be noted. Of particular concern is the assumption that the respective departments under a general area, e.g., behavioral sciences, are truly representative of that area. The titles of Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Natural Sciences are rather broad and their main service is to provide one with a general image of an area of academic orientation. This concern over these titles is more relevant to the minor hypothesis of the study where graduate teaching assistants from different areas of general academic orientation are being investigated.

Of additional concern is the fact that there is only one department listed under the general area of Natural Sciences and that is Mathematics. There are two reasons for this, (1) the study pertained to graduate teaching assistants who have or had responsibility for discussion or recitation section of a course. The Mathematics department seemed to fit this criterion best because other departments, such as Chemistry, Zoology, Botany and Plant Pathology used assistants for laboratory sections, (2) the main focus of the study was to look at undergraduates, graduate teaching assistants and graduate teaching assistants by general academic area. No interest or particular attempt was made to identify specific departments. Consequently, caution should be taken when reviewing the term "Natural Sciences."

With respect to the analysis of the data, it should be noted that a few items pertaining to the major hypothesis indicated a weakness, in terms of observations, in the chi square cells. Therefore, of the statistically significant items three had this type of deficiency. Moreover, with respect to the minor hypothesis, the deficiency of observation in the chi square cells distorted the results to the point that the use of the chi square statistic was abandoned. As a result of this situation, frequencies and percentages of observations were reported.

Overview

In Chapter Two the pertinent literature is reviewed. The first half of the chapter is concerned with literature pertaining to graduate teaching assistants, while the remaining half is concerned with the literature and studies that have been done in the area of role theory. In Chapter Three there is a detailed description of the sample and procedures used in the study. Found in Chapter Four are the presentation, analysis, and summaries of the results gained from the administration of the questionnaire. The summary, conclusions, discussions, and implications of the results are found in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Graduate Teaching Assistants

Studies on Graduate Teaching Assistants. A search of the literature for studies and articles pertaining to graduate teaching assistants leads one to conclude that not much investigation has been done in this area. However, at Michigan State University, a rather notable study was undertaken by the Educational Development Program.¹⁴ During the fall term of 1963, fifteen departments, whose teaching assistants accounted for more than 20% of each department's student credit hour production, were examined. The chairman of each department was interviewed in depth. It was found that the rank of graduate assistant is defined with consistency by the departments, but that the rank of assistant instructor is defined in a variety of ways.¹⁵ Some departments do not use the rank at all, some use it occasionally,

¹⁴Educational Development Program, op. cit.

¹⁵An earlier study by the Office of Institutional Research showed that in spite of the fact that, "the position of assistant instructor was introduced as a useful category for the hiring of temporary instructional personnel not under tenure rules. . . . it has become apparent that vacancies at the instructorship level are often being filled by graduate degree candidates." Rodney Hartnett, "A Study of the Use of Assistant Instructors," Office of Institutional Research, June 28, 1963. (unpublished)

and some use it to a great extent. In actuality, an individual with the rank of graduate teaching assistant in one department may be doing exactly the same type of work as a colleague with the rank of assistant instructor in his department or another department.¹⁶ Moreover, there were other significant findings. Variations were found with respect to supervision of the graduate teaching assistant:

The variation in the amount of supervision provided in different courses by the departments surveyed is extremely broad and very difficult to codify. Very few of the departments interviewed employ a careful system of graduate teaching supervision. In most cases supervision is at present the responsibility of the senior faculty member in charge of the course. Thus the supervision is almost completely dependent upon the attitude of this senior faculty member.¹⁷

Furthermore, several reasons for using graduate teaching assistants were also listed:

- training of graduate students in teaching
- provision of relief for full time faculty
- need to support graduate students
- need to support growing graduate programs
- lack of financial resources
- growing shortage of qualified senior faculty
- sharp expansion of undergraduate enrollments.

In conclusion, the investigators noted that they became especially concerned as to how graduate teaching assistants are used and about their capabilities. A consequence of the study was a listing of eleven recommendations. Three of

¹⁶A consequence of this situation was that graduate teaching assistants and assistant instructors were, for this study, considered collectively under the title graduate teaching assistant.

¹⁷Educational Development Program, op. cit., p. 5.

these recommendations have been previously cited on page 4 of Chapter I.

In a more recent study at Michigan State University Nuermberger examined over 300 graduate assistants regarding their assistantship experience with the University.¹⁸

He noted:

Most assistants considered themselves either as respected interns or full-fledged peers in their departments. However, 16% saw themselves as "hired help," 6% as "clerks," and 11% as "just another graduate student." Considerable bitterness was expressed by some who placed themselves in these last categories.¹⁹

It was further noted that some graduate assistants never became involved in the duties listed as primary for their classification.²⁰

Teaching and Instructional Rank. There is reason to believe that college teaching is not independent of a given faculty member's academic rank. Guthrie, surveying students and faculty, noted in a study on the evaluation of college teaching that, "In the opinion of students, full professors are not better teachers than assistant professors."²¹

¹⁸Robert M. Nuermberger, "Reactions of MSU Graduate Students to Their Experience as Graduate Assistants," Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, May, 1966.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 3.

²⁰It should be made explicit that the study pertained to graduate students in general and not exclusively to graduate teaching assistants.

²¹E. R. Guthrie, "The Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Record, 30:109-115, April, 1949, p. 113.

It was pointed out that a full professor may lack enthusiasm, and that increasing distractions and non-teaching responsibilities may further impede his effectiveness.

In a study at the State University of Iowa, Stuit and Ebel found that students perceived differences in emphasis within the various ranks of the teaching faculty.²² The authors related:

It is interesting to note that in this sample of students and instructors, the students credit full professors with more knowledge of their subjects, and with more interest in it, but less tolerance and less helpfulness than instructors of other ranks. Similar comparisons may be made in various categories for other academic ranks, and for instructors of courses at various levels.²³

Some proponents of the use of graduate teaching assistants claim that their enthusiasm and the recency of their own undergraduate experiences help them to relate better to students in their classes. A study by DeLisle, which did not pertain to instruction but rather to advising, gave a glimpse of such thinking:²⁴

The graduate academic advisors are aware that some undergraduates might feel disadvantaged by having a graduate student for an academic advisor because of his inexperience, lack of authoritative knowledge of the field, and lack of continuity in his period of service. Other students, however, welcome the association with the graduate student in this capacity. They feel a closer identification with him in age

²²Dewey Stuit and Robert Ebel, "Instructor Rating at a Large State University," College and University, 27:247-254.

²³Ibid., p. 253.

²⁴Frances H DeLisle, "A Study of Undergraduate Academic Advising: A Preliminary Report," Office of Institutional Research, Michigan State University, May, 1965.

usually, and in the recency of his undergraduate experiences.²⁵

Several experimental studies on the use of teaching assistants are reported in a volume sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education.²⁶ The descriptions are somewhat brief but they do lend support to the value to be gained in the utilization of teaching assistants.

Occurrence of the Graduate Teaching Experience. The graduate teaching experience is not an uncommon one for graduate students. Tucker, Gottlieb, and Pease noted in their study that 60% of the Ph.D. recipients had teaching assistantships during their course of study, while 48% of the drop outs had the same experience. When both groups were considered together, a total of 54% of the graduate students held teaching assistantships.²⁷ Davis and his colleagues found in their study that, "Four out of ten (41%) students had a duty stipend. Teaching assistantships were twice as common as research assistantships, a little more than one out of four students holding a teaching assistantship."²⁸ Although the teaching assistantship is rather

²⁵Ibid., p. 77.

²⁶Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources, op. cit., pp. 44-49.

²⁷Allan Tucker, David Gottlieb, and John Pease, "Attrition of Graduate Students at the Ph.D. Level in the Traditional Arts and Sciences," Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 1146, Publication #8, 1964, Office of Research Development and the Graduate School, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan.

²⁸James A. Davis, op. cit., p. 59.

common, a question which presents itself is, What is the quality of this experience?

Role

Literature on Role Theory. A search of the literature on role theory reveals several definitions for the term role. It has been discussed in terms of "normative culture patterns," i.e., with reference not to actual behavior of an occupant of a position but to a behavioral standard. Linton describes role as consisting of ". . . attitudes, values and behavior ascribed by the society to any and all persons occupying this status."²⁹ Newcomb agrees with this notion and refers to role as the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position.³⁰ The main thought to be considered in both definitions is what a person should do.

Another interpretation views role as an individual's definition of his situation with reference to his and others' social position. Essentially, this conception, as presented by Parsons, interprets role as a mode of organization of actor's orientation to a situation. "A role . . . is a sector of the total orientation system of an individual actor

²⁹Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality, New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1945, p. 77.

³⁰Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology, New York: The Dryden Press, 1951, p. 280.

which is organized about expectations in relation to a particular interaction context. . . ."31

A third major interpretation is advanced by Davis. "How an individual actually performs in a given position, as distinct from how he is supposed to perform, we call his role."³² Gross, Mason, and McEachern note that:

A role defined in this way does not refer to normative patterns for what actors should do, nor to an actor's orientation to his situation, but to what actors actually do as position occupants.³³

Another line of thinking focuses on the reciprocal nature of behavior and views role in a context of interaction. In this sense Sarbin defines role as "a patterned sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation."³⁴

There is a tendency to conclude, in light of the preceding discussion, that confusion is the order of the day when discussing the concept of role. This is not so, for Gross and his colleagues make the point that, for the most part, three basic ideas appear in the majority of the conceptualization, namely that individuals: (1) in social

³¹Talcott Parsons, The Social System, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951, pp. 38-39.

³²Kingsley Davis, Human Society, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948, p. 90.

³³Neal Gross, Ward Mason, Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958, p. 14.

³⁴Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I, Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954, p. 225.

locations (2) behave (3) with reference to expectations.³⁵

The basic idea of expectations with respect to role is further elaborated upon by Gross, Mason and McEachern:

People do not behave in a random manner. Their behavior is influenced to some extent by their own expectations and those of others in the group or society in which they are participants. . . . Regardless of their deviation, expectations are presumed by most role theorists to be an essential ingredient in any formula for predicting social behavior. Human conduct is in part a function of expectations.³⁶

Moreover, Bates and Videbeck concur when they write that

". . . the behavior of a number of people in interaction is at least in part a function of their own expectations of what behavior should be."³⁷

Imperative in any discussion of the term role is the concept of status. To some sociologists they are inseparable. Linton regards status as a collection of rights and duties and role as the dynamic aspect of status. "When the individual puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role."³⁸ Brookover discussed the status-role relationship in his recent book:

³⁵Gross et al., op. cit., p. 17.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 17-18.

³⁷Alan Bates and Richard Videbeck, "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," Sociometry, Vol. 22, 1:1-11, March, 1959.

³⁸Ralph Linton, The Study of Man, New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936, pp. 113-114.

Status may be defined as the expectations which various persons or groups interacting with a particular position hold for any occupant of that position. . . . The expectation held for a specific person occupying a position may be different in some respects from those held for another occupant of the same position. . . . These specific expectations we term role. We distinguish role from status . . . by identifying it as the expectations which persons or groups hold for a particular occupant or actor in a status.³⁹

One could conclude the discussion of status and role by saying that there are no roles without statuses and no statuses without roles.

An important consideration pertaining to role-expectations is the fact that although some participants in a social system do have some agreement among themselves on expectations, others do not. The problem then becomes one of to what extent or degree. Gross and others write:

In contrast to the holistic approach so frequently found in social science literature, that is, that a role is an indivisible unit of rights and duties ascribed by a group or society, theoretically grounded empirical inquiries are needed to determine how much agreement there is on the expectations for the behavior of position incumbents.⁴⁰

The holistic approach and the concept of agreement-disagreement is further debated by Levinson:

The prevailing image of the organization has been that of a mechanical apparatus operating impersonally once it is set in motion by administrative edict. . . . The individual member is regarded as a cog in the apparatus, what he thinks and does being determined by

³⁹Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education, New York: American Book Company, 1964, p. 323.

⁴⁰Gross et al., op. cit., p. 43.

requirements in the organizational structure. . . . To assume that what the organization requires, and what its members actually think and do, comprise a single, unified whole is severely to restrict our comprehension of organizational dynamics and change. It is my thesis, then, that the unitary conception of social role is unrealistic and theoretically constricting.⁴¹

Studies on Role Analysis. Several studies on role analysis have been completed in which the basic approach was not holistic or unitary in orientation, but rather emphasized segmentation. Role segmentation, according to Gross and others, is concerned with "the classification of a group or set of expectations that individuals may hold for an incumbent of a specified position."⁴²

A study of the role of the enrollment officer at Michigan State University was conducted by Nonnamaker.⁴³ By using a sixty item questionnaire, he compared the responses of staff members representing Education, Social Science, Mathematics and Science, and Professional Counselors with those of students in Education, Social Science, and Mathematics and Science. He concluded that there is no one set of expectations for the enrollment officer at Michigan

⁴¹Daniel Levinson, "Role, Personality, and Social Structure in the Organization Setting," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58:170-180, 1959, pp. 172-73.

⁴²Gross et al., op. cit., p. 61.

⁴³Eldon R. Nonnamaker, "The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University," Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan, 1959.

State University. No significant differences were found among the student groups, an indication that students tended to have similar expectations for the role. Generally speaking, all groups had relatively high expectations for the enrollment officer's need to be familiar with a majority of the dimensions as described in the questionnaire.

Lacognata examined faculty and student academic role expectations.⁴⁴ His general assumption was that residential and off-campus faculty and students would view their academic roles differently and would hold differing role expectations for faculty and students. He found that faculty members displayed greater agreement on the dimensions of role consensus than did students and that role convergence was greater between faculty perception of their roles and student role expectations of faculty.

Another study was done by Marquardt concerning resident assistants in men's residence halls.⁴⁵ He compared the responses of resident assistants, resident advisors, and students as to their expectations of the role of the resident assistant. It was concluded that the three groups differed in their expectations for the role. Consensus on expectations

⁴⁴Angelo Anthony Lacognata, "Role Expectations of University Faculty and Students: A Social Psychological Analysis," Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan, 1962.

⁴⁵Harold Roy Marquardt, "The Role of the Resident Assistant in Men's Residence Halls at Michigan State University," Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan, 1961.

for each separate group of respondents was nearly the same and consequently the resident assistants themselves were not considered to be in a conflict situation.

Other studies not pertaining to higher education yet employing the concept of role in terms of expectations and segmentation were conducted by Didier,⁴⁶ Doyle,⁴⁷ and Gross.⁴⁸

Socialization in Graduate School Departments. As noted in Chapter I, very few studies have been done regarding graduate teaching assistants. Yet the environment in which they operate, their own graduate departments, have been shown to be social systems. Gottlieb, in writing of the changes in career preferences of graduate students, concluded:

We have shown that graduate students do alter their career preferences and that these changes do not appear to be so much a result of a selecting process as they are a function of the graduate school system itself.⁴⁹

The entire area of graduate education, according to one administrator at Michigan State, offers much to be studied; in fact it is relatively virgin territory.

⁴⁶James W. Didier, "The Role of the Baptist Parish Minister in the State of Michigan," Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan, 1965.

⁴⁷L. A. Doyle, "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Role," Unpublished doctor's thesis, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, Michigan, 1956.

⁴⁸Gross et al., op. cit.,

⁴⁹David Gottlieb, "Process of Socialization in American Graduate Schools," Social Forces, Vol. 40, No. 124-131, p. 131.

Consequently, with the perspectives in mind as outlined in this chapter, the study of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant was undertaken. A motivating force was the notion that lack of consensus may be interpreted as conflict and that the "consequence of role conflict may be frustration for the individual teacher and ineffectiveness for the educational institution."⁵⁰

Summary

Attention in this chapter has been given to a review of the literature pertaining to graduate teaching assistants and role theory. Under the general topic of graduate teaching assistants, two studies at Michigan State were described. In addition, there was a discussion of the idea that students are sensitive to a faculty member's teaching effectiveness with implications being made for a faculty member's instructional rank. Consideration was also given to the frequency of the graduate teaching experience and to the conclusion that it is a rather common occurrence in graduate education.

The main feature of the second part of the chapter was role theory. Several interpretations of the concept of role were presented with the observation being made that individuals in social locations behave with reference to expectations. (The operational definition of role for this study is:

⁵⁰J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Role and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 29:31-40, Sept., 1959, p. 40.

a set of expectations applied to an occupant in a particular social position.) The relationship between status and role was then presented.

An important consideration that was subsequently treated was the notion that role is not unitary or holistic in nature, but is, rather, composed of segmented elements. Several studies on role analysis were presented and then attention was given to the point that the process of socialization exists in the departments of graduate schools.

CHAPTER III

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

The Sample

To test the hypotheses it was necessary to have a representative sample of undergraduate students and graduate teaching assistants. Furthermore, to be better able to generalize, it was necessary to include the major areas of study throughout the University. The traditional major areas of study were considered to be three, the Behavioral Sciences, the Humanities, and the Natural Sciences. The departments that were subsequently used from each of these general areas are noted in Table 1.

Table 1. Traditional Areas of Study and Respective Departments

General Areas	Department
Behavioral Sciences	Education* Speech Marketing and Transportation Administration
Humanities	English History Philosophy Music
Natural Sciences	Mathematics

* Education is considered a College, not a department. However, for the remainder of this study, it will be referred to as a "department" to conform, for discussion purposes, with the other departments.

Selection of the Undergraduates. A basic consideration in the selection of the undergraduate sample was whether or not the students had been exposed to a graduate teaching assistant at one time or another in their course work. It was decided to select the sample from multiple-section courses characterized by a senior faculty member conducting the main lecture and graduate teaching assistants conducting the discussion or recitation sections. The particular courses from which the undergraduate sample was selected are found in Table 2.

Table 2. Departments and Courses from Which the Undergraduate Population was Drawn

Departments	Course Number
<u>Behavioral Sciences</u>	
Education	200 and 301
Speech	100 and 108
MTA	300 and 301
<u>Humanities</u>	
English	201, 206, 207, 213, 380
History	220 and 221
Music	180
Philosophy	137
<u>Natural Sciences</u>	
Mathematics	108

Fall term, 1965, class lists for these respective courses were obtained from the Registrar's Office. Sixty students were randomly selected from the courses comprising

each of the general areas. The selection per department from a given general area was on a percentage basis. Consequently, 180 undergraduates were selected for the study. Because of random selection, various majors and all four class levels were represented.⁵¹

Selection of the Graduate Teaching Assistants. A basic consideration in the selection of the graduate teaching assistant sample was whether or not the assistants were engaged in the same general type of activity.⁵² The chairman of each department was contacted and briefed about the nature of the study.⁵³ At the same time each chairman was asked to provide a list of names of the graduate teaching assistants who had responsibility for discussion or recitation sections in their departments. The departmental chairmen were most cooperative. Sixty individuals were selected from each of the three general areas which provided a total of 180 graduate teaching assistants.⁵⁴

⁵¹It should be noted that just because a student was enrolled in a particular course did not necessarily mean that the student was a major in that department or general area.

⁵²Some graduate teaching assistants have full responsibility for a course, others simply read themes or grade papers, while still others have responsibility for discussion or recitation sections of a class.

⁵³With respect to Education, the senior faculty members in charge of Ed. 200 and 301 respectively were contacted.

⁵⁴It was learned after the study had commenced that five subjects from the general area of the Humanities and one from the general area of the Natural Sciences were not eligible.

During the middle of the winter term, 1966, the questionnaires accompanied by letters of explanation of the study were mailed to the sample populations. Two weeks later a follow-up mailing went to those who had yet to respond. There was a 75.5% return from the undergraduate population and an 81.6% return from the graduate teaching assistant population. The total percent of return was 78.6%. See Table 3.

Instrumentation

During the summer term, 1965, several graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates were interviewed regarding their feelings about the use of graduate teaching assistants in instruction. In addition, several journal articles and books were read which further described some perspectives about the use of graduate teaching assistants.

As a result of the preceding activities, three dimensions of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant were developed. It was noted that any teacher engages in instructional activities, offers advice of an academic nature to his students, and may respond to students' non-academic problems. Consequently, the preceding dimensions of a teacher's role were ascribed to the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant. Hence, three sub-scales of the questionnaire were developed:

1. "Instruction"--refers to classroom procedures and classroom conduct of the graduate teaching assistant.

Table 3. Nature of the Sample and Percent of Sample Returning the Questionnaire

Sample	Number	Returns	Percent
<u>Undergraduates</u>			
Behavioral Sciences			
Education	23	18	78
Speech	19	15	79
MTA	18	12	67
Humanities			
History	18	11	61
Music	7	3	43
Philosophy	9	7	78
English	26	20	77
Natural Sciences			
Mathematics	60	49	82
<u>Graduate Teaching Assistants</u>			
Behavioral Sciences			
Education	25	23	92
Speech	17	17	100
MTA	18	17	94
Humanities			
History	18	15	83
Music	7	7	100
Philosophy	9	7	78
English	21	14	67
Natural Sciences			
Mathematics	59	43	73

Totals	354	278	78

2. "Advisement"--refers to the assistance that a graduate teaching assistant might render in all matters pertaining to a student's academic program and progress.
3. "Counseling-Personal Relations"-- refers to interpersonal relations between a graduate teaching assistant and his students in matters not strictly academic.

Questionnaire items were then constructed. Each item was characterized by five forced-choice responses. They were Absolutely Must (AM), Preferably Should (PS), May or May Not (MMN), Preferably Should Not (PSN), and Absolutely Must Not (AMN). Numerical values were also assigned to each response choice: AM - 5, PS - 4, MMN - 3, PSN - 2, and AMN - 1.

The questionnaire, at this point, contained 50 items. It was then pretested on 18 undergraduates and 18 graduate teaching assistants. There was a return of 94% on the pre-test questionnaire. The results of this effort were subject to critical review by the writer, two members of the guidance committee, and the Director of Institutional Research.⁵⁵ The final form of the questionnaire contained 44 items, 19 items under the topic of "Instruction," 13 items under "Advisement," and 11 items under "Counseling-Personal

⁵⁵The Director, Dr. Paul Dressel, offered several comments that were most helpful in the formulation of the final draft of the questionnaire. He also wrote a letter of introduction and recommendation on behalf of the writer to the chairmen of the departments that were to be used in the study. (A recent policy statement from the Central Administration of the University requires that the Director of Institutional Research review proposals involving campus-wide questionnaires addressed to students or faculty members.)

Relations." The last item was an open ended item which solicited any additional comments that the respondent might care to make. See Appendix D for the final form of the questionnaire.

Statistical Hypotheses

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant in terms of expectations held for the role by undergraduates and by graduate teaching assistants themselves. Of particular concern were points of agreement and disagreement. Consequently, two hypotheses were advanced. To be tested statistically, they must be presented in operational terms, i.e., in the null form.

Major Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

Minor Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants from different areas of general academic orientation hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

Analysis of the Data

Responses were transcribed onto code sheets from which punched cards were typed for use with the CDC 3600 computer

at the University. The chi square statistic was used for determining the degree of similarity or difference of expectations. It was necessary to "collapse categories" so that there would be sufficient numbers of responses in the cells of the contingency table. Therefore, in the final analysis, there were only three responses per item, "Preferably Should" (Agree), "May or May Not," and "Preferably Should Not" (Disagree). The computer program "ACT" was used in determining the chi square statistic, and the .05 level was chosen for the level of significance. This level was chosen because the total number in each group was small and to make generalizations concerning significant differences in items for probabilities above this level would not be justified.

Summary

The undergraduate sample was chosen by randomly selecting students from multiple-section courses offered by eight different departments of the University. The graduate teaching assistant sample was determined by soliciting from departmental chairmen of these eight departments the names of graduate teaching assistants who have had responsibility for discussion or recitation sections of multiple-section courses.

A questionnaire was designed for the study which was subdivided into three sub-scales with a total of 44 items. Response categories of Absolutely Must, Preferably Should,

May or May Not, Preferably Should Not, and Absolutely Must Not were used for each item (except for the last which was open ended).

A major hypothesis was advanced regarding role expectations of undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant. A minor hypothesis was advanced regarding expectations for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant by teaching assistants from different areas of academic orientation. A chi square analysis with significance at the .05 level was used to determine consensus by the groups in question. A collapsing of the response categories from five responses to three responses (Agree, May or May Not, Disagree) was necessary in determining chi square values.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the responses of the graduate teaching assistants and of the undergraduates are presented and analyzed. For the undergraduate sample, fifty-five freshmen responded, thirty sophomores, forty-seven juniors, and three seniors. For the graduate teaching assistant sample, fifty-one master's candidates and ninety-two doctoral candidates responded.

Major Hypothesis

The first hypothesis to be tested and stated in the null form is:

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

Application of the chi square statistic revealed significant differences in expectations on fifteen of the forty-three items of the questionnaire. Three of the fifteen items exhibited a weakness in the chi square cells.

Sub-scale 1: Instruction

With respect to the nineteen items comprising the sub-scale entitled "Instruction," the chi square statistic

indicated that there were significant differences in expectations among eight of the nineteen items. Significance at the five percent level was indicated for three of the items, and significance at the one percent level was indicated for five of the items. The null hypothesis can thus be rejected for eight of the items on this sub-scale (see Table 4). Two of the eight items exhibited a weakness in the chi square cells.

A review of the items in which there was consensus (no significant difference in expectations) revealed that both undergraduates (69%) and teaching assistants (74%) indicated a strong preference for a graduate teaching assistant's having the liberty to conduct his section in a manner that he feels appropriate (Item 5); 82% of the undergraduates and 73% of the teaching assistants indicated that the graduate teaching assistant preferably should help in the construction of examinations for the course (Item 7); 71% of the undergraduates and 58% of the teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant construct his own examinations for the discussion section (Item 8); 66% of the undergraduates and 74% of the teaching assistants indicated that the graduate teaching assistant preferably should identify obstacles to learning for his section (Item 10); 79% of the undergraduates and 85% of the teaching assistants strongly preferred that the graduate teaching assistant suggest study techniques for coping with the subject matter of the course (Item 11); and

Table 4. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on sub-scale 1, "Instruction" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants.
Undergraduates N=135 Teaching Assistants N=143

Item		Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		X ²
		N	%	N	%	
<u>The Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>						
1. Have had previous teaching experience	Agree	83	62	51	36	19.06**
	MMN	52	39	91	64	
	Disagree	-	-	1	.7	
2. Possess an M.A. or equivalent.	Agree	70	52	59	41	3.26
	MMN	62	46	79	55	
	Disagree	3	2	5	4	
3. Be exposed to orientation.	Agree	130	96	121	85	10.97*
	MMN	4	3	15	10	
	Disagree	1	.7	7	5	
4. Teach only in introductory courses.	Agree	50	37	62	43	1.53
	MMN	66	49	66	46	
	Disagree	19	14	15	11	
5. Conduct section in manner he feels appropriate.	Agree	93	69	105	73	2.18
	MMN	22	16	25	18	
	Disagree	20	15	13	9	
6. Have final say about handling content of course.	Agree	54	40	73	51	5.40
	MMN	29	22	33	23	
	Disagree	52	38	37	26	

continued

*Significant at the 5 percent level.

**Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 4. - Continued

Item	Undergraduates			Graduate teaching assistants			χ^2
		N	%		N	%	
7. Help construct examinations for the course.	Agree MMN Disagree	111 15 9	82 11 7		104 31 8	73 21 6	5.63
8. Construct own examinations for his section.	Agree MMN Disagree	96 28 11	71 21 8		83 40 20	58 28 14	5.45
9. Have full responsibility for assigning grades.	Agree MMN Disagree	72 31 32	53 23 24		100 18 25	70 13 17	8.64*
10. Identify general obstacles to learning.	Agree MMN Disagree	89 44 2	66 33 1		106 31 6	74 22 4	5.51
11. Suggest study techniques.	Agree MMN Disagree	107 27 1	79 20 .7		121 20 2	85 14 1	2.01
12. Conduct extra-class group help sessions.	Agree MMN Disagree	62 70 3	46 52 2		30 91 22	21 64 15	28.10**
13. Have work subject to review by full-time faculty member.	Agree MMN Disagree	105 24 6	78 18 4		78 39 26	55 27 18	19.84**

continued

Table 4. - Continued

Item		Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		χ^2
		N	%	N	%	
14.	Expect same intellectual respect as full-time faculty.	112	83	113	79	3.08
	Agree	13	10	23	16	
	MMN Disagree	10	7	7	5	
15.	Be viewed as a less adequate teacher than full-time faculty.	12	9	11	8	0.49
	Agree	27	20	25	17	
	MMN Disagree	96	71	107	75	
16.	Be viewed primarily as a faculty member.	99	73	85	59	7.25*
	Agree	23	17	30	21	
	MMN Disagree	13	10	28	20	
17.	Be viewed primarily as a student.	7	5	14	10	4.49
	Agree	27	20	38	27	
	MMN Disagree	101	75	91	63	
18.	Be viewed both as faculty and student.	67	50	89	62	6.53*
	Agree	42	31	40	28	
	MMN Disagree	26	19	14	10	
19.	Regard teaching duties as second in importance to his own studies.	15	11	52	36	38.68**
	Agree	11	8	27	19	
	MMN Disagree	109	81	64	45	

83% of the undergraduates and 79% of the teaching assistants indicated a preference that the graduate teaching assistant expect the same intellectual respect from his students as a full-time faculty member (Item 14). Consensus in a negative vein was noted when both groups indicated a "preferably should not" response to the graduate teaching assistant being viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member, undergraduates 71% and teaching assistants 75% (Item 15); and to the graduate teaching assistant being viewed primarily as a student, undergraduates 75% and teaching assistants 64% (Item 17). On Items 2 (Possess an M.A, or its equivalent in the discipline which he teaches), 4 (Be allowed to teach only introductory courses), and 6 (Have the final say about the way he handles the content of the discussion or recitation section that he is teaching), the general response pattern favored the "May or May Not" category. (However, on Item 6 about half of the teaching assistants agreed that this privilege should be theirs.)

As for the significant difference in response items, it was observed that undergraduates preferred, more than the teaching assistants, that the graduate teaching assistant should have previous teaching experience (Item 1). Sixty-two percent of the undergraduates indicated a preference for such experience, while only 36% of the teaching assistants indicated such. In addition, the undergraduates noted a stronger preference for graduate teaching assistants' being

exposed to a general orientation program (Item 3). Ninety-six percent of the undergraduates so indicated, while 85% of the teaching assistants responded likewise. (Significant difference was noted on this item in spite of the high percentage of agreement because even after collapsing cells for the chi square statistic there was still a shortage of frequencies in a couple of cells.) On the other hand, teaching assistants indicated a stronger preference for the graduate teaching assistant having full responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section (Item 9). Only 53% of the undergraduates felt that this should be done, while 70% of the teaching assistants so indicated. More undergraduates than teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant conduct extra-class group help sessions for his own section (Item 12). Forty-six percent of the undergraduates indicated this expectation as compared to 21% of the teaching assistants. Undergraduates also strongly preferred that a teaching assistant have his work as a graduate teaching assistant subject to review by a full-time faculty member (Item 13). Only 55% of the teaching assistants felt this way as opposed to 78% of the undergraduates. Interestingly enough, undergraduates exhibited a stronger preference for viewing the graduate teaching assistant as a faculty member than did the teaching assistants themselves (Item 16). Seventy-three percent of the undergraduates so indicated, while 60% of the teaching assistants did. On the

other hand, a greater percentage of teaching assistants (62%) preferred that the graduate teaching assistant be viewed both as a faculty member and as a student (Item 18). Fifty percent of the undergraduates felt this way. On the final item of the sub-scale (Item 19), the teaching assistants (39%) indicated a preference for viewing the graduate teaching assistant's teaching obligations as second in importance to his own studies. Eighty-one percent of the undergraduates preferred that the teaching assistant not feel this way.

Summary: Sub-scale 1

In terms of positive consensus, both groups indicated that the graduate teaching assistant should feel at liberty to conduct his section in a manner that he feels appropriate. In addition, both groups tended to prefer that the graduate teaching assistant construct examinations not only for his section, but assist in constructing them for the course at large. It was also generally agreed that the graduate teaching assistant identify general obstacles to learning and suggest study techniques for coping with the subject matter of the course. Both groups preferred that the graduate teaching assistant expect the same intellectual respect from his students as a full-time faculty member and consequently, not be viewed as a less adequate teacher nor primarily as a student.

Significant difference in expectations indicated that the undergraduates are more concerned than the teaching

assistants themselves that the graduate teaching assistant have previous teaching experience and be subject to an orientation program. (On the latter item the significant difference can be partially attributed to a lack of frequencies in the chi square cell even after collapsing.) On the other hand, teaching assistants tended to prefer to have full responsibility for assigning final grades to the students in their sections. Undergraduates showed a greater preference than the teaching assistants for the graduate teaching assistant's conducting extra-class group help sessions for his own section, and for the graduate teaching assistant's having his work subject to review by a full-time faculty member. Furthermore, undergraduates preferred to view the graduate teaching assistant as a faculty member more than did the teaching assistants themselves. On the other hand, teaching assistants showed a greater preference for being viewed as both faculty members and students. As expected, more undergraduates preferred than did teaching assistants that the graduate teaching assistant not regard his teaching obligations as second in importance to his own studies.

Sub-scale 2: Advisement

An examination of the items in this sub-scale revealed that consensus was held by both groups on ten of the thirteen items. Of the three items in which significant differences

in expectations were expressed, two were significant at the five percent level and the remaining item was significant at the one percent level. The null hypothesis can thus be rejected for three of the items on this sub-scale (see Table 5). One of the three items exhibited a weakness in chi square cells.

A negative consensus was expressed by both groups with respect to the graduate teaching assistant having office hours only by appointment (Item 21). Fifty-three percent of the undergraduates felt that this should not be the practice, while 41% of the teaching assistants felt much the same way. Seventy-two percent of the undergraduates and 61% of the teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant have office hours by appointment in addition to regular office hours (Item 22). Consensus was also expressed that the graduate teaching assistant be knowledgeable about related courses in his discipline (Item 23--undergraduates 88% and teaching assistants 95%); be familiar with the basic requirements for a major within his department (Item 24--undergraduates 75% and teaching assistants 69%); be familiar with the university's rules and regulations concerning academic policies (Item 25--undergraduates 79% and teaching assistants 70%); and help students see the rationale for the course in terms of curriculum requirements (Item 26--undergraduates 79% and teaching assistants 86%). The mean response for both groups on each of the preceding items was

Table 5. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on subscale 2, "Advisement" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants. Undergraduates N=135 Teaching Assistants N=143

Item	Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		χ^2
	N	%	N	%	
<u>The Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>					
20. Have regular office hours.	118	87	108	76	6.81*
	16	12	31	22	
	1	.7	4	2	
21. Have office hours only by appointment.	11	8	18	13	
	52	39	66	46	4.41
	72	53	59	41	
22. Have office hours by appointment and regular office hours.	97	72	87	61	
	33	24	42	29	5.66
	5	4	14	10	
23. Know about related courses in his discipline.	119	88	136	95	
	16	12	7	5	4.43
	-	-	-	-	
24. Be familiar with requirements for a major in his department.	101	75	98	69	
	34	25	42	29	3.66
	-	-	3	2	
25. Be familiar with academic policies of the university.	107	79	100	70	
	25	19	37	26	3.33
	3	2	6	4	
26. Help students see rational for the course in terms of curriculum requirements.	106	79	123	86	
	27	20	18	13	2.83
	2	1	2	1	

*Significant at the 5 percent level.

**Significant at the 1 percent level.

continued

Table 5 - Continued

Item	Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		χ^2
	N	%	N	%	
27. Aid students in the selection of courses in assistant's discipline.	41 75 19	30 56 14	44 68 31	31 48 21	3.10
28. Discuss with students career possibilities within assistant's discipline.	58 72 5	43 53 4	60 68 15	42 48 10	4.92
29. Encourage able students to major in his discipline.	41 73 21	30 54 16	80 58 5	56 41 3	23.92**
30. Help students to select courses outside that of the assistant's department.	23 73 39	17 54 29	19 60 64	13 42 45	7.50*
31. Help students achieve greater independence and responsibility for their educational planning.	70 55 10	52 41 7	76 55 12	53 39 8	0.20
32. View the advising of students as a significant part of his job.	56 34 45	42 25 33	48 46 49	34 32 34	2.36

close to 4.0. A little more than half of the undergraduates and teaching assistants respectively indicated that the graduate teaching assistant should help students achieve greater independence and responsibility for their own educational planning (Item 31). On Items 27 (Assist students in the selection of courses within the teaching assistant's discipline), 28 (Discuss with students the different career possibilities within the teaching assistant's discipline), and 32 (View the advising of students as a significant part of his job) the general pattern of response was "May or May Not."

There was significant difference in expectations regarding the graduate teaching assistant's holding regular office hours (Item 20). Eighty-seven percent of the undergraduates felt that this should be the case, while 76% of the teaching assistants so indicated. It should be noted, however, that the mean responses for each group was near 4.0. (Again chi square significance was partially due to lack of frequencies in some cells even after collapsing.) Teaching assistants also held a different expectation for the graduate teaching assistant's encouraging able and interested students to major in the discipline that he is teaching (Item 29). Fifty-six percent of the teaching assistants subscribed to this notion, while only 30% of the undergraduates did. Teaching assistants also differed from undergraduates in their expectation that the graduate teaching assistant help students in their

requests for advice in the selection of courses outside that of the teaching assistant's department (Item 30). Forty-five percent of the teaching assistants preferred that this type of assistance should not be given, while only 29% of the undergraduates felt this way.

Summary: Sub-scale 2

Both teaching assistants and undergraduates tended to prefer that the graduate teaching assistant not have his office hours only by appointment. Furthermore, both groups strongly preferred to have the graduate teaching assistant hold office hours by appointment in addition to regularly scheduled times.

High consensus was also expressed with respect to a graduate teaching assistant's being knowledgeable about related courses in his discipline as well as being familiar with academic requirements of the university and the department.

Significant differences in expectations were noted over the graduate teaching assistant's having regular office hours. The undergraduates indicated a stronger preference for regular office hours than did the teaching assistants. (However, significance was partially attributed to lack of frequencies in some chi square cells even after collapsing.) More teaching assistants than undergraduates preferred that the graduate teaching assistant encourage able and interested students to major in the discipline which he teaches.

Teaching assistants also preferred not to help students in their requests for advice in the selection of courses in departments outside that of their own.

Sub-scale 3: Counseling and Personal Relations

Of the eleven items in the third sub-scale, four indicated significant differences in expectations. Of these four, two were significant at the five percent level, and two were significant at the one percent level. The null hypothesis can thus be rejected for four items in this sub-scale (see Table 6).

Both undergraduates and teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant be familiar with the student personnel services of the university (Item 33). Sixty-one percent of the undergraduates indicated such and 49% of the teaching assistants felt the same way. Especially strong consensus was indicated with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's being sensitive to the psychological differences of his students (Item 36). Eighty-four percent of the teaching assistants felt that this should be the case, and 74% of the undergraduates felt likewise. The remainder of the consensus items, 34 (Have an understanding of the nature of the student personnel records and tests that are utilized by the university), 37 (Be willing to listen to students who want to confide in him about problems not related to the course), 38 (Help students cope with the stresses

Table 6. Frequency and percentage of responses and chi square values for each item on sub-scale 3, "Counseling-Personal Relations" by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants. Undergraduates N=132 Graduate Teaching Assistants N=138 (Eight individuals did not respond to the items on this sub-scale)

Item	Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		X ²
	N	%	N	%	
<u>Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>					
33. Be familiar with student personnel services of the university.	80	61	67	49	3.96
	47	26	64	46	
	5	3	7	5	
34. Have an understanding of the student personnel records and tests.	59	45	45	33	4.36
	56	42	74	54	
	17	13	19	13	
35. Be allowed access to confidential information about students in his section.	21	16	48	35	16.92**
	37	28	43	31	
	74	56	47	34	
36. Be sensitive to psychological differences of his students.	98	74	116	84	4.16
	28	21	17	12	
	6	5	5	4	
37. Be willing to listen to students who want to confide in him.	57	43	71	52	1.88
	55	42	50	36	
	20	15	17	12	
38. Help students cope with stresses and pressures of college life.	61	46	73	53	1.68
	57	43	49	36	
	14	11	16	11	

continued

*Significant at the 5 percent level.

**Significant at the 1 percent level.

Table 6 - Continued

Item		Undergraduates		Graduate teaching assistants		X ²
		N	%	N	%	
39.	Help students in personal and social adjustment.	50	38	57	41	1.15
	Agree	60	45	54	39	
	MMN Disagree	22	17	27	20	
40.	Talk with students outside of the class about current political and social topics.	40	30	52	38	1.80
	Agree	84	64	77	56	
	MMN Disagree	8	6	9	6	
41.	Listen to student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty member.	26	20	24	17	8.94*
	Agree	62	47	44	32	
	MMN Disagree	44	33	70	51	
42.	Listen to student's claims of unfair treatment by the Dean of Student's Office.	19	14	23	17	12.16**
	Agree	71	54	46	33	
	MMN Disagree	42	32	69	50	
43.	Write letters of recommendation for students.	71	54	72	52	8.60*
	Agree	49	37	37	27	
	MMN Disagree	12	9	29	21	

and pressures of college life), 39 (Be willing to help students in personal and social adjustment if so asked), and 40 (Talk with students, outside of class, about current political and social topics not related to the course) indicated responses which were "May or May Not" in nature.

Undergraduates indicated significant differences in their responses from the teaching assistants with respect to allowing the graduate teaching assistant access to confidential information about the students in his section (Item 35). Fifty-six percent of the undergraduates preferred that the graduate teaching assistant not be allowed to do this, while only 36% of the teaching assistants objected to this practice. As for a graduate teaching assistant's willingness to listen to an individual student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members (Item 41), 51% of the teaching assistants preferred that this should not be done, while only 33% of the undergraduates felt this way. The same pattern of response held for the graduate teaching assistant being willing to listen to an individual student's claim of unfair treatment by the Dean of Student's Office (Item 42--teaching assistants 50% and undergraduates 32%). With respect to a graduate teaching assistant writing letters of recommendation for students if they so request (Item 43), 21% of the teaching assistants indicated that this should not be done, while only 9% of the undergraduates indicated this preference.

Summary: Sub-scale 3

Both undergraduates and teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant have some feeling for students on an individual basis when they agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should be sensitive to the psychological differences of his students, and to be familiar, for referral purposes with the student personnel services of the university. The remainder of the consensus items were characterized by "May or May Not" responses.

However, there were some significant differences in expectations for this sub-scale. Undergraduates felt more strongly than teaching assistants that the graduate teaching assistant should not be allowed access to confidential information about students in his section. Teaching assistants preferred more than undergraduates that the graduate teaching assistant not be willing to listen to students' complaints about other faculty members and unfair treatment by the Dean of Student's Office. More teaching assistants also preferred not to write letters of recommendation for students than did the undergraduates.

Minor Hypothesis

The second hypothesis to be tested pertained only to graduate teaching assistants who were grouped according to their general area of academic orientation, namely, Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Natural Sciences. The second

hypothesis to be tested and stated in the null form is:

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants from different areas of general academic orientation hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

The application of the chi square statistic revealed significant difference in expectations on 18 of the 43 items.

However, the widespread lack of frequencies in the chi square cells distorted the statistical chi square findings.

Consequently, the data is presented in terms of percentages and subjective observational relationships.

Sub-scale 1: Instruction (see Table 7)

High consensus in terms of percentages was expressed by the three groups with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's feeling at liberty to conduct his section in a manner that he feels appropriate (Item 5). Seventy percent of the teaching assistants in the behavioral sciences agreed, as did 77% in the humanities and 73% in the natural sciences. About 50% of the respondents in the three groups agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should have the final say about the way he handles the content of the section he is teaching (Item 6). High consensus was also indicated with respect to the graduate teaching assistant identifying general obstacles to learning for his section (Item 10), and for suggesting study techniques for coping with the subject matter of the course (Item 11). The average percentage

Table 7. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 1, "Instruction" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general-academic orientation. Behavioral Sciences N=57 Humanities N=43 Natural Sciences (Mathematics) N=43

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>The Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>							
1. Have had teaching experience.	Agree	28	49	13	30	10	23
	MMN	29	51	29	67	33	77
	Disagree	-	-	1	3	-	-
2. Possess an M.A. or equivalent.	Agree	35	61	20	47	4	9
	MMN	21	37	21	49	36	84
	Disagree	1	2	2	4	3	7
3. Be exposed to orientation.	Agree	51	90	30	70	40	93
	MMN	4	7	9	21	2	5
	Disagree	2	3	4	9	1	2
4. Teach only in introductory courses.	Agree	10	18	28	65	25	57
	MMN	39	68	12	28	14	34
	Disagree	8	14	3	7	4	9
5. Conduct section in a manner he feels appropriate.	Agree	40	70	33	77	32	73
	MMN	12	21	6	14	6	14
	Disagree	5	9	4	9	5	13
6. Have final say about handling	Agree	32	56	23	54	17	41
	MMN	14	25	9	21	10	23
	Disagree	11	19	11	25	16	36
7. Help construct examinations for the course.	Agree	49	86	33	77	22	50
	MMN	7	12	10	23	13	32
	Disagree	1	2	-	-	8	18

continued

Table 7 - Continued

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
8. Construct own examinations for his section.	Agree MMN Disagree	32 20 5	56 35 9	34 8 1	79 17 4	17 11 15	39 27 34
9. Have full responsibility for assigning grades.	Agree MMN Disagree	44 6 7	77 11 12	34 8 1	79 17 4	23 3 17	52 9 39
10. Identify general obstacles to learning.	Agree MMN Disagree	44 10 3	77 18 5	30 12 1	70 28 2	33 8 2	75 20 5
11. Suggest study techniques.	Agree MMN Disagree	45 11 1	79 19 2	38 5 -	88 12 -	39 3 1	89 9 2
12. Conduct extra-class group help sessions.	Agree MMN Disagree	12 38 7	21 67 12	5 27 11	12 63 25	14 25 4	32 59 9
13. Have work subject to review by full-time faculty member.	Agree MMN Disagree	32 17 8	56 30 14	18 13 12	42 30 28	28 8 7	64 20 16
14. Expect same intellectual respect as full-time faculty member.	Agree MMN Disagree	47 8 2	82 14 4	33 8 2	77 17 6	34 6 3	77 16 7
15. Be viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member.	Agree MMN Disagree	4 11 42	7 19 74	4 7 32	9 16 75	3 6 34	7 16 77

continued

Table 7 - Continued

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
16. Be viewed primarily as a faculty member.	Agree MMN Disagree	45 8 4	79 14 7	22 11 10	51 25 24	18 10 15	41 25 34
17. Be viewed primarily as a student.	Agree MMN Disagree	4 14 39	7 25 68	4 11 28	9 26 65	7 13 23	16 30 54
18. Be viewed both as faculty and as a student.	Agree MMN Disagree	34 17 6	60 30 10	24 14 5	56 33 11	31 8 4	70 20 10
19. Regard his teaching duties as second in importance to his own studies.	Agree MMN Disagree	19 8 30	33 14 53	16 11 16	37 26 37	18 7 18	41 18 41

agreeing with Item 10 was 74%, while the average percentage agreeing with Item 11 was 85%. A lesser degree of consensus was noted by the three groups regarding the graduate teaching assistant's having his work as a graduate teaching assistant subject to review by a full-time faculty member (Item 13). Fifty-six percent of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences agreed, 42% from the humanities and 64% from the natural sciences. High consensus again appeared concerning the graduate teaching assistant's expecting the same intellectual respect from his students as a full-time faculty member (Item 14). The average percent agreeing from the three areas was 79%. High negative consensus appeared with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's being viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member (Item 15), and being viewed primarily as a student (Item 17). The average percentage of the three groups agreeing negatively, i.e. should not, with Item 15 was 75%, while the average percentage agreeing negatively with Item 17 was 62%. Positive consensus again emerged with respect to a graduate teaching assistant's being viewed both as a faculty member and as a student (Item 18). Sixty percent of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences agreed, as did 56% from the humanities and 71% from the natural sciences. As for the graduate teaching assistant's regarding his teaching obligations as second in importance to his own studies (Item 19), about 50% of the teaching assistants in the

humanities and in the natural sciences agreed and about 50% disagreed. The teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences indicated a slight tendency not to regard the graduate teaching assistant's teaching obligations as second in importance to his own studies. Fifty-three percent of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences indicated that the graduate teaching assistant should not regard his teaching obligation as second in importance to his own studies. The responses of the three groups to Item 6 (Have the final say about the way he handles the content of the discussion or recitation section that he teaches) and Item 12 (Conduct extra-class group help sessions for his own section) were in the "May or May Not" category.

A percentage "difference" in expectations was noted with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's having had previous teaching experience (Item 1). Fifty percent of the teaching assistants representing the behavioral sciences felt that this should be the case, while only 30% from the humanities and 23% from the natural sciences agreed. More of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences and the humanities, 61% and 47% respectively, agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should possess an M.A. or its equivalent (Item 2) than did the teaching assistants from the natural sciences (9%). On the other hand, more representatives from the behavioral sciences (90%) and from the natural sciences (93%) agreed that graduate teaching assistants

should be exposed to a general orientation program (Item 3) than did those from the humanities (70%). The teaching assistants from the humanities (65%) and from the natural sciences (57%) agreed much more than those from the behavioral sciences (18%) that the graduate teaching assistant be allowed to teach only introductory courses (Item 4). More respondents from the behavioral sciences (86%) and from the humanities (77%) agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should help in the construction of examinations for the course (Item 7). Only 50% of the respondents from the natural sciences agreed. With respect to the graduate teaching assistant's constructing his own examinations for his discussion section (Item 8), again teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences 56% and from the humanities 79% agreed that this should be the case, while only 39% responding from the natural sciences agreed. Much of the same alliance in response pattern was indicated for the graduate teaching assistant's having full responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section (Item 9). Behavioral science assistants (77%) and humanities assistants (79%) agreed, while 52% of the assistants from the natural sciences indicated this preference. As for the graduate teaching assistant being viewed primarily as a faculty member (Item 16), the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences agreed rather strongly (79%), while those from the humanities (51%) and from the natural sciences (41%) agreed less so.

Summary: Sub-scale 1

Teaching assistants from the general areas of the behavioral sciences, humanities, and natural sciences tended to agree on a percentage basis that the graduate teaching assistant should feel at liberty to conduct his discussion or recitation section in a manner that he feels appropriate. The three groups also supported the idea that the graduate teaching assistant should assist his students by identifying obstacles to learning, and suggesting study techniques for coping with the subject matter of the course. They also preferred, for the most part, to have the work of the graduate teaching assistant subject to review by a full-time faculty member, yet felt that the graduate teaching assistant should expect the same intellectual respect from his students. They also preferred not being viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member, nor being viewed primarily as a student. With respect to the last item, they preferred that the graduate teaching assistant be viewed both as a faculty member and as a student. Expectations for the graduate teaching assistant regarding his teaching obligation as second in importance to his own studies were, for the most part, divided between agreement and disagreement with the exception of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences. They tended not to regard his teaching obligation as second in importance.

With respect to the percentage "difference" in expectations, more teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences indicated a preference that the graduate teaching assistant have previous teaching experience than did respondents from the humanities and natural sciences. On the other hand, more assistants from the behavioral sciences and humanities preferred that the graduate teaching assistant possess an M.A. or its equivalent than did those from the natural sciences. Fewer respondents from the humanities preferred that the graduate teaching assistant be exposed to a general orientation program than did those from the behavioral sciences and the natural sciences. Concerning the graduate teaching assistant's teaching only introductory courses, over half of the assistants from the humanities and natural sciences felt this way, while considerably fewer assistants from the behavioral sciences agreed. The two groups representing the behavioral sciences and the humanities concurred that the graduate teaching assistant should help in the construction of examinations for the course and for his particular section, as well as having full responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section. On the preceding three items fewer respondents from the natural sciences indicated this preference. Finally, teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences preferred that the graduate teaching assistant be viewed primarily as a faculty member. Their counterparts in the humanities and natural sciences

were less inclined to feel this way. None of the groups indicated a preference that a graduate teaching assistant should or should not conduct extra-class group help sessions for his own section.

Sub-scale 2: Advisement (see Table 8)

Consensus was expressed on a percentage basis by the three groups with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's having office hours by appointment in addition to regular office hours (Item 22). The average percentage of response from those in the behavioral sciences and humanities was 55%, while 75% of the teaching assistants from the natural sciences agreed. A rather high consensus was given concerning the graduate teaching assistant's being knowledgeable about related courses in his discipline (Item 23). The average percentage of responses agreeing was 95%. Consensus was also registered with the graduate teaching assistant's being familiar with university rules and regulations concerning academic policies (Item 25). Seventy-five percent from the behavioral sciences so indicated, 61% from the humanities, and 73% from the natural sciences. A little more than half of the respondents from each group agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should encourage able and interested students to major in the discipline that he is teaching (Item 29). For the most part, the responses to the graduate teaching assistant's helping students achieve greater

Table 8. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 2, "Advisement" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general-academic orientation. Behavioral Sciences N=57 Humanities N=43 Natural Sciences (Mathematics) N=43

Item	Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<u>The Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>							
20. Have regular office hours.	Agree	46	81	25	58	38	86
	MMN	10	17	16	37	4	11
	Disagree	1	2	2	5	1	3
21. Have office hours only by appointment.	Agree	8	14	5	12	5	12
	MMN	22	39	28	65	15	36
	Disagree	27	47	10	23	23	52
22. Have office hours by appointment and regular office hours.	Agree	32	56	23	53	33	75
	MMN	20	35	14	33	7	18
	Disagree	5	9	6	14	3	7
23. Know about related courses in his discipline.	Agree	57	100	39	91	41	93
	MMN	-	-	4	9	3	7
	Disagree	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. Be familiar with requirements for a major in his department.	Agree	47	82	24	56	28	64
	MMN	10	18	18	42	13	32
	Disagree	-	-	1	2	2	4
25. Be familiar with the academic policies of the university.	Agree	43	75	26	60	32	73
	MMN	12	21	15	35	9	22
	Disagree	2	4	2	5	2	5
26. Help students see the rationale for the course in terms of curriculum requirements.	Agree	56	98	33	77	35	80
	MMN	1	2	9	21	7	18
	Disagree	-	-	1	2	1	2
continued							

continued

Table 8 - Continued

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
27.	Assist students in the selection of courses in the assistant's discipline.	27	47	9	21	8	18
	Agree	20	35	22	51	25	59
	MMN	10	18	12	28	10	23
28.	Discuss with students career possibilities in assistant's discipline.	35	61	14	33	11	25
	Agree	18	32	23	53	26	61
	MMN	4	7	6	14	6	14
29.	Encourage able students to major in his discipline.	31	54	22	51	27	61
	Agree	24	42	21	49	13	32
	MMN	2	4	-	-	3	7
30.	Help students to select courses in departments outside that of the teaching assistant's.	13	23	1	2	5	11
	Agree	27	47	18	42	14	33
	MMN	17	30	24	56	24	56
31.	Help students achieve greater independence and responsibility for their own educational planning.	36	63	19	44	21	48
	Agree	17	30	19	44	18	44
	MMN	4	7	5	12	4	8
32.	View the advising of students as a significant part of his job.	23	40	13	30	12	27
	Agree	17	30	14	33	14	34
	MMN	17	30	16	37	17	39
	Disagree						

independence and responsibility for their own educational planning (Item 31) followed a "May or May Not" pattern except for teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences. Sixty-three percent from this group agreed with the item. The responses to Item 32 (Viewing the advising of students as a significant part of his job) did follow the "May or May Not" pattern for all three groups.

"Differences" in expectations on a percentage basis were expressed with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's having regular office hours (Item 20). Assistants from the behavioral sciences (81%) and from the natural sciences (86%) agreed more than those from the humanities (58%). More assistants from the behavioral sciences (47%) and natural sciences (52%) than from the humanities (23%) indicated that the graduate teaching assistant should not have office hours only by appointment. More teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences (83%) than from the humanities (56%) and natural sciences (64%) agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should be familiar with the basic requirements for a major within his department (Item 24). The same response pattern followed for the graduate teaching assistant's helping students see the rationale for the course in terms of curriculum requirements (Item 26). More assistants from the behavioral sciences (98%) agreed to this item than did those from the humanities (77%) and natural sciences (80%). In addition, more assistants from the

behavioral sciences (47%) agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should assist students in the selection of courses within the teaching assistant's discipline (Item 27). In fact, only 21% of the respondents from the humanities and only 18% from the natural sciences agreed with this item. Much of the same response pattern followed for the graduate teaching assistant's discussing with students the different career possibilities within the teaching assistant's discipline (Item 28). Sixty-one percent of the respondents from the behavioral sciences agreed, while only 33% from the humanities and 25% from the natural sciences agreed. Teaching assistants from the humanities (56%) and from the natural sciences (55%) agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should not help students in their requests for advice in the selection of courses in departments outside that of the teaching assistant's (Item 30). At the same time, only 30% from the behavioral sciences felt this way.

Summary: Sub-scale 2

The three groups agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should have office hours by appointment in addition to regular office hours; should be knowledgeable about related courses in his discipline; should be familiar with university rules and regulations concerning academic policies; and should encourage able and interested students to major in the discipline in which he is teaching.

Percentage disagreement as to expectations for the graduate teaching assistant's instructional role was noted on seven items. More teaching assistants in the behavioral sciences and the natural sciences than in the humanities agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should have regular office hours. Furthermore, more teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences and the natural sciences than from the humanities agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should not have office hours by appointment only. More respondents from the behavioral sciences than from the other two groups agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should be familiar with the basic requirements for a major within his department. The same pattern of response held for the graduate teaching assistant helping students to see the rationale for the course which is being taught. Fewer assistants from the humanities and natural sciences as compared with those from the behavioral sciences agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should assist students in the selection of courses within the teaching assistant's discipline; should discuss with the students different career possibilities within his discipline; or should help students in their requests for advice in the selection of courses in departments outside that of the graduate teaching assistant's.

None of the groups exhibited a definitely should or should not preference with respect to the graduate teaching

assistant's viewing the advising of students as a significant part of his job. Much the same pattern emerged concerning the helping of students achieve greater independence and responsibility for their own educational planning, with the exception of the behavioral sciences teaching assistants who preferred that the graduate teaching assistant consider this as one of his obligations.

Sub-scale 3: Counseling-Personal Relations (see Table 9)

Consensus on a percentage basis was expressed by the three groups regarding the willingness of the graduate teaching assistant to listen to students who want to confide in him about problems not related to the course (Item 37). Sixty-two percent responding from the behavioral sciences agreed, 45% from the humanities, and 43% from the natural sciences. Consensus was also exhibited toward the graduate teaching assistant helping students cope with the stresses and pressures of college life (Item 38). About half of the teaching assistants from each group agreed. Negative consensus resulted when close to half of the teaching assistants from each group agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should not be willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members (Item 41). Somewhat the same pattern of response was expressed concerning the graduate teaching assistant's being willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by the

Table 9. Frequency and percentage of responses for each item on sub-scale 3, "Counseling-Personal Relations" by graduate teaching assistants from three areas of general academic orientation. Behavioral Sciences N=53 Humanities N=42 Natural Sciences (Mathematics) N=43 (Five assistants who responded to the other sub-scales neglected to respond to this one.)

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>The Graduate Teaching Assistant</u>							
33. Be familiar with the student personnel services of the university.	Agree	34	64	17	40	17	39
	MMN	17	32	21	50	26	59
	Disagree	2	4	4	10	1	2
34. Have an understanding of the student personnel records and tests	Agree	21	40	14	33	10	23
	MMN	24	45	23	55	28	64
	Disagree	8	15	5	12	6	13
35. Be allowed access to confidential information about students in his section.	Agree	24	45	10	24	14	32
	MMN	17	32	15	36	11	25
	Disagree	12	23	17	40	19	43
36. Be sensitive to the psychological differences of his students.	Agree	45	85	37	88	35	80
	MMN	8	15	5	12	4	10
	Disagree	-	-	-	-	5	10
37. Be willing to listen to students who want to confide in him about problems not related to the course.	Agree	33	62	19	45	19	43
	MMN	15	28	16	38	19	43
	Disagree	5	10	7	17	6	14
38. Help students cope with the stresses and pressures of college life.	Agree	31	58	21	50	21	48
	MMN	16	30	14	33	19	43
	Disagree	6	12	7	17	4	9
							continued

Table 9 - Continued

Item		Behavioral Sciences		Humanities		Natural Sciences (Mathematics)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
39.	Help students in personal and social adjustment.	24	45	17	40	16	36
	Agree	19	36	16	38	19	43
	MMN	10	19	9	22	9	21
	Disagree						
40.	Talk with students outside of class about political and social topics not related to the course.	21	40	18	43	13	30
	Agree	27	51	23	55	28	64
	MMN	5	9	1	2	3	6
	Disagree						
41.	Listen to students' claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members	10	19	6	14	8	18
	Agree	17	32	12	29	16	26
	MMN	26	49	24	57	20	46
	Disagree						
42.	Listen to students' claims of unfair treatment by the Dean of Student's Office.	11	20	6	14	6	14
	Agree	21	40	13	31	12	27
	MMN	21	40	23	55	26	59
	Disagree						
43.	Write letters of recommenda- tion for students.	36	68	12	29	24	55
	Agree	12	23	13	31	12	27
	MMN	5	9	17	40	8	18
	Disagree						

Dean of Student's Office (Item 42). The general pattern of response by the three groups to Item 34 (Have an understanding of the nature of the student personnel records and tests that are utilized by the university), Item 39 (Be willing to help students in personal and social adjustment if they so ask), Item 40 (Talk with students, outside of class, about current political and social topics not related to the course), was that of "May or May Not." Such was the same pattern for Item 35, that the graduate teaching assistant be allowed access to confidential information about students in his class, except that the teaching assistants from the humanities and the natural sciences tended to prefer this not to be the case as opposed to the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences.

A percentage "difference" in expectations was held with respect to the graduate teaching assistant being familiar, for referral purposes, with the student personnel services of the university (Item 33). More assistants from the behavioral sciences (64%) agreed to this item than did those from the humanities (41%) and natural sciences (39%).

A percentage "difference" was held between the teaching assistants in the natural sciences on the one hand and those in the humanities and behavioral sciences on the other regarding the sensitivity of the graduate teaching assistant to the psychological differences of his students (Item 36). Eleven percent from the natural sciences agreed that the

graduate teaching assistant should not exhibit this sensitivity. Otherwise, a high percentage of the three groups agreed to the item. More teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences (68%) and the natural sciences (55%) than from the humanities (29%) agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should write letters of recommendation for students if they so request (Item 43).

Summary: Sub-scale 3

The three groups, for the most part, agreed positively that the graduate teaching assistant should be willing to listen to students who want to confide in him about problems not related to the course, and to help students cope with the stresses and pressures of college life. Negative consensus was noted when the three groups agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should not be willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members or by the Dean of Student's Office.

However, percentage "difference" in expectations were noted on three items. More assistants from the behavioral sciences than from the other two groups agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should be familiar, for referral purposes, with the student personnel services of the university. More respondents from the behavioral sciences and the natural sciences than from the humanities agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should write letters of recommendation for students if they so request. All three groups,

with the exception of a few assistants from the natural sciences, agreed that the graduate teaching assistant should be sensitive to the psychological needs of his students.

The "May or May Not" response pattern characterized the three groups with respect to the graduate teaching assistant's having an understanding of the student personnel records and tests used by the university; being allowed access to confidential information about students in his class (not quite half of the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences agreed that this should be permitted); being willing to help students in personal and social adjustment if they so ask; and talking with students, outside of class, about current political and social topics not related to the course.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

The general problem of the study was to determine the nature of the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant at Michigan State University. There was no attempt in this study to solve problems. Rather an attempt was made to provide more information and insight into areas of agreement and differences regarding the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant as perceived by undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants themselves.

The graduate teaching assistants used for this study were selected from departments representing the general areas of: behavioral sciences (College of Education, Departments of Speech, and Marketing and Transportation Administration); humanities (Departments of History, English, Music, and Philosophy); and natural sciences (Department of Mathematics). Their main responsibility was instruction in discussion or recitation sections of multiple-section, undergraduate courses. The undergraduates used for this study

were drawn randomly from courses within the aforementioned departments.

The Design and Procedure of the Study

The study was conducted in the winter term, 1966. The instrument used to measure role expectations was mailed to the sample. Seventy-eight percent of those contacted completed and returned their questionnaires, the results of which constitute the data for the study.

The 44 item instrument was divided into three subscales pertaining to the areas of "Instruction," "Advisement," and "Counseling-Personal Relations" respectively. The last item on the questionnaire was open-ended. Items for the questionnaire instrument were developed as a result of interviews with graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates, and readings from books, studies, and journal articles. Each item could have been answered in one of five ways, two of the categories indicated a positive preference, two a negative preference, and one referred to a neutral category. Values were assigned to each response category with the highest number indicating a high preference for a given expectation. The instrument was pretested, analyzed, revised, and subsequently mailed to the sample in question.

Analysis

The expectations of the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant for the different groups were indicated

by frequencies, percentage of respondents to a given item, and chi square values. The hypotheses tested and in the null form are:

Major Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

Minor Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the expectations that graduate teaching assistants from different areas of academic orientation hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

In testing each hypothesis, the five percent level of significance was selected for rejection. Whenever it was appropriate, the one percent level for rejecting the null hypothesis was also noted.

The application of the chi square statistic entailed a "collapsing" of the five response categories to three. The new response categories indicated "Preferably Should" (Agree), "May or May Not," and "Preferably Should Not" (Disagree). The application of the chi square statistic to the data with respect to the first sub-scale, "Instruction," of the major hypothesis indicated significant differences in the responses to eight of the nineteen items. Significant differences were noted on Items 1, 3 (weakness in chi square cells were evidenced on these two items), 9, 12, 13, 16, 18,

and 19. There were three items out of a total of thirteen in which significant differences were indicated for sub-scale two, "Advisement." These three were items 20 (weakness in the chi square cells was evidenced for this item also), 29, and 30. As for sub-scale three, "Counseling-Personal Relations," significant differences were noted on four of the eleven items. The four items were 35, 41, 42, and 43. Thus, significant differences in the expectations of graduate teaching assistants and the undergraduates were noted on fifteen of the forty-three items of the instrument for the major hypothesis with three of the significant difference items having a weakness in chi square cells.

An analysis of the data with respect to the minor hypothesis revealed a predominant weakness in the chi square cells. Consequently, the chi square statistic was not used for testing this hypothesis. Frequencies and percentages were used instead tempered by subjective interpretation. On the first sub-scale "differences" in responses on a percentage basis were found for eight of the nineteen items (1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 16); on sub-scale two percentage "differences" were found for seven of the thirteen items (20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30); and on sub-scale three "differences" on a percentage basis were found for three of the eleven items (33, 36, and 43). Thus, percentage "differences" in expectations of teaching assistants from different areas of academic orientation for the instructional

role of the graduate teaching assistant were noted on eighteen of the forty-three items. In each of these cases, one of the three groups exhibited a different percentage pattern of response from the other two.

Conclusions

1. For the major hypothesis, there were significant differences in expectations held by graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.
2. For the major hypothesis, there were more significant differences expressed for expectations concerning the sub-scale "Instruction" than for the other two sub-scales.
3. For the major hypothesis, the largest number of highly significant differences in expectations at the one percent level was also found in the sub-scale "Instruction."
4. The graduate teaching assistant should be given some idea regarding what is expected of him.
5. The graduate teaching assistant should have, for the most part, autonomy in the classroom.
6. The graduate teaching assistant is not viewed primarily as a student.

7. The graduate teaching assistant is expected to be available to students on a regular basis.
8. The graduate teaching assistant is expected to be knowledgeable about his department and discipline.
9. Advisement is not the most important function of the graduate teaching assistant's role.
10. Counseling and personal relations are even less important than advisement.
11. For the minor hypothesis, graduate teaching assistants from different areas hold differences of opinion for some aspects of their instructional role.
12. Graduate teaching assistants prefer to be viewed both as faculty and students.
13. Graduate teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences tend to be more students oriented.
14. Graduate teaching assistants from the humanities tend to be more subject oriented.
15. No definite response pattern was established for the graduate teaching assistants from the natural sciences.

Discussion

The items on the sub-scale "Instruction" generally indicated a preference on the part of the teaching assistants

and undergraduates that the graduate teaching assistant not be viewed primarily as a student. Consequently, if a graduate teaching assistant is to be considered faculty, then many expectations, especially on the part of the undergraduates, are related to this position. A faculty member should preferably know specifically what his duties and responsibilities are within his department, have some responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section, regard his teaching obligations as being of prime importance, be knowledgeable about courses in his discipline, be available for consultation with students outside of class, and in general be willing to assist students in their academic progress. If these expectations and others commensurate with the status of a faculty member are not met, then instruction will suffer. Frustration and apathy may well set in on the part of the students when their expectations are not being met. The basic notion that the graduate teaching assistant is viewed as part of the faculty is a "global" concept when discussing the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant.

On the sub-scale "Instruction," as was previously noted, eight items indicated significant differences in expectations between the two groups. More undergraduates than teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant have had previous teaching experience. This preference may not be as crucial to the actual duties and

responsibilities of the teaching assistant as other items, but it may indicate concern on the part of the students that they as undergraduates be exposed to competent instructors and that previous teaching experience tends to enhance competency. A significant difference was noted regarding the teaching assistant's being exposed to a general orientation program, but this difference was attributed to a weakness in the chi square cells even after collapsing. In actuality, there was high consensus on this item. More teaching assistants than undergraduates preferred that the graduate teaching assistant have full responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section. An important consideration in this regard is that many students "work for the grade" and, consequently, a certain attitude toward instruction is involved. Instruction and learning may well suffer because some students will work hard only for the person who is going to grade them or have more say in the final grade. If teaching assistants have only a minor say in grading, they may well consider their part in the multiple-section course as being minor in nature. The relationship between a senior faculty member and a graduate teaching assistant in assigning grades for a course is important. It affects the attitudes of both undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants.

More undergraduates than teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant conduct extra-class

group help sessions for his own section. In fact, only 21% of the teaching assistants preferred that this be a function of their role. Granted, more assistants responded "May or May Not," but the point remains that on this item a positive attitude was lacking on the part of the graduate teaching assistant. A learning environment is less than healthy when a conflict in expectations exists as to how far a teaching assistant should go in helping students outside of regular class hours.

Undergraduates, for the most part, preferred more than teaching assistants that the graduate teaching assistant have his work as a teaching assistant subject to review by a full-time faculty member. This item is not a functional aspect of the assistant's role, but it certainly can influence role functions. Observation and some supervision by an accomplished senior faculty member can have immediate and long-range benefits on the teaching competency of the assistant. A teaching assistant supported this notion when he wrote after the last item of the questionnaire used in this study, "As an apprentice he (the graduate teaching assistant) stands to gain by constructive criticism his mentor, major professor, or department chairman could make--these are the formative years of teaching." There is much to be gained from a well integrated program that views the assistantship as an internship.

It was interesting to note that more undergraduates preferred to view the graduate teaching assistant primarily as a faculty member than did teaching assistants themselves. One interpretation of this situation could be that undergraduates expect more from teaching assistants as teachers than teaching assistants may be willing to give. Here is a conflict situation and conflict situations of this nature are not conducive to learning. For instance, if some undergraduates feel it is necessary to have an extra class session or two and the teaching assistant feels that this is not his function as a teaching assistant or at least conveys this impression, then the students will most likely not press the matter.

It was stated at the beginning of this discussion that the items on the sub-scale "Instruction" generally tend to support the notion that a graduate teaching assistant is viewed more as a faculty member than as a student. However, when responding to the item that a graduate teaching assistant should be viewed both as a faculty member and as a student, more teaching assistants felt that this should be the case. The teaching assistants' viewpoint on this item may more closely approach their daily experiences but it certainly doesn't help their status-role concept as graduate teaching assistants. Whenever a person has two important and "equal" demands placed on himself and his time, in this case one's own studies and teaching responsibilities, quite often one or

the other of the demands suffers. It is not necessary to speculate at length as to which suffers. An undergraduate wrote on the last item of the questionnaire, "Some (graduate teaching assistants) place their teaching duties far below that of their studies. This is hurting the new members of this college."

An examination of the final item of the sub-scale "Instruction" indicated that percentage wise, almost twice as many undergraduates as teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant not regard his teaching obligations as second in importance to his own studies. This point may well be a source of irritation to undergraduates, for they undoubtedly feel that their own studies should not be regarded as second in importance to those of the graduate teaching assistant. Such an instructional situation is less than desirable. The teaching assistant's preference on this item can well be appreciated, but the "second in importance" factor need not be as significant as it is. The teaching assistantship experience can be made less of a means to an end. In fact, this experience could well be an excellent opportunity for the preparation of good college teachers. As one teaching assistant noted on the questionnaire, "Most graduate students still have a long way to go before they will be capable of handling a class well."

An examination of the items on the sub-scale "Advice-ment" tends to support the position that a graduate teaching

assistant should be quite knowledgeable about his department within the university. The teaching assistant is a teacher and a teacher often influences and motivates his students. A motivated student is prone to seek opinions and advice. Consequently, the potential that a graduate teaching assistant has for advising students should not be overlooked. A teaching assistant may well influence student attitudes not only toward the subject matter, but also toward the choice of a major. However, before any of the preceding can be done, a teaching assistant must first of all have the information to pass on and the time to do it.

On the sub-scale "Advisement" there were only three items on which significant differences were noted between the expectations of undergraduates and teaching assistants. There was a difference on the item pertaining to the graduate teaching assistant's having regular office hours. However, this difference was attributed to a weakness in the frequencies of the chi square cells even after collapsing. Both groups agreed, with the undergraduates agreeing more strongly, that regular office hours should be held.

A second significant item pertains to the graduate teaching assistant's encouraging able and interested students to major in the discipline that he is teaching. More teaching assistants than undergraduates felt that this should be done. This activity is somewhat tangential to the instructional role and borders on proselytizing. However,

students may well be, either directly or indirectly, influenced by teaching assistants. Consequently, it would seem that undergraduates will profit by a teaching assistant who is well informed about policies, procedures, and courses within his own department. A final significant item on this sub-scale was noted on responses to the graduate teaching assistant's helping students in their requests for advice in the selection of courses outside the discipline of the teaching assistant. More assistants than undergraduates felt that this should not be done. Although this item is not central to the role of the graduate teaching assistant, it does give a general feeling that either graduate teaching assistants do not know or do not care about this activity, while undergraduates are a little more inclined to see this as a role function of the graduate teaching assistant. Both groups indicated that they wanted to know about related courses within a discipline, requirements for a major within a department, and other miscellaneous academic rules and regulations. Granted, one's own academic advisor may have this information, but the undergraduate may not relate very well to his advisor or may simply prefer to ask a teaching assistant for this information. An undergraduate's choice of a major or occupational goal may result from such interaction between a teaching assistant and himself.

A general examination of the responses to sub-scale three, "Counseling-Personal Relations," gives the impression

that a teaching assistant should have a positive regard for students in his sections. But such a feeling may be in sentiment only. Aside from the expectation that a teaching assistant be familiar, for referral purposes, with the student personnel services of the university, a majority of the responses evoked low mean values in terms of expectations. This was particularly so of the four significant difference items on this sub-scale. On the first significant item more undergraduates than teaching assistants preferred that the graduate teaching assistant not be allowed access to confidential information about students in his section. (In actuality, both groups indicated negative preferences on this item.) The undergraduates' response pattern may indicate some misgivings about the teaching assistants, while the assistants' response pattern was distributed almost evenly among the response categories. This item has little bearing on the instructional situation. There were two other items that were very similar in which significant differences were noted. In both cases, that the graduate teaching assistant be willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members, and by the Dean of Student's Office, more teaching assistants than undergraduates felt that this should not be done. Actually both groups generally felt this way, but the assistants felt it even more. These two items have little bearing on the instructional situation but do give an idea as to how far a

teaching assistant is expected to go. The expectations emerging from this sub-scale indicate that both groups expect that the graduate teaching assistant have a positive feeling for undergraduates and that he not get involved on a personal basis but rather that he know where to refer students by being familiar with the student personnel services of the university. The implication, therefore, is that a teaching assistant should be knowledgeable about these services in order to be a more helpful teacher. In actuality, the teaching assistant is less an authority when compared to a full-time faculty member or counselor, and consequently, he is not sought after, nor does he care to be, by undergraduates who have non-academic problems. Essentially, the dimensions of a graduate teaching assistant's functioning as a counselor may not be clearly perceived by either group.

Of further importance in the study was the finding on the minor hypothesis that graduate teaching assistants from different areas hold expectations for some aspects of their instructional role which are different from those of their counterparts in other areas. They also hold some expectations in common. For example, an examination of the items indicates that teaching assistants tend to have a high regard for their competency in the classroom. In fact, a high percentage of them preferred that a graduate teaching assistant not be viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member. This is a desirable quality in terms of self concept,

but a more important question presents itself. For the most part, are teaching assistants as capable as teachers as full-time faculty? One undergraduate had a definite feeling on this matter when he wrote on the questionnaire, "They (graduate teaching assistants) should try to avoid acquiring the attitude that just because they are graduates they are better than the undergraduates they are teaching." The instructional situation may be hindered if teaching assistants think they are particularly competent when in some cases they aren't. An old cliché may have relevance here: "A little knowledge can be dangerous." Undergraduates may be led to think that they are being given the "last word" in a field when in reality they are not. The whole question of competency may be partly helped by some definite statement by the department and university as to the status and role of the graduate teaching assistant.

In terms of percentage "differences" in expectations, the teaching assistants from the behavioral sciences tend to be more student oriented, while those from the humanities tend to be more subject oriented. These are generalizations and tend to overlap, but for the most part, the preceding patterns seem to be discernible. On the other hand, the teaching assistants from the natural sciences exhibited no definite response pattern. The major point to be taken from the foregoing comments is that teaching assistants from different areas do hold different expectations and that the

formulation of any policy or program dealing with the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant should be based upon these considerations.

Recommendations

The graduate teaching assistant serves an important function in the university community. He provides a service to the university and in turn the university provides a service to him. But more importantly, the graduate teaching assistant serves the academic enterprise as a neophyte now, and hopefully as a competent, mature scholar-teacher in the future. Another consideration at this time is the shortage of qualified faculty and a concern for the preparation of qualified faculty. Perhaps the preceding comments provide credence for the following recommendations:

- a. Since there does seem to be a less than adequate definition of the graduate teaching assistant's role, a University committee should review the objectives of using teaching assistants with special consideration to the teaching assistant's experience as an internship.
- b. From the preceding activity a statement of philosophy for using graduate teaching assistants should be developed.
- c. The University, working with and through its various colleges and departments, should develop a policy

statement regarding the use of graduate teaching assistants.

- d. A program should be devised whereby the teaching assistant experience may become more meaningful. Such an effort may be characterized by a well-structured orientation program and by regular seminars on the various aspects of college teaching.
- e. The different departments within the University should make it a particular point to orient their graduate teaching assistants to the various aspects of their responsibilities within the respective departments.

Implications for Further Research

The study points out the need for further research on how faculty members view the role of the teaching assistant. Their expectations for the role compared with those of undergraduates and teaching assistants themselves may provide greater perspective and insight into this area.

A more comprehensive picture of the status and role of the graduate teaching assistant could be gleaned from a study of the expectations that department chairmen or senior faculty members in charge of multiple-section courses hold for the role of the teaching assistant.

Former teaching assistants could be studied as to their perceptions of the teaching assistant experience. As a result

some guidelines for the development of college teachers may be forthcoming.

Although this dissertation study has relevance for undergraduate education, in some departments graduate teaching assistants are teaching graduate courses both on campus and off campus. A study could be made of the expectations and attitudes of full-time faculty, teaching assistants, and students in both these settings. Such a study presents implications for "quality" education for students and a morale factor for teaching assistants and full-time faculty respectively.

There are some graduate teaching assistants who have full responsibility for teaching a course. A study might be made to determine the perceptions of undergraduates, teaching assistants, and full-time faculty members with respect to this role of the graduate teaching assistant. Is there much differentiation between this type of graduate teaching assistant and the full-time faculty member?

The non-academic side of the graduate assistant's life might be studied. The attitudes of the assistant's spouse regarding graduate study and the assistantship experience might be studied to determine the environmental press acting on the graduate teaching assistant.

To further locate the position of the teaching assistant in the University community a study could be made of the non-academic rights and privileges of the graduate teaching

assistant. Included in such a study might be such topics as driving privileges, library privileges, health services, and student personnel services peculiar to graduate students in general.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Annual Report, Office of the Registrar. East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1961-62.
2. Bates, Alan and Richard Videbeck. "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations." Sociometry. Vol. 22:1-11, March, 1959.
3. Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
4. Brookover, William and David Gottlieb. A Sociology of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1964.
5. Brown, David G. and Jay Tontz. "The Present Shortage of College Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 8: 435-36, April, 1966.
6. Carmichael, Oliver C. Graduate Education: A Critique and a Program. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
7. Cooper, Russel. "The College Teaching Crisis." Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 35:6-11, January, 1964.
8. Davis, James A. Stipends and Spouses: The Finances of American Arts and Science Graduate Students. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
9. Davis, Kingsley. Human Society. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.
10. DeLisle, Frances H. "A Study of Undergraduate Academic Advising: A Preliminary Report," Office of Institutional Research: Michigan State University, May, 1965.
11. Didier, James W. "The Role of the Baptist Parish Minister in the State of Michigan." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Michigan State University, 1965.
12. Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

13. Doyle, Louis A. "A Study of the Expectations Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members and Parents Have of the Elementary Teacher's Role." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Michigan State University, 1956.
14. Draper, Hal. Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965.
15. Dressel, Paul L. The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
16. Educational Development Program. "A Study of Departments Making Major Use of Assistant Instructors and Graduate Students as Teachers." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, October, 1964. (mimeographed)
17. Educational Policies Committee. "The Use of Teaching Assistants at Michigan State University." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, November 13, 1964. (mimeographed)
18. Fund for the Advancement of Education. Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources. The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1959.
19. Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "The Structure of Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation." The Journal of Educational Sociology. Vol. 29:31-40, Sept., 1959.
20. Gottlieb, David. "Process of Socialization in America's Graduate Schools." Social Forces. Vol. 40:124-31.
21. Gross, Neal, Ward Mason and Alexander McEachern. Expectations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
22. Guthrie, E. R. "The Expectations of Teaching." Educational Record. Vol. 30:109-15, April, 1949.
23. Hamilton, Thomas and Edward B. Blackman. The Basic College at Michigan State. MSU Press, East Lansing, Michigan, 1955.
24. Hartnett, Rodney. "A Study of the Use of Assistant Instructors." East Lansing, Michigan State University. Office of Institutional Research, June 28, 1963. (mimeographed)

25. Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
26. Johnson, Jo Anne. "Residence Halls Goals and Objectives: Perceptions of Students and Staff." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State University, 1965.
27. Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research: Educational and Psychological Inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
28. Kuhn, Madison. Michigan State: The First Hundred Years. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1955.
29. Lacognata, Angelo Anthony. "Role Expectations of University Faculty and Students: A Social Psychological Analysis." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Michigan State University, 1962.
30. Langer, Elinor. "Crisis at Berkeley (1) The Civil War." Science. Vol. 148:199-200, April, 1965.
31. Levinson, Daniel. "Role, Personality, and Social Structure in the Organizational Setting." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 58:170-80, 1959.
32. Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1945.
33. _____. The Study of Man. D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936.
34. Marquardt, Harold Roy. "The Role of the Resident Assistant in the Men's Residence Halls at Michigan State University." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Michigan State University, 1961.
35. Miller, Michael V. and Susan Gilmore. Revolution at Berkeley. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.
36. Newcomb, Theodore M. Social Psychology. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
37. Nonnamaker, Eldon R. "The Role of the Enrollment Office at Michigan State University." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Michigan State University, 1959.

38. Nuernberger, Robert M. "Reactions of MSU Graduate Students to Their Experience as Graduate Assistants." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Office of Institutional Research, May, 1966. (mimeographed)
39. Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.
40. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1962.
41. Ryan, W. Carson. Studies in Early Graduate Education: The Johns Hopkins, Clark University, The University of Chicago. Bulletin Number 30. New York: The Carnegie Foundation For the Advancement of Teaching, 1939.
42. Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory." in Gardner, Lindzey (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. I. Cambridge: Addison-Wesly Publishing Company, 1954.
43. Storr, Richard J. The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
44. Stuit, Dewey and Robert Ebel. "Instructor Rating at a Large State University." College and University. Vol. 27:247-54.
45. Tucker, Allan. "Some Questions About the Critics of Graduate Education and Their Criticism." Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting, Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research. Chicago, April 6-7, 1964.
46. _____, David Gottlieb and John Pease. "Attrition of Graduate Students at the Ph.D. Level in the Traditional Arts and Sciences." Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 1146. Publication #8, 1964. Office of Research Development and the Graduate School. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
47. _____, and Lee Sloan. "Graduate-School Talent: Sold to the Highest Bidder." Journal of Higher Education. Vol. 35:12-18, January, 1964.
48. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1973-74. Washington, D.C., 1965 edition.

49. Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
50. Walters, Everett. Graduate Education Today. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.
51. Wright, Benjamin F. "The Ph.D. Stretch-Out and the Scholar Teacher." in Arthur Traxler (ed.). Vital Issues in Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957.
52. Wyeth, Irving R. "Status-Role Perceptions in the Taiwan Extension Organization." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State University, 1964.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Trend in the Use of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty
Paid from the General Fund

TREND IN THE USE OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY

PAID FROM THE GENERAL FUND*

Year	"B" Faculty (not on tenure system)	"A" Faculty (on tenure system)
1956-57	193.4	1094.6
1957-58	204.9	1206.2
1958-59	188.5	1201.2
1959-60	249.4	1142.4
1960-61	306.1	1101.1
1961-62	364.2	1062.7
1962-63	390.9	1086.2
1963-64	431.0	1092.2
1964-65	498.0	1206.5
1965-66	550.3	1322.2

*Tables of Basic Data on Student Credit Hours, Faculty, Courses, Budget, Expenditures, Majors, Degrees, and Library. Office of Institutional Research.

APPENDIX B

Letter to Graduate Teaching Assistants

Dear Fellow Graduate Student:

Some confusion seems to exist as to the status and role of the graduate teaching assistant. The various departments on campus view him and his functions differently. In this connection, I am attempting to focus on the graduate teaching assistant who is responsible for a discussion or recitation section. (This study does not pertain to a teaching assistant who has sole responsibility for a course.) More specifically, I am trying to assess what his instructional role is by soliciting his own responses as well as those of a selected number of undergraduates. Hopefully, from your responses and those of others, some expectations and dimensions of the role of this graduate teaching assistant will become evident. The information obtained from this study will be used for my Ph.D. thesis.

I would appreciate a few minutes of your time in thoughtfully responding to this 44 item questionnaire. Your responses as well as those of others will not be individually identified. The number on the questionnaire will enable me to check returns and tabulate the data and is not for the purpose of identifying you. Your name was given to me by the chairman of your department. He acknowledges the worth of this study but leaves the completion of the questionnaire to your discretion.

I am fully aware that yours is a busy schedule and consequently appreciate the time that you might give in answering this questionnaire. Please use the enclosed stamped envelope and return the completed questionnaire by February 16, 1966 to me:

James McNally
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

James McNally

APPENDIX C

Letter to Undergraduates

Dear Student:

As you probably well know, graduate teaching assistants are being used more and more in required courses at MSU to teach discussion or recitation sections. The various departments on campus view him and his functions differently. In this connection, I am trying to assess what is the instructional role of this graduate teaching assistant, that is, one who is responsible for a discussion or recitation section, by soliciting responses from undergraduates and graduate teaching assistants themselves. (This study does not pertain to those graduate teaching assistants who have sole responsibility for a course.) Hopefully, from your responses and those of others, some expectations and dimensions of the graduate teaching assistant's role will become evident. In addition, the findings of this study will be used to review the quality of undergraduate instruction at MSU so that further progress may be made in this area.

I would appreciate a few minutes of your time in thoughtfully responding to this 44 item questionnaire. Your responses as well as those of others will not be individually identified. The number on the questionnaire will enable me to check returns and to tabulate the data and is not for the purpose of identifying you.

I am fully aware that yours is a busy schedule and consequently appreciate the time that you might give in answering this questionnaire. Please use the enclosed, stamped envelope and return the completed questionnaire by February 16, 1966 to me:

James McNally
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

James McNally

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire to Determine the Instructional Role of the Graduate Teaching Assistant

QUESTIONNAIRE
TO DETERMINE THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF THE
GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT

This questionnaire is being used to examine the expectations that graduate teaching assistants and undergraduates hold for the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant (that is, one who is responsible for a discussion or recitation section, and not one who has sole responsibility for a course). This information will be used as the basis for my Ph.D. dissertation. It should take but a few minutes of your time to complete the 44 items.

You are asked to express your expectations regarding what you think this graduate teaching assistant at MSU should do or be.

Begin each item with "The graduate teaching assistant. . . ." Then choose one of the responses which best expresses to what extent you actually expect the function or attribute to be important to the instructional role of this graduate teaching assistant. Your responses are to be according to your actual expectations and not according to ideal expectations. Circle your responses and make certain that you answer all items. There are no right or wrong responses.

Return to:

James McNally
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
 PS Preferably Should
 MMN May or May Not
 PSN Preferably Should Not
 AMN Absolutely Must Not

I. "INSTRUCTION"

The following items refer to classroom procedure and classroom conduct of this graduate teaching assistant.

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 1. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have had previous teaching experience. |
| 2. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | possess an M.A. or its equivalent in the discipline which he is teaching. |
| 3. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be exposed to a general orientation regarding his duties and responsibilities as a teaching assistant. |
| 4. | AM | PS | MN | PSN | AMN | be allowed to teach only introductory courses. |
| 5. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | feel at liberty to conduct his section in a manner that he feels appropriate, e.g., lecture, discussion groups, class-committee assignments. |
| 6. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have final say about the way he handles the content of the discussion or recitation section that he is teaching. |
| 7. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | help in the construction of examinations for the course. |
| 8. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | construct his own examinations for the discussion section. |
| 9. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have full responsibility for assigning final grades to students in his section. |
| 10. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | identify general obstacles to learning for his section, e.g., poor study habits, sources of distraction. |

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
 PS Preferably Should
 MMN May or May Not
 PSN Preferably Should Not
 AMN Absolutely Must Not

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 11. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | suggest study techniques for coping with the subject matter of the course. |
| 12. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | conduct extra-class group help sessions for his own section. |
| 13. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have his work as a graduate teaching assistant subject to review by a full-time faculty member. |
| 14. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | expect the same intellectual respect from his students as a full-time faculty member. |
| 15. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be viewed as a less adequate teacher than a full-time faculty member. |
| 16. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be viewed primarily as a faculty member. |
| 17. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be viewed primarily as a student. |
| 18. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be viewed both as a faculty member and as a student. |
| 19. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | regard his teaching obligation as second in importance to his own studies. |

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
 PS Preferably Should
 MMN May or May Not
 PSN Preferably Should Not
 AMN Absolutely Must Not

II. "ADVISEMENT"

The following items refer to the assistance that the graduate teaching assistant might render (outside of class) in all matters pertaining to a student's academic program and progress.

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 20. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have regular office hours. |
| 21. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have office hours only by appointment. |
| 22. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have office hours by appointment in addition to regular office hours. |
| 23. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be knowledgeable about related courses in his discipline. |
| 24. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be familiar with the basic requirements for a major (including degree requirements) within his department. |
| 25. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be familiar with university rules and regulations concerning academic policies (e.g. probation, withdrawal from a course, change of major). |
| 26. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | help students see the rationale for the course which is being taught in terms of curriculum requirements. |
| 27. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | assist students in the selection of courses within the teaching assistant's discipline. |
| 28. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | discuss with students the different career possibilities within the teaching assistant's discipline. |

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
 PS Preferably Should
 MMN May or May Not
 PSN Preferably Should Not
 AMN Absolutely Must Not

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

29. AM PS MMN PSN AMN encourage able and interested students to major in the discipline that he is teaching.
30. AM PS MMN PSN AMN help students in their requests for advice in the selection of courses in departments outside that of the teaching assistant's.
31. AM PS MMN PSN AMN help students achieve greater independence and responsibility for their own educational planning.
32. AM PS MMN PSN AMN view the advising of students as a significant part of his job.

III. "COUNSELING-PERSONAL RELATIONS"

The following items refer to interpersonal relations between a graduate teaching assistant and his students in matters not strictly academic.

33. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be familiar, for referral purposes, with the student personnel services of the university (i.e. counseling center, financial aids, health center) available for students.

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
 PS Preferably Should
 MMN May or May Not
 PSN Preferably Should Not
 AMN Absolutely Must Not

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 34. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | have an understanding of the nature of the student personnel records and tests that are utilized by the university. |
| 35. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be allowed access to confidential information about students in his section. |
| 36. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be sensitive to the psychological differences of his students. |
| 37. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be willing to listen to students who want to confide in him about problems not related to the course. |
| 38. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | help students cope with the stresses and pressures of college life. |
| 39. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be willing to help students in personal and social adjustment if so asked. |
| 40. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | talk with students, outside of class, about current political and social topics not related to the course. |
| 41. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by other faculty members. |
| 42. | AM | PS | MMN | PSN | AMN | be willing to listen to individual student's claims of unfair treatment by the Dean of Student's Office. |

RESPONSES

AM Absolutely Must
PS Preferably Should
MMN May or May Not
PSN Preferably Should Not
AMN Absolutely Must Not

THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT (circle your response)

43. AM PS MMN PSN AMN write letters of recommendation for students if they so request.

PLEASE CHECK TO SEE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL ITEMS

Thank you for your cooperation.

44. If you have additional expectations or observation about the instructional role of the graduate teaching assistant, please include them in the space that remains.

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03145 5912