VARIATIONS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE TEACHER ROLE: AS RELATED TO GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ROLES, EXPECTATION CATEGORIES, AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

> Thests for the Degree of Ph. D. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY Clinton A. Snyder 1963

the sea of





This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

VARIATIONS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE TEACHER ROLE: AS RELATED TO GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ROLES, EXPECTATION CATEGORIES, AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

presented by

Clinton A. Snyder

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Sociology

<u>Najor professor</u>

Date August 8, 1963

**O**-169

55-330 -R75 31967 en PJ. PH

Copyright by Clinton A. Snyder 1965

•

	•	
VARI	,	
EX		
In		
and empiri		
directed t		
toward all		
of a socia		
tions stip		
such posit		r
in expecta		
of role w		
tole defin		
T		1
teres		
"eners		
for		

#### ABSTRACT

# VARIATIONS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE TEACHER ROLE: AS RELATED TO GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ROLES, EXPECTATION CATEGORIES, AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

by Clinton A. Snyder

Inadequate attention has been paid the conceptual and empirical separation of the normative expectations directed toward a given social position qua position, or toward all members of a social group, or all representatives of a social category--as distinguished from the expectations stipulated for the individual real persons occupying such positions. To identify dimensions related to variations in expectations, two analytic structures for the concept of role were postulated. The social relationships between role definers and role occupants were also examined.

The problem was operationalized by submitting to neighbors (n-163) of male junior and senior high school teachers (n-47) a set of 166 closed response expectation items for that teaching role.

## General and Specific Roles

Half the respondents stipulated the <u>general</u> role by their expectations for "most male secondary teachers." The others stipulated the <u>specific</u> role by expectations for their neighboring teachers.

The two sets of responses were compared by "F" and "t" tests on items. The incidence of expectations with significant differences between the two groups was insufficient to reject null hypotheses of difference between the general and specific roles.

## Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations

<u>Primary</u> expectations are the qualities and performances expected of role incumbents within a given social system relevant to the achievement of that system's goals. <u>Peripheral</u> expectations are pertinent to collateral positions or roles of adjoining social systems which are supplementary to the original system. <u>Secondary</u> expectations stipulate attributes or behaviors for positions in other social systems relatively independent of and external to the original system.

Primary (36 items), peripheral (58 items), and secondary (72 items) expectation categories were validated

by judgmental t€ by median tests Means showed no peripheral, and ı. expectations had variance than ei These findings h specific role re 1 Social Distance ł. Three so to: (1) a "good and (3) **s**pecific requirements for scaled independe. <sup>scalog</sup>ram. Usin ference measures <sup>respondents</sup> to t Mighboring teac! <sup>isse measure</sup> pred <sup>:eaching</sup>. Mediar <sup>for the</sup> difference <sup>lelated</sup> to role e by judgmental techniques. "F" and "t" tests were supplemented by median tests of means and variances between categories. Means showed no significant differences between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations. But secondary expectations had significantly more items with "low" variance than either primary or peripheral expectations. These findings held for both within general and within specific role responses.

#### Social Distance

Three social distances were scaled, from respondents to: (1) a "good friend," (2) "most male secondary teachers," and (3) specific neighboring teachers. Eleven items met the requirements for Guttman measures of the three distances scaled <u>independently</u> and also when <u>pooled</u> on a single scalogram. Using the "good friend" score as a base, difference measures were taken for the social distance from respondents to the teaching position in general and to their neighboring teachers. Use of the "good friend" scale as a base measure precluded any item contents concerned with teaching. Median tests on neither the direct scale scores nor the difference measures showed social distance to be related to role expectations.

<u>Conclusi</u> , role of t • a highly same expe as they d of the "mo / different friendly" ' group's exp for teacher The tions. The requirement or "should p Larked diff <sup>respondent</sup>s concerned te <sup>related</sup> to t lower conser <sup>expect</sup>ed. W <sup>second</sup>ary te

### Conclusions

The expectations which collectively constitute the role of the male secondary public school teacher appear to be a highly stable set of stipulations. Respondents held the same expectations for the teachers living next door to them as they did for teachers in general. Even the expectations of the "most friendly" respondents were not significantly different from those held by the respondents who were "least friendly" with their neighboring teachers. Nor were either group's expectations significantly different from those held for teachers in general.

There were differences between categories of expectations. The differences did not indicate varying modes of requirement as to whether male secondary teachers "should" or "should not." Instead, the categories demonstrated marked differences in the consensus, or agreement, among respondents as to what they expected. When expectations concerned teaching activities and allied situations closely related to the teaching role, respondents showed a relatively lower consensus, or higher disagreement, as to what they expected. When expectations were concerned with male secondary teachers acting independently of, or externally

to the s

1

ŧ

,

ŧ

ŧ

sensus a:

ı.

to the school, respondents tended to show greater consensus as to what they expected of those teachers.

X

æ

VARIAT

AS 2

EXPEC

in pa

Depar

# VARIATIONS IN EXPECTATIONS FOR THE TEACHER ROLE: AS RELATED TO GENERAL AND SPECIFIC ROLES, EXPECTATION CATEGORIES, AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

By

Clinton A. Snyder

.

## A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

CEAPTER I. THE PR I. Sta II. De: A. в. c. 1 II. REVIEW ł I. The A. . в. c. II. Empi A. Β. c. ۰. III. Place III. IMPLEMEN I. Defi II. Defi III. Gene IV. Prim E

.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

E 34475

CHAPTER		PAGE
I. THE	PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS	1
I. II.	Statement of the Problem Definition of Variables	1 6
	<ul> <li>A. General and Specific Roles</li> <li>B. Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary</li> </ul>	7
	<b>Expectations</b>	10
	C. Evaluation of Interaction	15
II. REVI	EW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE	21
I.	Theoretic Formulations	21
	A. Social Psychology	21
· •	B. Anthropology	23
	C. Sociology	24
II.	Empirical Studies	34
	A. Status-Role as an Analytic Unit	36
	B. Status-Role Content as the Object of Study	38
	C. Analysis of the Status-Role	
	Conceptualization	43
III. P	lacement of Reported Research	46
III. IMPL	EMENTATION OF THE PROBLEM	50
I.	Definition of the Position	50
II.	Definition of the Sample	52
III.	General and Specific Roles	54
IV.	Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary	
	<b>Expectations</b>	56

1 CEAPTER A. в. c. V. Soci VI. Sect F VII. Clas IV. ANALYSIS I. Reje A. Β. с. ( II. Acce E S 1 A. Β. c. III. Reje D A. Β.

	A. Primary Expectations	58
	B. Peripheral Expectations	59
	C. Secondary Expectations	61
v.	Social Distance	63
VI.	Sector Analysis of Primary and	
	Peripheral Expectations	75
VII.	Classifications of Secondary	
	Expectations	77
IV. AN	ALYSIS OF FINDINGS	79
I.	Rejection of General and Specific Roles	79
	A. Analysis of the Variances of	
	Responses on Expectations	81
	B. Analysis of the Means of Responses	
	on Expectations	86
	C. Conclusions Concerning the Concepts	
	of General and Specific Role	90
II.	Acceptance of Primary and Peripheral	
	Expectations as compared to	
	Secondary Expectations	96
	A. Analysis of the Variances of	
	Responses on Primary,	
	Peripheral, and Secondary	
	<b>Expectations</b>	97
	B. Analysis of the Means of Responses	
	on Primary, Peripheral, and	
	Secondary Expectations	104
	C. Conclusions Concerning the Concepts	
	of Primary, Peripheral, and	
	Secondary Expectations	105
III.	Rejection of the Effect of Social	
	Distance on Expectations	109
	A. Analysis of the Effect of Social	
	Distance on Expectations	110
	B. Conclusions Concerning the Influence	
	of Social Distance on	
	Expectations	117
	TUPOCOUCTOND	× × /

URPTER V. SUMMA I. O II. I III. S FCOINOTES . Chapter I

Chapter :

I. TH II. En

Chapter I

Chapter I

31 BLIOGRAP HY

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	119
I. General and Specific Roles II. Primary and Secondary Expectations III. Social Distance	119 122 125
FOOTNOTES	129
Chapter I	130
Chapter II.	
I. Theoretic Formulations II. Empirical Studies	135 139
Chapter III	145
Chapter IV	147
BIBLIOGRAPHY	150

TABLE 1. Numbers betw resp 2. Numbers gene belo 3. Total**s** o role thei Numbers 4. betw resp 5. Numbers gene and 2.85 6. Totals o gene belo 7. Numbers expe belo and 8. Numbers item over gene 9. Numbers item over gene

## LIST OF TABLES

•

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Numbers of expectation items with differences between their variances on specific role responses and general role responses	82
2.	Numbers of expectation items for specific and general roles showing variances above and below the overall median variance, .5475 .	84
3.	Totals of expectations for specific and general roles having variances above and below their overall median variance, .5475	85
4.	Numbers of expectation items with differences between their means on specific role responses and general role responses	87
5.	Numbers of expectation items for specific and general roles showing mean responses above and below their overall median mean, 2.855	88
6.	Totals of expectations for both specific and general roles having means above and below their overall median mean, 2.855	89
7.	Numbers of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the median variance of specific and general role responses	98
8.	Numbers of primary and peripheral expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses	99
9.	Numbers of primary and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses	101

v

•

 Numbers expe and spec
 Numbers expe belo

THELE

and

12. Rejectio

expe diff

## TABLE

10.	Numbers of peripheral and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses 102
11.	Numbers of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations showing means above and below their overall median mean, specific and general roles
12.	Rejection of null hypotheses of difference in expectations based on social distance difference scores

.

.

.

APPEND	IX
λ.	REVIEW
	Sectior
	I.
	II.
	III. IV.
	Section
В.	INSTRUM
c.	PROCEDU
	I.
	II.
	III.

D. STATIST

.....

#### LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX</b>		PAGE
А.	REVIEW OF THE SAMPLE	165
	Section 1. Sample Definition, Exclusions, and Attrition	165
	I. Definition of the Sample-base II. Field Exclusions of Teachers and	165
	Adjacent Residences	167
	III. Respondent Attrition	171
	IV. Sample Summary	174
В	Section 2. Respondent Background Data and Validation of Sample Matches	176
<b>D</b> •		102
c.	PROCEDURES FOR SCALING SOCIAL DISTANCE	227
	I. Construction of Social Distance Scale	227
	II. Verification of Social Distance Scale	231
	III. Validation of Social Distance Scale	232
D.	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF EXPECTATION DATA	237

.

TABLE Delimita A-1. of sa A-2. Field exc adjac Attritio: A-3. A-4. Summary genera A-5. Ages of r **A-6**. Sex of  $r_{\rm G}$ A-7. Marital s A-8. Responder A-9. Attendanc Public A-10. Responder. kll. Responder. 1-12. Responden neighb 4-13. Responden teache: 1-14. Respondent seconda 125. Respondent

# LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

•

TABLE		PAGE
A-1.	Delimitation and exclusions for homogenity of sample-base	165
A-2.	Field exclusions of teacher sample-base and adjacent residences	167
A-3.	Attrition of respondents and addresses	172
A-4.	Summary of sample pairing for specific and general roles	175
A-5.	Ages of respondents	177
A-6.	Sex of respondents	177
A-7.	Marital status of respondents	177
A-8.	Respondents having children	178
A-9.	Attendance of respondents' children at public or parochial school	178
A-10.	Respondents' church attendance	179
A-11.	Respondents' church membership	179
A-12.	Respondents' length of residence in neighborhood	179
<b>A-13.</b>	Respondents' kinship to male secondary teachers	180
A-14.	Respondents' acquaintance with male secondary teachers	180
A-15.	Respondents' educational level	180

TABLE ł A-16. Social o C-1. Analysis socia C-2. Error ar C-3. Analysis scale C-4. High and dista C-5. Complete respo score D-1. Response stated D-2. Primary ( media: D-3. Periphera Pooled D-4. Secondar: Pooled

#### TABLE

A-16.

C-1.

C-2.

C-3.

C-4.

C-5.

Social class level of respondents	181
Analysis of item responses on cumulated social distance scale	<b>2</b> 30
Error analysis of social distance scales	233
Analysis of scores on the separate distance scales	234
High and low scores on the separate social distance scales	235
Complete and accumulated distributions of respondent's social distance difference scores	236

# D-1. Response distributions on expectations stated for general and specific roles . . 237 D 2. Primary expectations divided by their peoled

D-2.	<pre>Primary expectations divided by their pooled   median variance, .774</pre>	266
D-3.	Peripheral expectations divided by their pooled median variance, .6935	267
D-4.	Secondary expectations divided by their	

pooled median variance, .3745 . . . . .

ix

# PAGE

TH I. <u>Statement</u> In that mbric of "role that people and This implies th position as a ge may be modified persons occupyi: <sup>evident</sup> that the should require the requirement. <sup>characteristics</sup> have concepts b two dimensions specifically de difference betw of the study he evidence could

#### CHAPTER I

#### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

## I. Statement of the Problem

In that branch of social theory subsumed under the rubric of "role theory" there is an inherent assumption that people and their positions are not necessarily equatable. This implies that the expectations delimiting a given social position as a generalized and relatively abstract entity may be modified or redefined for the specific actual persons occupying that position. It seems nearly selfevident that the phenomena of real interaction systems should require adjustments of role expectations to meet the requirements of the particular situation and the especial characteristics of the actors at hand. But only occasionally have concepts been presented which distinguish between these two dimensions of a role.<sup>1</sup> And no known studies have been specifically designed to generate and test hypotheses of difference between them. This then was the major objective of the study herein reported: to determine if empirical evidence could validate differences between the "generalized"

ä	expectations wh
	status, or a so
	expectations wh
	of those real p
	All the
	role are not of
	system in which
	persons necessa
	either in accor
	With the norms
	<sup>k</sup> second object
	conceptually an
	<sup>zore</sup> salient an
1	which are more
1	<sup>role</sup> being stud
	<sup>be</sup> categorized
	Defined primiti
	<sup>articula</sup> tes a p
	<sup>secondary</sup> expec
	<sup>social</sup> systems.
	Finally
	al or role expe
	<sup>occupying</sup> a pos
	-

expectations which structure and circumscribe a position, a status, or a social location; and the perhaps more "specific" expectations which stipulate the real behaviors and qualities of those real persons occupying it.

All the expectations comprised by a position or a role are not of equal functional importance for the social system in which the position is located. Nor will all persons necessarily value a role behavior or attribute either in accord with each other or even perhaps in accord with the norms of the social system in which they are acting. A second objective of this study was to differentiate conceptually and empirically those expectations which are more salient and primal for a role definition from those which are more marginal or perhaps even irrelevant to the role being studied. To this end expectations will later be categorized as primary, peripheral, and secondary. Defined primitively for the moment, a primary expectation articulates a position within its own social system; a secondary expectation relates it to other, or external, social systems.

Finally, if the premises are accepted that positional or role expectations are adjusted for the real persons occupying a position and that different kinds of expectations
ay undergo diff rist be given of these variations interaction which expectations and seemed reasonabl jefiners would e others would be tions for both t characteristics became the third <sup>examine</sup> how expe <sup>relationship--la</sup> which role-defin and those other their expectatio That the <sup>such an</sup> area of tis noted  $^{\mathtt{Ather}} \, \mathtt{disparate}$ witings used co <sup>ing the socializ</sup> <sup>of the self or t</sup>

may undergo different modifications, then some explanation must be given of the etiology of such variations. Probably these variations become most crucial during actual social interaction which may develop between the persons defining expectations and those who are the recipients of them. It seemed reasonable, therefore, that the manner in which roledefiners would evaluate their social interactions with these Others would be related to the adjustment of their expectations for both the requirements of the situation and the characteristics of the actors present. This therefore became the third objective of this investigation: to examine how expectations may vary as a function of the relationship--later to be defined as social distance-which role-definers perceive to exist between themselves and those other persons towards whom they are directing their expectations.

That the social sciences have largely neglected such an area of investigation is readily understandable when it is noted that role theory has developed out of two rather disparate sources. Early social-psychological writings used concepts of role to aid in better understanding the socialization mechanisms involved in the development of the self or the personality. Such usage emphasized

the "individual by which person practice them, But at anthropologists structure and f morms, rights, persons in a so identification of also their signi group as a whole tive dimensions There do <sup>normative</sup> dimens <sup>coherence</sup> and in the position is <sup>structural</sup> view. <sup>the normative</sup> as persistence of t <sup>sanctioning</sup> the But obvi tions which def: <sup>ilfilled</sup> with  $\epsilon$ 

the "individualized" dimensions of role: the processes by which persons learn their roles, the ways in which they practice them, the adaptations which they make to them.

But at the same time, sociologists and social anthropologists were beginning to develop concepts of social structure and function. Recognition was growing that certain norms, rights, and duties often devolve upon particular persons in a social group. This permitted not only the identification of social locations within the group, but also their significance for each other as well as for the group as a whole. Such analysis emphasized the more normative dimensions of such concepts as role and status.

There does exist a widespread recognition of this normative dimension of roles.<sup>2</sup> This normativeness provides coherence and integration within the social system of which the position is a component unit--but this is only a structural view. When the social system is in process, the normative aspect of expectations contributes to the persistence of the system by regulating, controlling, and sanctioning the interaction going on within it.

But obviously, all of the various and several expectations which define a given status-role cannot always be fulfilled with equal facility by a particular actor. Nor

can it be expe rcles will be tion defined for from the expect within the enac at also betwee particularly as ality for the s fore, in transl position to a be seem that certa: performance must Mthough social Mariations, it d structure for the Such ind integral to the d dimension of sta <sup>Permitted</sup> range The range of this <sup>2laced</sup> upon behav <sup>appectation.</sup> Bu: <sup>the result</sup> of a r

can it be expected that other actors in identical statusroles will be of equal skill in fulfilling a common expectation defined for all of them. Variation in role-performance from the expected normative action may then occur not only within the enactment of a given position by an incumbent, but also between positions which are purportedly identical, particularly as to their similarities of normative functionality for the social system of which they are a part. Therefore, in translating the expectations stated for a given position to a behavioral level of interaction, it would seem that certain allowances for individual variation in performance must in some way be made by role-definers. Although social theory presents explanations for such variations, it does not provide a systematic conceptual structure for their empirical observation and analysis.

Such individual allowances are usually considered integral to the definition of a status-role. The normative dimension of status-role concepts obviously implies a permitted range for prescribed or proscribed behavior.<sup>3</sup> The range of this permissivity may vary with the value placed upon behavior in conformity with the normative expectation. But this evaluation may itself, however, be the result of a normative process wherein the evaluation

of the norm or t 4 level. Such in to occur on a m is not placed up definers' disre to alternative expectations for from one individ the subsequent v dependent upon s or sub-cultural These po <sup>of course</sup> all a <sup>role-definers.</sup> <sup>a proper</sup> topic however, assume <sup>in responses</sup> wh group of respon II. <u>Definition</u> In the Will be used wh

of the norm or normative expectation is defined on a cultural level.

Such individual allowances are also recognized to occur on a more particularized level. When high value is not placed upon conforming behavior--either through roledefiners' disregard of a value, or as they assign primacy to alternative values--they may individually define variant expectations for the status-role concerned. Such variation from one individual to another--in their valuations and in the subsequent variation in their expectations--may be dependent upon situational variables, personality variables, or sub-cultural variables.

These possible variations of role expectations are of course all attributable to variations found in individual role-definers. As such, they neither are, nor should be, a proper topic for investigation in this study. They were, however, assumed to be operant in producing the variability in responses which is nearly always demonstrated by a given group of respondents.

### II. Definition of Variables

In the ensuing portion of this chapter, terminology will be used which has in large part been adopted from Gross,

MacEac he considered as actors in a syst position is that being directed. 7 which expectatio stitute a recipr system. Focal a pants of those r An expec bents' own state they hold for a A. General and A parad the possibility <sup>expectations</sup> wh given position, <sup>this</sup> generalize <sup>istics</sup> of the i and actor objec <sup>Variable</sup>s, are <sup>Such a conceptu</sup> Mason, and MacEachern's role vocabulary.<sup>5</sup> A <u>position</u> will be considered as "the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships."<sup>6</sup> A <u>focal</u> **position** is that position towards which expectations are being directed.<sup>7</sup> A <u>counter</u> position is that position from which expectations are being directed.<sup>8</sup> Together they constitute a reciprocal and dyadic component of a social **system**. Focal and counter incumbents are simply the occu-**Pants** of those respective positions.<sup>9</sup>

An <u>expectation</u> will be defined as the counter incumbents' own statement of the evaluative specifications which they hold for a focal position and/or its incumbents.<sup>10</sup>

A. General and Specific Roles

A paradigm offered by Brookover<sup>11</sup> indicates not only the possibility of the existence of a set of general expectations which may apply to all persons occupying a given position, but also the possibility of variation from this generalized set of expectations when the characteristics of the individual actor subjects (counter incumbents) and actor objects (focal incumbents) as well as situational variables, are operating in a social interaction system. Such a conceptualization is concretized by Gross, Mason,

and MacEachern' members can eva they would appl States . . . or the superintend ments appeared of expectations <u>Apectations</u> generic level, or action is the towards focal in (2) Specific Exp phenomenal and p <sup>when the</sup> object incumbent of the A defin expectations wo: concepts of gene Althoug the theoretic v. they do not ope the basic conce <sup>of their macros</sup>

and MacEachern's statement that "for example, school board members can evaluate their superintendent on the standards they would apply to all superintendents in the United States . . . or (on the) standards they would hold only for the superintendent in their own community."<sup>12</sup> Such statements appeared to warrant proposing the empirical separation **Of** expectations into two categories. (1) <u>Generalized</u> Expectations - those which are defined on the abstract and **Generic level**, which are used when the object of interest **Or** action is the focal position, and which are directed towards focal incumbents as a class rather than as individuals. (2) Specific Expectations - those which are defined on the Phenomenal and particular level, and which are employed when the object of interest or action is the discrete incumbent of the focal position.

A definition of role as a composite set of associated expectations would thus, of course, introduce the corollary concepts of <u>general role</u> and <u>specific role</u>.

Although Gross, Mason, and MacEachern recognize<sup>13</sup> the theoretic variation between general and specific roles, they do not operationally separate them as subdivisions of the basic conceptualization of status-role. Although part of their macroscopic role analysis<sup>14</sup> is somewhat analogous

m an examinatio 15 role analysis theless stated expectations ex apply to 'super As they compare to their other The pre Attributes the others. Attributes position pr reason to d with equal feel it is compare the position) w for incumbe No prio <sup>and since items</sup> different conte <sup>data</sup> to justif; In viev <sup>chapter,</sup> it was such an infere both for a pos Position might. <sup>offered</sup> a few

to an examination of the general role and their microscopic role analysis<sup>15</sup> to that of the specific role, it is nevertheless stated that "it will be necessary to infer that the expectations expressed for 'superintendents in Massachusetts' apply to 'superintendents in particular communities.'<sup>16</sup> As they compare their "Superintendent's Attributes Instrument" to their other instruments they further state:

The presentation of these items (on the Attributes Instrument) was different from that of the others. . Although they (items on the Attributes Instrument) were asked as expectations for position prerequisites there seems to be little reason to doubt that obligations . . . should apply with equal validity to incumbents. At least we feel it is justifiable to make this inference and to compare these attributive obligations (stated for a position) with the behavioral obligations (stated for incumbents) of the other instruments.<sup>17</sup>

No prior evidence was presented for such an inference and since items in their various instruments<sup>18</sup> covered different contents they were unable to analyze their data to justify the assumption.

In view of the introductory statements of this chapter, it was the investigator's original premise that such an inference of commonality of expectations defined both for a position and for the incumbents of that position might not be warranted. Occasional studies have offered a few suggestive evidences of difference between

the general and	
been designed (	
difference. T	
in this study w	
<u>General Hyp</u>	
Incumbe	
positions d	
role which	
same expect	
<sup>B.</sup> Primary, Pe	
Several	
<sup>differences</sup> bet	
is the effect o	
incumbents upon	
<sup>With in the dis</sup>	
<sup>Other</sup> questions	
tions. Such and	
<sup>lemain</sup> Constant	
"Mat kinds of	
difference both	
What types	
<sup>or</sup> proscri	
triptive	

the general and specific role,<sup>19</sup> but none appear to have been designed explicitly to test an hypothesis of such difference. Thus the first general hypothesis to be tested in this study was:

### General Hypothesis I

Incumbents of role-defining or counter positions define expectations for a general role which are significantly different from the same expectations defined for a specific role.

B. Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations

Several questions are immediately evident as to the differences between the general and specific roles. What is the effect of the relationship between counter and focal incumbents upon the expectations held? This will be dealt with in the discussion of the third investigated variable. Other questions are concerned with structuring of the expectations. Such questions as: "What expectations, if any, remain constant for both general and specific roles?" "What kinds of expectations, if any, show the greatest difference between the general and specific roles?" "What types of expectations, if any, are most prescriptive or proscriptive?" "Which are the most permissive?" Such

mestions lead i which was invest Obvious] a given focal po fcal incumbent of these define istics expected interaction occu the position is how the positior of that system w <sup>of that</sup> positior they define the <sup>of the</sup> basic or tions were defir <sup>definition</sup> of th <sup>indicators</sup> requi <sup>both</sup> into this d  $p_{\mathsf{resented}}$  as the <sup>describ</sup>ed. Other ex <sup>or an</sup> incumbent <sup>or other</sup> charac

questions lead into the statement of the second variable which was investigated.

Obviously a multitude of expectations may be held for a given focal position (general role) or for a particular focal incumbent of that position (specific role). Certain of these define performances, qualities, or other characteristics expected for the general or specific roles as interaction occurs within the parent social system of which the position is a component unit. These expectations define how the position is integrated into the social structure of that system within which it is found and the functions of that position for the parent system. In large part, they define the means and conditions for the implementation of the basic or chartering goals of the system. Such expectations were defined as primary expectations. A detailed definition of this concept, together with the phenomenal indicators required for classification of expectations both into this category and into those following will be presented as the operationalization of this research is described.

Other expectations directed towards a focal position or an incumbent are concerned with performances, qualities, or other characteristics expected as interaction occurs in

activities adj are expected c are subsidiary collateral fun expectations w Primary and pe Merton has call The th an empirical ap This, of course directed toward positions in se distinctly sepa <sup>system</sup>. These expectations. To exem <sup>expecta</sup>tion**s**, o <sup>for teachers</sup> wi <sup>student</sup>s within <sup>are integral to</sup> defined as prim <sup>for teache**rs w**i</sup> <sup>at an</sup> extra-cur

activities adjunctive to the prime social system. They are expected of the actor as he performs in systems which are subsidiary and supplementary to, and which serve collateral functions for, the parent social system. Such expectations were defined as <u>peripheral expectations</u>. Primary and peripheral expectations together comprise what Merton has called the role-set of the actor.<sup>20</sup>

The third major division of expectations was simply an empirical application of Merton's concept of status-set.<sup>21</sup> This, of course, comprises the numerous <u>sets</u> of expectations directed towards the focal incumbent as he performs in his positions in secondary social systems, those which are distinctly separate and different from the prime social system. These expectations were defined as <u>secondary</u> <u>expectations</u>.

To exemplify the preceding structure of a set of expectations, one might indicate that expectations are held for teachers with reference to their behavior vis-a-vis students within the classroom. These are expectations which are integral to the prime social system and might be defined as primary. In addition, expectations are held for teachers with reference to their interaction with students at an extra-curricular activity, in a school cafeteria, or

at a school pic concerning the ir a union orga Such expectatio system and thus are held for te and activity, th holding addition respect to their etc. The expecta in such secondar expectations. Primary. <sup>as those</sup> cited r <sup>a given</sup> focal po definition of the The particulari <sup>light</sup> be **sum**med those expectation <sup>of the</sup> focal po The cond <sup>peripheral</sup>, and <sup>for hypotheses</sup>

at a school picnic; with parents in consultation perhaps concerning the health of their child; with other teachers in a union organization or in other collateral situations. Such expectations are peripheral to the prime social system and thus might be so labeled. Finally, expectations are held for teachers with reference to their family behavior and activity, their church membership, with regards to their holding additional jobs to supplement their income, with respect to their participation in voluntary associations, etc. The expectations for focal incumbents as they are seen in such secondary social systems might be labeled secondary expectations.

Primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations such as those cited might be stated for <u>any</u> and <u>all</u> incumbents of a given focal position. Their sum would constitute the definition of the <u>generalized role</u> for the focal position. The particularization of them for a specific incumbent might be summed into the construct of the <u>specific role</u>: those expectations directed towards <u>particular</u> incumbents of the focal position being defined.

The conceptualization of expectations into primary, peripheral, and secondary categories abrogated the need for hypotheses of substantive difference between the types

since they we was anticipate incumbents to significant va General Hy The co significan and second As thi the variable p two corollary ) Coroll In incumbe betweer expecta Coroll In incumb betwee expect

since they were definitionally postulated. However, it was anticipated that the consensual response of counter incumbents to the three types of expectations would show significant variations between the categories.

### General Hypothesis II

The concensus among counter incumbents is significantly different between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations.

As this categorization of expectations, meshes with the variable proposed earlier, general and specific roles, two corollary hypotheses may be derived.

# Corollary IIA

In the degrees of consensus among counter incumbents there are significant differences between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations as stated for the general role.

### Corollary IIB

In the degrees of consensus among counter incumbents there are significant differences between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations as stated for the specific role.

C. Evaluation It was guestions which differences bet concerned with definition of the The other quest: might exist. T exist between th coles that such the interactive incumbent and th <sup>tole vary</sup> as a f Des it vary wit <sup>bes</sup> it vary as <sup>or perceptions</sup> o <sup>of interaction  $\circ$ </sup> <sup>&t an</sup> even more <sup>issume</sup>s a separa <sup>a general</sup> role d <sup>for a</sup> Particular the generalized

C. Evaluation of Interaction

It was earlier indicated that there are various questions which may be asked concerning the hypothesized differences between the general and specific role. One, concerned with the type of expectations, resulted in the definition of the second variable of expectation types. The other questions asked why such variations as hypothesized might exist. The assumption was made that if variation did exist between the definitions of the specific and general roles that such difference might in part be a function of the interactive relationships existing between the counter incumbent and the focal incumbent.<sup>22</sup> Does then the specific role vary as a function of the frequency of interaction? Does it vary with increasing intimacy of the interaction? Does it vary as the counter incumbent expands his knowledge or perceptions of the focal incumbent directly as a result of interaction or indirectly from other sources of information? But an even more basic question must be answered. If one assumes a separation in the mind of a counter incumbent of a general role definition from his specific role definition for a particular focal incumbent, does this mean then that the generalized role will change as a result of the operation

of the above va constant and on variables are n ful or valued i and focal posit difference betw role? In an a variable, it is of the conceptu that the "self-<sup>the oth</sup>er's jud Mead furthers t <sup>situation</sup> may 1 <sup>the</sup> individual from the refled other.<sup>25</sup> Turne by proposing a <sup>role-taker</sup> bec <sup>recogni</sup>zes tha ation in and o <sup>alter</sup>."<sup>26</sup> An <sup>this; that an</sup>

of the above variables, or does the general role hold constant and only the specific role change? If the above variables are not evident (if there is little or no meaningful or valued interaction between the incumbents of counter and focal positions), does this mean a minimization of difference between the generalized role and the specific role?

In an attempt to specifically define the third variable, it is first necessary to review certain aspects Of the conceptualization of self. Cooley has indicated that the "self-idea" requires the actor's imagination of the other's judgment of his appearance to the other.<sup>23</sup> Mead furthers this by indicating that response to a social Situation may be derived either from a consideration by the individual of his self as an object in itself<sup>24</sup> or from the reflection of the self in taking the role of the other.<sup>25</sup> Turner reintroduces and further refines such theory by proposing a variable of "reflexiveness" in which the role-taker becomes "self-conscious and at least partially recognizes that he is or is potentially an object of evaluation in and of himself in an interaction situation with alter."<sup>26</sup> An assumption of change might be derived from this; that an increase in social interaction may shift the

actor's role-ta through interac cognizant of th person and his either in fact and place of in . of the counter to extend this might observe t for their inter systems with fo incumbents of t incumbents as n Potential membe <sup>associations,</sup> e tave proven so <sup>of such</sup> evaluat Alterna <sup>able.</sup> One was <sup>the past,</sup> inves interaction fre action; some ha situational cor

actor's role-taking to a more reflexive position since through interaction one becomes more sensitized to and cognizant of the fact that the other may be evaluating ego's person and his performances. The degree of reflexiveness, either in fact or as perceived, might vary with the type and place of interaction which occurs between incumbents of the counter and focal positions. If it had been possible to extend this investigation to the ultimate limits, one might observe the perceptions which counter incumbents hold for their interactions in all possible social interaction Systems with focal incumbents. One might have had the incumbents of the counter position evaluate the focal incumbents as neighbors, as fellow church goers, as Potential members of his family, as members of voluntary associations, etc., but extrapolation of this process might have proven so diluent as to result in an idiographic analysis of such evaluations.

Alternative modes of attack were, of course, available. One was to define a single, <u>selected</u> variable. In the past, investigators have measured the effects of interaction frequency, the effects of intimacy of interaction; some have chosen to analyze interaction into situational components, others have concerned themselves

with friendship into a single o evaluations whi incumbents. It research desigr and specific ro were made to is the decision wa but to let them which was defin different types of friendship o incumbents befo of the interact

<sup>of interaction</sup>

<sup>counter</sup> incumbe

<sup>between</sup> the act

The use

incumbent could

with focal inci

part be depende

<sup>alread</sup>y had wi

the counter in (

with friendships.<sup>28</sup> Another possibility was to <u>subsume</u> into a single composite variable several of the various evaluations which the respondents might hold for focal incumbents. It seemed reasonable to assume that initial research designed for validation of the concepts of general and specific role would become quite speculative if attempts were made to isolate several causative variables. Therefore, the decision was made not to factor such variables out, but to let them contribute to a single, synthesized variable which was defined as social distance. It was assumed that different types of situations would demand various degrees Of friendship or intimacy between the counter and focal incumbents before the counter incumbent would render approval Of the interaction situation. Therefore, the more situations of interaction with the focal incumbent approved by the counter incumbent, the less would be the social distance between the actors.

The use of such a variable required that the counter incumbent could make definite evaluations of his interactions with focal incumbents. But such evaluations might in large part be dependent upon the interactions which he has already had with them. It was possible, of course, that the counter incumbents had not engaged in extensive interaction,

or for that mat the incumbents cluded the exis other; a perhap perception of h A projective el social distance <u>vould</u> evaluate their interacti distance was th incumbents of t of the focal po a zero datum le <sup>structures</sup> and <sup>described</sup> in t this study. The st fore, leads to <sup>to ind</sup>icate tH and specific 1 secondary exp{

<sup>in the</sup> third

or for that matter, possibly any interaction at all, with the incumbents of the focal position. This would have precluded the existence of a definitive evaluation of the other; a perhaps unstable, or unstructured, or inconsistent perception of his evaluation of the other might have resulted. 29 A projective element was, therefore, introduced into the social distance variable by asking respondents how they would evaluate the situations if such were to arise in their interactions with the subject focal incumbents. Social distance was thus defined as the evaluation made by counter **i**ncumbents of their potential interactions with incumbents Of the focal position. A rather unique method of obtaining a zero datum level as well as minimizing the personality structures and patternings of the respondents will be described in the discussion of the operationalization of this study.

The statement of the third proposed variable, therefore, leads to the development of the relational hypotheses to indicate the changes of the first two variables, general and specific roles, together with primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations, as dependent upon change observed in the third variable, defined as the independent variable.

# <u>General</u> The dif roles defir their evalu (social dis

position.

# Genera

Th

periph

the ge

are re

incumb

Genera

Th

periph

the  $s_F$ 

are re

incum

### General Hypothesis III

The differences between the general and specific roles defined by counter incumbents are related to their evaluations of potential interaction with (social distance to) incumbents of the focal position.

#### General Hypothesis IVA

The differences between the primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations within the general role defined by counter incumbents are related to their social distance to incumbents of the focal position.

# General Hypothesis IVB

The differences between the primary, peripheral and secondary expectations within the specific role defined by counter incumbents are related to their social distance to incumbents of the focal position.
# I

L Theoretic F: A. Social Psych One of stood the test role.<sup>1</sup> The fou psychology by m These authors h understanding c <sup>to converge</sup> in the emergence o which this occu <sup>and imitative</sup> <sup>oneself</sup> the at and explicitly <sup>analyzed</sup> in de <sup>in taking</sup> the <sup>person</sup> takes d

#### CHAPTER II

#### REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

### I. Theoretic Formulations

#### A. Social Psychology

One of the major theoretical concepts which has withstood the test of time in the social sciences is that of role.<sup>1</sup> The foundations of the concept were laid for social Psychology by men such as James, Dewey, Baldwin, and Cooley.<sup>2</sup> These authors had as one of their common goals an improved Understanding of personality development, and they tended to converge in their analyses by equating this process with the emergence of the self. The major mechanisms through which this occurred they proposed as being the sympathetic and imitative processes of both imagining and assuming for oneself the attitudes of other persons. This was expanded and explicitly formalized by George Herbert Mead as he analyzed in detail the mental and social processes involved in taking the role of the other.<sup>3</sup> Via the roles which a person takes during either imagined or real interaction

with others, he perceptions conc actions with var cept of role was subject to empir means to arrivin processes. The access of role perception and concern was sho fication of the <sup>is, the</sup> object has already be $\epsilon$ dissertation wi incumbent of a The usa <sup>social</sup> psychol <sup>nevertheless</sup> f <sup>concept</sup> has as discipline. N <sup>Sarbin</sup> make us <sup>their theoreti</sup> <sup>Lindesmith</sup> and

with others, he continually expands his range of selfperceptions concurrently as he broadens his range of interactions with various members of various groups. The concept of role was used, not so much as a pragmatic concept subject to empirical validation, but as a theoretical means to arriving at a better understanding of socialization processes. The "internal" or psychological results of the process of role taking were emphasized in terms of selfperception and construction of the self-image. Little Concern was shown for the systematic analysis and classification of the independent or "external" variable--that is, the object external to the individual; the other. As has already been indicated, one of the major subjects of this dissertation will be the other, when he is defined as an incumbent of a counter position, acting as a role-definer.

The usage of the concept of role in contemporary social psychology will be later examined in detail, but nevertheless for the present, it should be said that the concept has assumed critical importance in the modern discipline. Newcomb, Cameron, Sargent, McClelland, and Sarbin make use of role as one of the "focal concepts in their theoretical formulations."<sup>4</sup> Lapier and Farnsworth,<sup>5</sup> Lindesmith and Strauss,<sup>6</sup> the Hartleys,<sup>7</sup> and Walter Coutu<sup>8</sup>

are only a few also utilize it for the explication 3. Anthropolog Kinship fattention in area was an app were interested through the rel Radcliffe-Brown kinship system) of address, but rights and duti <sup>organ</sup>ization or <sup>even</sup> though us <sup>Within</sup> a social <sup>separation</sup> of Linton in his first defining

Particular pat

formance of the

<sup>he was</sup> able to

are only a few of the many other social psychologists who also utilize it as one of their central theoretic elements for the explication of social behavior.

#### B. Anthropology

Kinship organization early attracted a great deal of attention in anthropology. Latent within this conceptual area was an approach to status-role, since investigators were interested in analyzing social structure as defined through the relationship of one person to another. Radcliffe-Brown states "The relationship system . . . (i.e., **k**inship system) . . . is not only a system of names or terms Of address, but is preeminently a system of reciprocal rights and duties."<sup>9</sup> Such early emphasis upon social organization or social structure led to an understanding, even though usually implicit, of the concept of "position" within a social structure. This culminated with the explicit separation of the positional and behavioral elements by Ralph Linton in his definitions of status and role.<sup>10</sup> Through first defining the concept of status as "a position in a particular pattern," and subsequently role as the performance of the status requirements by the individual,<sup>11</sup> he was able to abstract out the concept of a social system

fra its reific: definition of r which concretiz from between th C Sociology A limit sociology might Bughes defined ••• that part in the mores of under the conce much broader ra the "consisten <sup>in relation</sup> tc <sup>viously</sup> relate for the concept <sup>ization</sup> of sta <sup>advanced</sup> form ··· "a stand <sup>ing upon</sup> a per <sup>Dubin's</sup> usage <sup>statu</sup>s. Althd

from its reification in behavior. Since, however, the definition of role was restricted to only that activity which concretizes status, there is but little to choose from between the two concepts as stated.<sup>12</sup>

C. Sociology

A limited selection of the several approaches in sociology might be made to indicate a few of the possibilities. Hughes defined status as being "only [author's underlining] • . . that part of one's role which has a standard definition in the mores or in law."<sup>13</sup> Status here is thus subsumed under the concept of role. The latter being inclusive of a much broader range of behavior since Hughes defines it as the "consistent conception (which one holds) with himself in relation to other people." This definition is obviously related to those which are frequently accepted for the concept of self. He introduces the institutionalization of status when he recognizes that a somewhat more advanced form of status might be differentiated as "office" . . . "a standardized group of duties and privileges devolving upon a person in certain defined situations."14 Dubin's usage well exemplifies another common approach to status. Although he follows Hughes in the usage of the

concept of of external mark and groups in equation of t is unusual, t in the usage Dictionary of as "social st The locationa "social statu statement "re emphasis is p The f both a positi <sup>as well</sup> as to <sup>system</sup> or str <sup>in the</sup> usage <sup>Work</sup> does not <sup>in the</sup> status <sup>ranking</sup> sense thus becomes <sup>of the</sup> behavi <sup>10re</sup> frequent concept of office, he defines status as "a set of visible external markings that systematically ranks individuals and groups in relation to each other."<sup>15</sup> Although the equation of the indicators or symbols of rank with status is unusual, the connotation of ranking is frequently intended in the usage of the term of status. In fact, Fairchild's <u>Dictionary of Sociology and Related Sciences</u> defines status as "social standing or prestige of a person in his group."<sup>16</sup> The locational function is assigned to the complex term "social status," but even here there is included the statement "relative position, rank, or standing" although emphasis is placed upon the ideas of position or locus.<sup>17</sup>

The fact that status has been thus used to connote both a position or location in any social system or structure as well as to indicate the idea of position in a ranking system or stratification structure has produced repercussions in the usage of the role concept. Some authors, whose work does not demand precise discrimination of definition in the status-role area, have used status <u>only</u> in the ranking sense in order to avoid confusion. For them role thus becomes a more inclusive term with lack of separation of the behavioral elements from those positional aspects more frequently attributed to status. This has been

concept of off external marki md groups in equation of the is unusual, th in the usage of Dictionary of s "social sta The locational 'social status statement "rel emphasis is pl The fa both a position as well as to : system or strat <sup>in the</sup> usage of Work does not <sup>in the</sup> status-<sup>ranking</sup> sense thus becomes a <sup>of the</sup> behavic Dore frequent]

concept of office, he defines status as "a set of visible external markings that systematically ranks individuals and groups in relation to each other."<sup>15</sup> Although the equation of the indicators or symbols of rank with status is unusual, the connotation of ranking is frequently intended in the usage of the term of status. In fact, Fairchild's <u>Dictionary of Sociology and Related Sciences</u> defines status as "social standing or prestige of a person in his group."<sup>16</sup> The locational function is assigned to the complex term "social status," but even here there is included the statement "relative position, rank, or standing" although emphasis is placed upon the ideas of position or locus.<sup>17</sup>

The fact that status has been thus used to connote both a position or location in any social system or structure as well as to indicate the idea of position in a ranking system or stratification structure has produced repercussions in the usage of the role concept. Some authors, whose work does not demand precise discrimination of definition in the status-role area, have used status <u>only</u> in the ranking sense in order to avoid confusion. For them role thus becomes a more inclusive term with lack of separation of the behavioral elements from those positional aspects more frequently attributed to status. This has been

particularly Sheld as he differe when he state the position occupies a st he is said to significance analysis of . In fact, he de tionalized rol "is made up of or components In a b interaction th <sup>an actor's</sup> ori Participation <sup>phenomenon</sup> in interaction wh indicates that Patterned int $\epsilon$ <sup>purposes</sup> the r This particip

particularly frequent in social psychological writings.

Sheldon typifies a recurrent sociological definition as he differentiates between status and role in institutions when he states that "in the formal description of institution, the position of the actor is described by saying that he occupies a <u>status</u> [italics]. When he acts in this status, he is said to be acting out a <u>role</u> [italics]."<sup>18</sup> The significance of the concept of role in relationship to an analysis of institutions is similarly indicated by Parsons. In fact, he defines an institution as "a complex of institutionalized role integrates."<sup>19</sup> Further, the institution "is made up of a plurality of interdependent role-patterns or components of them."<sup>20</sup>

In a broad and generic definition of role, Parsonian interaction theory defines it as "that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process."<sup>21</sup> The crucial phenomenon in this theoretical system is, of course, the interaction which goes on within the social system. Parsons indicates that "it is the participation of an actor in a patterned interactive relationship which is for many purposes the most significant unit of the social system."<sup>22</sup> This participation which Parsons emphasizes may be viewed

from two pers

aspect" which

the second be

Since status

structure, an

ficance for t

concepts of s

bundle, " (whe

considered) a

of social sys

The c

as a hyphenate

occasions for

<sup>to</sup> give a ran]

behavioristic;

Beegle also ut

consideration

milque-toast

which do not

<sup>specific</sup> grou

<sup>Validated</sup> in

<sup>They</sup> suggest

<sup>class</sup>ificatiq

from two perspectives. The first being that of the "positional aspect" which may be equated with social locus or status;<sup>23</sup> the second being that of the "processual aspect" or role.<sup>24</sup> Since status is defined as a basic component of social system structure, and since role is "seen in the functional significance for the social system," Parsons consolidates the concepts of status and role into status-role or "status-role bundle," (when the rights and duties of the actor are being considered) as being a more productive unit for the analysis of social systems.<sup>25</sup>

The concepts of status and role are thus combined as a hyphenated term by several authors. One of the earlier occasions for this is found in Gardner Murphy's work, evidently to give a ranking connotation to role, which is defined behavioristically in terms of obligations.<sup>26</sup> Loomis and Beegle also utilize the combined term, but to "eliminate from consideration psychological concepts of role, such as the milque-toast role, Don Juan role, and glamour girl role, which do not require membership or participation in a specific group.<sup>27</sup> Such non-systemic roles have been validated in small group research by Benne and Sheats.<sup>28</sup> They suggest a typology of member roles and describe one classification as being certain roles which are related to

the needs of the

I.

pertinence to th

evaluation is a

such roles. It

individual is e

the functional

he is interacti

probably do ide

that such a per

will, affect th

systemic role

<sup>ized</sup> roles may

of the individ

<sup>over</sup>" from a s

<sup>Explication</sup> an

<sup>may be</sup> profici

theory.

Robert contributors

<sup>analys</sup>is of c

<sup>the concept</sup> o

<sup>of signal</sup> imp

<sup>for the</sup> actor

the needs of the individual members and "which have no pertinence to the functioning of the group."29 This latter evaluation is a common error of overgeneralization concerning such roles. It should be obvious that even though the individual is enacting a role which does not originate from the functional structure of the particular group in which he is interacting, nevertheless, other members may and probably do identify him in his "personal" role, and further, that such a personalized identification may, and probably will, affect the doubly contingent structure of his systemic role vis-a-vis their own. Although such individualized roles may find their genesis in the personality structure of the individual, they may also be the result of a "carryover" from a separate and different group or social system. Explication and analysis of such a "carry-over" of role may be proficiently handled through reference group theory.

Robert K. Merton has been one of the major contributors to reference group theory. In his first analysis of contributions to reference group theory, <sup>30</sup> the concept of the relative deprivation of the actor was of signal importance, particularly as it provided criteria for the actor's evaluation of his status. Merton used

- status in at 1
- tive function
- used in a way
- m indicate th
- being made wit
- Scondly, he u
- indicate the d
- individual may
- is quite in a c
- the discipline
- of his earlier
- various proble
- of reference of
- <sup>mnsequence</sup> he
- that lead to a
- <sup>conceptualizat</sup>
- <sup>to indicate se</sup>
- he delimits s
- and utilizes of
- <sup>status-superio</sup>
- <sup>Position</sup> or st
- Mertor <sup>elabo</sup>rated int <sup>these</sup> perhaps

status in at least two ways in this analysis of the comparative function of the reference group. First, status was used in a way which bears a strong connotation of ranking; to indicate that a comparative evaluation of statuses is being made within an hierarchically arranged structure.<sup>31</sup> Secondly, he used status in the lay sense, that is, to indicate the condition or state of affairs in which an individual may find himself.<sup>32</sup> This latter usage, incidentally, is quite in accord with the definition frequently seen in the discipline of psychology. In the current development of his earlier work, <sup>33</sup> Merton systematically analyzes the various problems which must be dealt with in the analysis of reference groups as related to social structure. In consequence he introduces distinctions and discriminations that lead to a more finely detailed structuring of his conceptualizations. Although Merton frequently uses status to indicate several somewhat variant concepts, at this point he delimits status to the basic idea of social position, <sup>34</sup> and utilizes the typology of "status-inferiors, peers, and status-superiors"<sup>35</sup> to bring out the connotation of rank position or stratification.

Merton's analysis of status and role later becomes elaborated into the idea of status-set and role-set but these perhaps might best be introduced by examining earlier

# Ţ

presentations of and "a role, "<sup>3</sup> role; a status ture, a role b with the enact "status of an to denote the The individual is the converg systems; <u>a</u> sta these. The c the **associa**te "from the var Merto this plural p of the "rolewhich persons This is not a <sup>roles</sup> in whi <sup>that</sup> a **s**ingl. <sup>seve</sup>ral inhe <sup>minis</sup>terial <sup>defined</sup> with

r

presentations of similar ideas. Linton had used "<u>a</u> status,"<sup>36</sup> and "<u>a</u> role,"<sup>37</sup> for a singular perspective of status and role; a status being a single position within a social structure, a role being only the particular behaviors associated with the enactment of that status. He also defined the "status of an individual,"<sup>38</sup> and the "role of an individual"<sup>39</sup> to denote the collective perspective of status and role. The individual acts in many social systems, and <u>his status</u> is the convergence or intersection of these many social systems; <u>a</u> status is <u>a</u> position which he holds in each of these. The collective role, <u>his role</u>, simply represents the associated series of patterned behaviors cumulated "from the various patterns in which he participates."<sup>40</sup>

Merton makes a similar discrimination in examining this plural perspective of statuses and roles by speaking of the "role-set"; that "complement of role relationships which persons have by occupying a particular social status."<sup>41</sup> This is not coterminous with the concept of the multiple roles in which an individual may act, but rather denotes that a single position which an individual may occupy has several inherent role relationships. For example, the ministerial position is characterized by relationships defined with parishioners, with the vestry, with the

bereaved pers participants. handles by PI "complex of 1 but with the find themselv individual ma etc. Merto vocabulary di Bates. 43 Whi macroscopic 1 status-sets, starts from a or commonly he held in commo these norms, <sup>or related</sup> su role. But ob <sup>Bates</sup> propose sets of norms the same post of norms, i.e

bereaved personnel of a funeral service, with marriage participants, etc. The concept of multiple roles Merton handles by proposing the term of "status-set." This is the "complex of roles associated, not with a single social status, but with the various statuses . . . in which individuals find themselves."<sup>42</sup> This is the familiar idea that an individual may be a father, husband, worker, buyer, voter, etc.

Merton's analysis is similar, although the technical vocabulary differs, to the analysis presented by Frederick Bates.<sup>43</sup> While Merton starts from the more abstract and macroscopic level of social structure and analyzes it into status-sets, under which are subsumed role-sets; Bates starts from a norm which is distinguished as: "A patterned or commonly held behavior expectation. A learned response held in common by members of a group."<sup>44</sup> He then synthesizes these norms, or expectations, into a "more or less integrated or related sub-set of social norms"; 45 this constitutes a role. But observing that their source as a given group, Bates proposes that they are "distinguishable from other sets of norms (which originate from other groups) forming the same position."<sup>46</sup> Thus the accretion of these <u>sets</u> of norms, i.e., "position," is comparable to Merton's

rcle-set, but B status-set. Ro structural in c Probabl attempts to res and operational seen in the wor the few who hay that of the pu of items and a <sup>cover</sup> the "tot <sup>subsumed</sup> under <sup>data</sup> of course <sup>design</sup> incorpc pertinent to a The  $m_{d}$ <sup>Tole</sup> theory--a <sup>the</sup> <u>de</u> <u>novo</u> d∢ <sup>With Which the</sup> <sup>critici</sup>sm. T <sup>will</sup> subsume generally asc <sup>grand</sup>iose and

-

role-set, but Bates does not conceptualize the homologous status-set. Role is looked upon as being "normative and structural in character and not behavioral."<sup>47</sup>

Probably one of the most ambitious and comprehensive attempts to resolve the many problems of conceptualization and operationalization that role theorists have to face is seen in the work of Bruce Biddle, et al.<sup>48</sup> They are among the few who have the temerity to study a "total" role-that of the public school teacher. To do so, many hundreds of items and a variety of instruments were required to cover the "total" gamut of behaviors which are generally subsumed under the rubric of "role theory." Such extensive data of course required the development of a conceptual design incorporating "all" the dimensions and variables pertinent to analysis of the "total" role.

The most frequent denigration of those who work with role theory--and Biddle also makes such comments  $^{49}$ --is the <u>de novo</u> definition and conceptualization of the variables with which they work. But Biddle, too, is subject to this criticism. The construction of a theoretical model which will subsume the totality of that segment of human behavior generally ascribed to role theory must of necessity be quite grandiose and exceedingly complex. Biddle's work is both.

Due to the diff vocabulary and with new titles or even apprais any role study and design, sho or similar comp incorporate inv <sup>Jata,</sup> conceptu: along with log some extent ma The pr confirmation o and Hughes tha <sup>vague,</sup> nebulou <sup>concept</sup> is us∈ writer to def <sup>research</sup> inter <sup>derived</sup> from ation and con <sup>in particular</sup> <sup>theoretical</sup> c Investigators

Due to the difficulty of interpreting another new role vocabulary and of recognizing familiar concepts relabelled with new titles, it becomes exceedingly difficult to review or even appraise the studies. Needless to say, however, any role study which goes beyond the most simplistic structure and design, should consider the advantages offered by this or similar comprehensive works. When research studies incorporate investigative variables to analyze myriads of data, conceptual design demands a consistency of definition, along with logical articulation of dimensions, which to some extent may be neglected in less extensive studies.

The preceding discussion only begins to introduce confirmation of a statement made several years ago by Neiman and Hughes thatthe "concept role is at present still rather vague, nebulous, and non-definitive. Frequently . . . the concept is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the concept."<sup>50</sup> The increased research interest in the area has rendered the usual rewards derived from the operationalization of concepts. Delimitation and concise definition of terms has been necessitated in particular empirical studies. However, problems of theoretical consensus have not yet been solved since different investigators choose different conceptual prototypes with

which to appr Thus divergen only for the well. "What define**s as a** calls role be theless, "in the concept r integral part II. <u>Empirica</u> In ex in the area o structure upo their discuss particular wo <sup>structure.</sup> C <sup>often</sup> require difficult to a <sup>have</sup> sharp an tempting to c <sup>do not</sup> at fir Such problems

which to approach the phenomenal reality of social behavior. Thus divergent and variant interpretations are seen not only for the concept of role, but for that of status as well. "What Linton and Newcomb define as a role, Davis defines as a status; what Davis defines as a role, Newcomb calls role behavior and Sarbin role enactment."<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, "in spite of the confusion and lack of consensus, the concept role (as well as status) is at present an integral part of sociological vocabulary."<sup>52</sup>

## II. Empirical Studies

In examining the empirical work which has been done in the area of status-role, it was necessary to impose structure upon such studies. Not only does this expedite their discussion, but it assists the explication of this particular work by permitting its location within such structure. Categorizations such as those which follow often require a certain amount of "shoehorning." It is difficult to establish mutually exclusive categories which have sharp and definitive lines of demarcation. It is tempting to create "ad hoc" categories for studies which do not at first appear to fit the structure proposed. Such problems are particularly evident since research

endies rarely examples menti in multiple lo theoretical pr conceptual pro Here is an outline of used in the e categorizatio problem at ha

The f

A. Status-ro

l. As a

2. As a

a. :

b. -

<sup>B.</sup> Status-r

1. Expe

a.

b.

2. The

a.

b.

c.

studies rarely have singular aims or objectives. The examples mentioned, therefore, may occasionally be indicated in multiple locations. In order to further comprehension, theoretical proposals will also be cited as sources for the conceptual prototypes which have stimulated investigation.

Here following below is presented in summary form an outline of the classification of studies which will be used in the ensuing section of this dissertation for the categorization of research literature pertinent to the problem at hand.

The following classification will be used: A. Status-role as an Analytic Unit

- 1. As a unit of social structure or social system
- 2. As a unit of socialization
  - a. The process of socialization
  - b. The results of socialization
- B. Status-role Content as the Object of Study
  - 1. Expectations as the content of status-role
    - a. Diachronic variation
    - b. Synchronic variation
  - 2. The status-role concept as an assumption
    - a. Occupational status-roles
    - b. Definitions of stereotypes
    - c. Attitudinal studies

3. Sociome a. Bel b. At 4. Correl C. Analysis o 1. Role c a. So b. Pe 2. Status 3. Status variał A. Status-Ro Many <sup>examination</sup> o approached th <sup>analys</sup>is. In <sup>instrumental</sup> conceptual co <sup>2ation</sup> of a n <sup>than</sup> is exami The concept

<sup>of oth</sup>er prop

- 3. Sociometric usage of status-role
  - a. Behavioral emphasis on interactions
  - b. Attitudinal emphasis on interactions
- 4. Correlative studies
- C. Analysis of Status-Role Conceptualization
  - 1. Role conflict
    - a. Sources of conflict
    - b. Perception and resolution of conflict
  - 2. Status-role as a unit of social interaction
  - 3. Status-role processes as related to psychological variables
- A. Status-Role as an Analytic Unit.

Many investigators have been concerned with examination of areas of human behavior which are readily approached through the usage of status-role as a unit of analysis. In such cases, status-role, per se, assumes an instrumental importance for it serves mainly as an appropriate conceptual component for the structuring and the systematization of a more generic and abstract level of human behavior than is examined under the other two ensuing major headings. The concept functions in a "means" role to expedite study of other problems.

l. Asau

The co

emphasizes

normative

and social

status-rol

not only e

status-rol

assists in

status-rol

to given s

binds disc

whole.<sup>1</sup>

2. Asau

a. Th

In

occur

often

as  $on_{\theta}$ 

growt

sugge

occur

proce

This

1. As a unit of social structure or social system

The concept of status-role in this context generally emphasizes a central element of normativeness. This normative element permits analysis of institutional and social systems into their component parts--of which status-role is one. The normative aspect of status-role not only emphasizes the position or location of the status-role within social structure, but in addition assists in defining the functionality of the particular status-role for the larger system. The norms attached to given status-roles are considered the cement that binds discrete elements of behavior into a structured whole.<sup>1</sup>

- 2. As a unit of socialization
  - a. The process of socialization

In analyzing the socialization processes which occur in personality development, investigators often have made use of the concept of status-role as one of the "evolutionary stages" in the social growth of the individual. There is generally a suggestion of diachronic or genetic process which occurs as the individual undergoes a continuing process of status-role learning and internalization. This process is generally described in such a way
ì that sequ b. with stru may the <u>has</u> the pers

Alth

neve

term

cepti

B. Status-Re

Many

somewhat mor

necessary fo

the abstract

directed the

substantive



that the various status-roles make up the concatenate sequence.<sup>2</sup>

b. The results of socialization

Investigators have been frequently concerned with developing a concept of total personality structure. In such cases, personality structure may be analyzed from a synchronic perspective into the many roles or status-roles which the individual <u>has</u> internalized.<sup>3</sup> This is somewhat analogous to the concept of the multiple self. Merton's perspective is the converse of this category. Although his prime emphasis is social-structural, nevertheless, a view of the individual is given in terms of his <u>many</u> status-roles; this Merton conceptualizes as status-set.

B. Status-Role Content as the Object of Study

Many investigators have preferred to look at a somewhat more phenomenal level of human behavior than is necessary for examining the macrocosm of society, or for the abstraction of a social system. Frequently they have directed their investigations towards more specific and substantive studies of status-roles. Concern has been



shown for the into a status are the many to, the state may be thus a may be define units rather of expectation the status-ro role as compa the preceding "B", includes and phenomena either "A" or 1. Expec Empir <sup>units</sup> usu expectati variatior a given s carried da.

shown for the many component units which are synthesized into a status-role. Since the source of these components are the many perceptions by persons of, and their relations to, the status-role under investigation, that status-role may be thus analyzed into these more minute units. They may be defined explicitly as expectations, or if behavioral units rather than attitudinal ones are examined, <u>the concept</u> of expectations may frequently be implicit. In such studies the status-role concept is perhaps being used in an "ends" role as compared to the "means" role which it served under the preceding category "A." This particular category, "B", includes studies which often generate a more delimited and phenomenal picture of status-role than is the case for either "A" or "C".

1. Expectations as the content of status-role.

Empirical examination of status-roles via expectation units usually has brought out the fact that such expectation units are not always uniformly defined. The variations observed in the expectations directed towards a given status-role has permitted the analyses to be carried out in at least two different ways.

a. Diachronic variation

If the variations in expectations appear to

occur d develo to pro indivi by a s compar i**s** upo terms and pa b. Sy En are co of sta defini a sta conta or exp all s 2. The s This of a comp sufficien <sup>as</sup> to war

occur over time, the status-role may be broken into developmental stages. Thus the investigator is able to propose that the eventual functioning of an individual in a given status-role is preceded by a stepwise process of status-role assumption comparable to "A 2 a." The emphasis in this category is upon the status-role <u>per se</u> rather than in terms of its significance for personality structure and patterning.<sup>4</sup>

b. Synchronic variation

Empirical studies have demonstrated that there are consensual clusterings in the variant definitions of status-role expectations which are held by the defining individuals. This permits the analysis of a status-role into sub-types, each of which may contain the repetitive variations of the perceptions or expectations which others may hold for the overall status-role.<sup>5</sup>

# 2. The status-role concept as an assumption

This particular classification is perhaps worthy of a completely separate major head or perhaps it is sufficiently variant from the other research indicated as to warrant exclusion from the cited structure. There

are many delineate emphasis structure status-ro theoretic be descri They rang to tho**s**e weak crit premise, positions and specia them. a. O b. D с. A 3. Socio Socio <sup>in the</sup> us <sup>role</sup> may <sup>attitud</sup>ir. <sup>data</sup> is u

are many research studies which frequently have not delineated status-role, although some do; wherein emphasis was neither laid upon the social system or structure, nor specifically upon the content of the status-role. These studies range from the highly theoretic and analytic to those which might best be described as being in the "life adjustment" category. They range from the broad and general in character to those which are specific case studies. The rather weak criterion for inclusion is that their initial premise, even though often tacit, is the existence of positions in society which have definable boundaries and specialized activities or attitudes associated with them.

- a. Occupational status-roles<sup>6</sup>
- b. Definitions of stereotypes<sup>7</sup>
- c. Attitudinal studies<sup>8</sup>

٠,

3. Sociometric usage of status-role

Sociometric studies have exhibited another variation in the usage of status-role. Here the content of statusrole may be considered from either a behavioral or an attitudinal perspective. In either case, the sociometric data is used inductively to abstract the functionality

of the va		
the group		
or for th		
statuses.		
a. E		
, v		
of th		
(frec		
the i		
These		
imple		
based		
b. ;		
J		
of i		
inte		
sele		
role		
choid		
ga e:		
4. Corre		
Valic		
studies v		
	1	

of the various status-roles for either the structure of the group, the interaction occurrent within the group, or for the individuals who fill the defined role statuses.

a. Behavioral emphasis on interactions

Various studies have reported the consequents of the mensurative processes of interaction (frequency, origination, recipience, types) for the interaction system or group under observation. These frequently have resulted in, or are implemented by, postulation of status-role types based on the observed variables.<sup>9</sup>

b. Attitudinal emphasis on interactions

Here the emphasis lies, not on the direct analysis of interaction, but on the analysis of respondents' interpretation and perception of it via choice and selection processes. Types of positions (statusroles) or persons may be postulated on the basis of choice-rejection profile patterns for the person as either subject or object.<sup>10</sup>

## 4. Correlative studies

Valid for inclusion under this category are certain studies which are basically correlative in nature even

though the implicit. wherein a are corre religion, other dem C. Analysis A sub the concept o categori**es** mi heuristic fun <sup>status-role</sup> i <sup>a basic</sup> or el <sup>implements</sup> ge <sup>specificity</sup> i <sup>instances</sup> of <sup>operationaliz</sup> <sup>anal</sup>yze it ir of structure 1. Role Such <sup>in</sup> View current1

though the concept of status-role may be entirely implicit. Such studies might be referred to as those wherein attitudes, beliefs, levels of aspiration, etc., are correlated with gross variables such as age, sex, religion, education, social class, and perhaps certain other demographic or ecologic variables.<sup>11</sup>

C. Analysis of the Status-Role Conceptualization.

A substitution for the means and ends functions of the concept of status-role suggested for the first two major categories might result here in the categorization of an heuristic function for the concept. Concern is shown that status-role is perhaps too inclusive a concept for use as a basic or elemental research tool. While it readily implements generalizing discussions of human activity, specificity is lacking when it is applied to concrete instances of behavior. Thus investigators who have operationalized the concept have found it necessary to analyze it into more detailed components either of content, of structure, or of process.

1. Role conflict

Such studies are probably worthy of a major category in view of the diversified interests which have been currently shown for the problems of role conflict.

Such inves and postul to bring a overl**y s**yr closes sev in **s**ingle a. S E freque vario Studi at th expec their the p b. p С on th probe of th Some group But m Such investigations have required proemial definition and postulation of the concept of status-role in order to bring about its subsequent operationalization. An overly synoptic view of role-conflict analyses discloses several sub-types, although their coalescence in single investigations is frequent.

a. Sources of conflict

Etiological analyses of incompatible expectations frequently have demonstrated their stemming from various segments of society or social systems. Studies of cultural and institutional marginality at the most inclusive level, of conflicting expectations from diverse reference groups or their members at a more discrete level, indicate the possible range of variation.<sup>12</sup>

b. Perception and resolution of conflict

Once role conflict is identified and defined on the existential level, investigations often probe into the functionality, of dysfunctionality, of the conflict for the system in which it is seen. Some studies have examined its pertinence for the group(s) or organization(s) in which it is present. But more frequently concern is shown for the

impinge structu towards have ex of the them as or res 2. Status Some i towards a finer ana foundatic theory ca upon the action 4 precedi inhere the so howev Blum€ call thej lev

•

impingement of role-conflict upon personality structure or upon the subject individuals' orientations towards alters or social systems. Investigators have examined the subjects' perception and tolerance of the inconsistent expectations directed toward them as well as the manner in which they adjust to or resolve the ambiguous situation.<sup>13</sup>

Status-role as a unit of social interaction 2. Some investigators have directed their efforts towards a breakdown of the status-role concept into finer analytic units in such a way that the phenomenal foundations of social structure and social process theory can be more readily examined. Emphasis upon the significance of the concept for social interaction theory is seen in this category. Some of the preceding studies referred to appear to have the inherent defect of describing in idiographic fashion the social situation which is under study. Here, however, investigators appear to be in accord with Blumer's caveats<sup>14</sup> to avoid problem bound and categorically constricted variables. They attempt to maintain their analyses of status-role at a sufficiently generic level to articulate their findings with social system

and social 3. Status varia Empha in indivi with vari either pl as empath show up a III. Placeme The fluence of in The core of of Status-Rc of social in <sup>deta</sup>iled faq which might <sup>Through</sup> the <sup>role</sup> dimens <sup>mechanisms</sup> ) Such an inv ~ improved un

and social interaction theory.<sup>15</sup>

3. Status-role processes as related to psychological variables

Emphasis is here laid upon the fact that variation in individual personality characteristics is associated with variation in the processes by which an individual either plays, takes, or defines a role. Variables such as empathy, insight, personal needs, and the like show up at this point.<sup>16</sup>

## III. Placement of Reported Research

The research herein reported resulted from the confluence of ideas from several of the previous categories. The core of this study originates from C 2, i.e., Analysis of Status-Role Conceptualization: Status-role as a unit of social interaction. The main goal was to examine certain detailed facets of the conceptualization of status-role which might be pertinent to inter-personal behavior. Through the investigation of this study's general and specific role dimensions it was hoped that better insights into the mechanisms by which roles are defined might be achieved. Such an investigation would be rewarding in producing an improved understanding of the normative dimensions of a

ì role as expect via the specif expectations a requirements c expectation**s** 1 The  $d\epsilon$ findings with Social Structu by the classi peripheral, an variable of th for the catego <sup>cerning</sup> the s and qualities <u>Within</u> given could be pres <sup>other</sup> social Socio <sup>the lack</sup> of a <sup>independent</sup> . <sup>and focal in </sup> <sup>ized by</sup> diff <sup>Content</sup> as t role as expectations are defined for the general role. But via the specific role variable it would also indicate how expectations are modified and adjusted to meet one of the requirements of a phenomenal interaction system . . . that expectations be defined for people, not for positions.

The desire was also entertained to articulate findings with "A 1," Status-Role as an Analytic Unit of Social Structure or Social Systems. This was implemented by the classification of expectations into the primary, peripheral, and secondary categories proposed as the second variable of this study. If differences could be validated for the categories, improved statements could be made concerning the salient and nuclear nature of primary behaviors and qualities expected of actors as they occupy positions <u>within</u> given social systems. And in addition evidence could be presented as to how expectations originating from other social systems impinge upon the primary system.

Sociometric selection techniques were precluded by the lack of group structure in this study but the defined independent variable of social distance between counter and focal incumbents was akin to the variables operationalized by different methods under "B 3 b," Status-Role Content as the Object of the Study; Sociometric usage of

status-role wi The social dis alized as the concerning va incumbents (d Similar to ce such a dimens or to be rela actor--the cd focal incumbe expressive or inve**s**tigatin <sup>qualitie</sup>s or <sup>actual</sup> inter <sup>expectations</sup> Fina <sup>that</sup> certair <sup>chan</sup>ge• Alt an assumptid <sup>originally</sup> s <sup>chan</sup>ge with <sup>but that</sup> pe: <sup>the</sup> general

status-role with attitudinal emphasis on interactions. The social distance variable of this study was operationalized as the attitudes which counter incumbents held concerning various possible interactions with focal incumbents (defined completely in Chapter III, Part V). Similar to certain of the selection techniques of sociometry, such a dimension was considered to act as an indicator of, or to be related to, the friendship or liking which one actor--the counter incumbent--might have for another--the focal incumbent. And such a dimension, together with its expressive or affective component, seemed promising in investigating a possible cause of variation in expected qualities or behaviors--particularly for the case of an actual interaction system, exemplified by specific role expectations.

Finally, on the most general level, it was hoped that certain data would be pertinent to theories of social change. Although the general hypotheses were stated with an assumption of stability for the general role, it was originally speculated that not only might the specific role change with the independent variable of social distance but that perhaps more moderate changes might be observed in the general role as well. Such findings would have been

suggestive as

social change,

right occur.

analyses of th

suggestive as to at least one of the processes by which social change, as indicated by changing role definitions, might occur. These speculations were not borne out by analyses of the data.

I. Definitio The posi of the male position exc. music and ar: specialists Inclusively, of English, mathematics, <sup>were</sup> believe <sup>of the</sup> Posit <sup>divergent</sup> ex associated v <sup>of the</sup> Posi In the <sup>for</sup> several <sup>the</sup> "separa <sup>compared</sup> to

### CHAPTER III

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

## I. Definition of the position

The position examined in this investigation was that of the male secondary teacher. Delimitation of the focal position excluded principals, assistant principals, coaches, music and art directors, shop teachers, counselors, and specialists such as speech and physical therapists. Inclusively, the focal position comprised classroom teachers of English, foreign languages, social studies, sciences, mathematics, and commercial subjects. These delimitations were believed necessary to work with as consistent an image of the position as possible by eliminating the perhaps divergent expectations stemming from school activities associated with, but not germane to, the teaching function of the position.

In the overall view, the position of teacher was chosen for several reasons. Statements have been made regarding the "separateness" of the institution of education as compared to other institutions of American society.<sup>1</sup>

This suggests of the person delineated th in our societ cerning the a communities a to have rath unsystematic personnel. exposure to <sup>days</sup>"; due t the teaching in our **s**ocie <sup>engendered</sup> ł control proc Man: <sup>variou</sup>s fac foundation <sup>items</sup>. And <sup>as</sup> a former <sup>education</sup> 1 concerning

-

This suggests that the definitions held for the positions of the personnel of education might be somewhat more clearly delineated than is the case for other comparable positions in our society.<sup>2</sup> Even though congruence of beliefs concerning the school is not necessarily high in different communities and social classes, nevertheless people do seem to have rather patent and clearcut, even though frequently unsystematic, ideas about our educational system and its personnel. This may well be due to the high frequency of exposure to interaction with role incumbents during "school days"; due to the relative "publicness" of the school and the teaching position; to the high value placed on education in our society; and even perhaps to the high involvement engendered by the traditional autonomy of the local control process.

Many former research studies have investigated various facets of the teacher role.<sup>3</sup> This gave an adequate foundation for the content selection of role expectation items. And finally, both the experience of the investigator as a former teacher and his later interest in sociology of education resulted in modicums of substantive information concerning the position defined for examination.

,

II. <u>Definiti</u>

The i

defined as th

interaction v

evaluations h

public it was

existence--du

ship with per

to a maximum

lationship w

teacher and

polar extrem

<sup>sample,</sup> it d

<sup>extreme</sup> type

<sup>interval</sup> of

<sup>the</sup> sample w

<sup>count</sup>er incu

<sup>teache</sup>rs and

<sup>them</sup>selves i

<sup>interaction</sup>

<sup>Therefore</sup>, t <sup>Who w</sup>ere nei

### II. Definition of the Sample

The independent variable for this study was earlier defined as the counter incumbent's evaluations of potential interaction with focal incumbents, the synthesis of these evaluations being called social distance. For the total public it was assumed that evaluations would range from nonexistence--due to a total lack of interaction and acquaintanceship with persons in the focal position, i.e., teachers-to a maximum of an intimate, warm, and affectionate relationship with focal incumbents, such as might exist between teacher and wife, or teacher and close kin. Although such polar extremes may be present in any relatively large sample, it did not seem necessary to analyze for these extreme types. Instead, it was decided that an intermediate interval of this variable should be observed. To this end, the sample was purposively designed to comprise a group of counter incumbents having at least some interaction with teachers and who thus might be better able to project themselves into situations of evaluation of their potential interaction with the defined focal incumbents, teachers. Therefore, the sample was constructed to include respondents who were neighbors of teachers occupying those positions

T indicated in consisted of located in a addresses, ap were used for Conta sent to the s homes. The 1 in a sample d the research Telephone cal <sup>to ma</sup>ke an aj

Some

Work and are

<u>sample</u>, incl

<sup>corres</sup>pondir

incumbents.

<sup>refus</sup>als amo

<sup>contacted</sup>.

<sup>What</sup> extent

<sup>analys</sup>es is

indicated in the previous section. This teacher base consisted of 64 focal incumbents. Their addresses were located in a 1959 Lansing City Directory and 118 adjacent addresses, approximately two for each teacher address, were used for the final respondent sample.

Contact letters (see sample in Appendix B) were sent to the sample of 118 addresses adjacent to teachers' homes. The letter indicated that their names had appeared in a sample drawn from the Lansing area and briefly described the research with which it was hoped that they would assist. Telephone calls followed up the contact letters in order to make an appointment to deliver the research instruments.

Some losses, of course, did occur in the actual field work and are described in Appendix A, Section 1. The <u>final</u> <u>sample</u>, including replacements, comprised <u>163 respondents</u> corresponding to a <u>teacher base</u> of forty-seven focal incumbents. It might be noted at this point that actual refusals amounted to only seven persons, 3.6% out of 194 contacted. Five of these were young, unmarried females. To what extent this default bias might repudiate subsequent analyses is at best only speculative.

III. <u>General</u> The d was operation. struction of instruments. For e base, two ad questionnair items on thi used the ite . expe Men Sho <sup>The</sup> actual <sup>count</sup>er inc <sup>stipulating</sup>  $T_{O}$ <sup>given</sup> quest

## III. General and Specific Roles

The differentiation of the general and specific roles was operationalized by purposive sample division, by construction of the schedule, and by administration of the instruments.

For each focal incumbent of the 47 teacher samplebase, two adjacent addresses were used. To one was given questionnaires which dealt with the general role. All items on this instrument (for samples, see Appendix B) used the item stub:

> In the following situations, what do you expect of most junior and senior high school men teachers?

> > Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

Should they or should they not? The actual expectation items then followed. A total of 79 counter incumbents responded to this instrument, thus stipulating the general role.

To the other addresses adjacent to each teacher were given questionnaires dealing with the specific role. All

items on t	
used the i	
ex	
hi	
111 (	
Che	
Shou	
<sup>The</sup> actual e	
<sup>counter</sup> incu	
stiuplating	
The p	
questionnaire	
<sup>by the</sup> counte	
In addition,	
<sup>restated</sup> the	
<sup>laintenance</sup> c	
of course var	
specific role	
<sup>20</sup> , 23, 26	
~~, e	

items on this instrument (for samples, see Appendix B) used the item stub:

> In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

> > Absolutely must
> > Preferably should
> > May or may not
> > Preferably should not
> > Absolutely must not

Should he or should he not?

The actual expectation items then followed. A total of 84 counter incumbents responded to this instrument, thus stiuplating the specific role.

The preceding stubs headed each page of the actual questionnaires in order to control the referent being used by the counter incumbents as they responded to the items. In addition, occasional items throughout the instruments restated the referent subject to ensure the respondents' maintenance of the proper frame of reference. Such items of course varied in wording between the general and the specific role instruments. (See items 5, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, etc. on sample questionnaires in Appendix B.)
All other it The ' (see samples in mind eith high schools of the sample you know" if of the sample explanation of delivery. IV. Primary, The transmitting Deliberate, <sup>to induce the</sup> the formal s <sup>day the</sup> resp <sup>enlar</sup>ged in <sup>experience</sup> t <sup>can still</sup> be <sup>school</sup>s, bot <sup>to imp</sup>ress u

All other items were worded identically on both instruments.

The written instructions to both instruments (see samples in Appendix B) cautioned the respondents to keep in mind either "most men teachers in our junior and senior high schools" if they were part of the general role segment of the sample--or "this particular teacher that you indicated you know" if they were part of the specific role segment of the sample. Similar verbal cautions were made during explanation of the research at the time of questionnaire delivery.

# IV. Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations

The institution of education is responsible for transmitting certain essential elements of culture. Deliberate, patterned, systematic, and compulsory attempts to induce the learning of these are carried on within the formal structure and organization of the school. Today the responsibility of the school has been tremendously enlarged in terms of the broad gamut of knowledge and experience to which the child is exposed. However, there can still be seen a rather firm core of learnings which schools, both currently and historically, have attempted to impress upon youth. Such learnings constitute the

raison d'etre purposes of t curricular or of these curr as one of the institution c which such le knowledge is curricular or might be cons <sup>overall</sup> educa <sup>the actors</sup> as <sup>system</sup> were d Curr€ commitment to <sup>Por the</sup> purpo <sup>such</sup> additior <sup>by the</sup> prima <sup>collateral</sup> s <sup>defined</sup> for 1 <sup>subsidiary</sup> s <sup>expectations</sup>

The

T

raison d'etre for the institution of education. For the purposes of this research, this core was identified as curricular or "classroom" learnings.<sup>4</sup> The implementation of these curricular learnings was defined for this study as one of the chartering goals or major premises for the institution of education. The nuclear social system within which such learnings are facilitated and where pertinent knowledge is communicated was identified as the primary, curricular or "classroom" system. This primary system might be considered as the nucleus of the parent or overall educational system. Those expectations defined for the actors as they take their roles within the primary system were categorized as "primary" expectations.

Current educational policy also defines the school's commitment to many extra- or co-curricular activities. For the purposes of this research it was postulated that such additional responsibilities are implemented not only by the primary system but also by many supplementary and collateral social systems or subsystems. The expectations defined for the actors as they take their roles within these subsidiary social systems were categorized as "peripheral" expectations.

The primary system together with the various subsidiary

systems compr The f peripheral an stated in the inserted pare A. Primary H Thes and distingu others (stud help, etc.) system, but <sup>cong</sup>ressman, <sup>systems</sup> (rel <sup>P</sup>rimary exp∈ <sup>of the</sup> prima sanctioning articulate <sup>(student</sup>, a <sup>the</sup> (educat <sup>enact</sup> their (implementa <sup>of the</sup> (ed:

I

systems comprise of course the total educational system.

The following three sections define primary, peripheral and secondary expectations. The definitions are stated in their generic form with the operational terms inserted parenthetically.

A. Primary Expectations

These expectations define the focal position (teacher) and distinguish it from all other positions, not only those others (student, administrator, school board member, clerical help, etc.) found within the sanctioning (educational) system, but also those (minister, policeman, father, congressman, etc.) which are identified with other social systems (religious, law-enforcement, family, government). Primary expectations implement and regulate the operation of the primary (curricular or "classroom") segment of the sanctioning (educational) system. Such expectations articulate the focal position (teacher) with other positions (student, administrator, school board member, etc.) within the (educational) system as the focal incumbents (teachers) enact their roles to fulfill the chartering goals (implementation of curricular or "classroom" learnings) of the (educational) system.

	An ex
fellowi	ing ind
1.	Role
	The a
	ident
	(tead
2.	Cont∈
	The 🤅
	cond.
	(tead
	goal
	room
	With
	unit
3,	• Loca
	Whil
	excl
	foca
	expe
	Prin
B	• Do
	reri
	Thes

1. Role identification:

The actor (teacher) is primarily and positively identified as an incumbent of the focal position (teacher).

2. Content of the expectation:

The expected quality or performance defines the conditions and means for the focal incumbent's (teacher's) endeavors to fulfill the chartering goals (implementation of curricular or "classroom" learnings) of that (educational) system within which his position (teacher) is a component unit.

3. Location of role enactment:

While neither a defining characteristic nor an exclusive indicator, the role enactment of the focal incumbent (teacher) pertinent to the expectation is usually observed within the primary (curricular or "classroom") system.

B. Peripheral Expectations

These are expectations not directly concerned with

# rtainment of cular or "cla cational) sys mentary and a culations of other systems curricular ac subsidiary or and periphera

of the actor

An ex

the following

l. Role

The

iden

(tead

2. Conte

The

expe

role

With

ment

of t

attainment of the chartering goals (implementation of curricular or "classroom" learnings) of the sanctioning (educational) system. They are not so much definitive as supplementary and adjunctive. Such expectations provide articulations of the focal position (teacher) with positions in other systems (teacher organizations, clerical help, extracurricular activities, custodial staff, P.T.A., etc.) subsidiary or collateral to the primary system. Primary and peripheral expectations together comprise the role-set of the actor (teacher).

An expectation may be categorized as peripheral by the following indicators:

1. Role identification:

The actor (teacher) is primarily and positively identified as an incumbent of the focal position (teacher).

2. Content of the expectation:

The expectation states the quality or performance expected of the actor (teacher) as he carries on role (teacher) activities <u>not</u> directly concerned with the fulfillment of the chartering goal (implementation of curricular or "classroom" learnings) of that (educational) system within which his

pos		
<b>J. D</b> OC		
Whi		
exc		
act		
usua		
syst		
tive		
C. Secondar		
Thes		
<sup>church</sup> membe		
<sup>of social sv</sup>		
Other the		
and the second		
<sup>jerined</sup> focal		
<sup>togeth</sup> er with		
<sup>const</sup> itute +1		
An <sub>ex</sub>		
<sup>the</sup> following		
1. Role		
mL		
tue a		
as <sub>ar</sub>		
(tead		

position is a component unit.

3. Location of role enactment:

While neither a defining characteristic nor an exclusive indicator, the role enactment of the actor (teacher) pertinent to the expectation is usually seen within the peripheral or supplementary systems (teacher organizations, P.T.A., administrative offices, school cafeterias, etc.).

## C. Secondary Expectations

These are expectations defined for positions (father, church member, voter, etc.) which are structural components of social systems (familial, religious, political, etc.) other than the one (educational) which subsumed the originally defined focal position (teacher). These other positions together with the originally defined focal position constitute the actor's status-set.

An expectation may be categorized as secondary by the following indicators:

# 1. Role identification:

The actor (teacher) is <u>not</u> primarily identified as an incumbent of the originally defined position (teacher). That position (teacher) is now of

T secor (tead as ar club to th 2. Conte The expe enac club part econ 3. Loca Whi] ind per the In <sup>three</sup> categ <sup>expectation</sup> <sup>ten</sup> includi <sup>complete</sup> se <sup>Sxpectation</sup> secondary significance. Here the focal incumbent (teacher) is primarily and positively identified as an incumbent of a position (parent, consumer, club member, citizen, etc.) in a system external to the originally defined (educational) system.

2. Content of the expectation:

The expectation states the quality or performance expected of the focal incumbent (teacher) as he enacts those additional roles (parent, consumer, club member, citizen, etc.) which stem from his participation in other social systems (family, economic, voluntary associations, community, etc.).

3. Location of role enactment:

While not a defining characteristic nor an exclusive indicator, the role enactment of the actor (teacher) pertinent to the expectation is usually seen within the above indicated external systems.

In order to validate the sorting of items into the three categories of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations, a judgment technique was used. Nine judges,<sup>5</sup> ten including the investigator, were given copies of this complete section (IV. Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations) up to the beginning of this paragraph. They

T were also gi expectation to sort the of the prece of items was will be note V. <u>Social I</u> Thi by Bogardus *evaluations* conceptuali The analog <sup>social</sup> dist counter pos <sup>focal</sup> posi <sup>is obvious</sup> and liking <sup>sonalit</sup>y s <sup>of affecti</sup>  $M_{\text{C}}$ <sup>attractior</sup> However, }

were also given field copies of the questionnaire on which expectation items were randomly ordered. They were asked to sort the 166 items into the three categories on the basis of the preceding definitions. Agreement on the placement of items was very good with only a few exceptions. These will be noted in the concluding two sections of this chapter.

## V. Social Distance

This variable is somewhat analogous to that proposed by Bogardus.<sup>6</sup> Since his concern was mainly with the ranking evaluations defined for members of minority groups<sup>7</sup> the conceptualization did not directly apply to this study. The analog of social distance here applicable was the social distance which existed between the incumbent of the counter position (respondent) and the incumbent of the focal position (teacher) as perceived by the former. This is obviously associated with such variables as friendship and liking. However, the dependence of these upon personality structures and patternings (as well as the problem of affective variables) led to an avoidance of such concepts.

Moreno's concept of the <u>tele</u> relationships of attraction and repulsion also was not altogether unrelated. However, here the problem was one of the development of

such relatio
This also wa
research <b>s</b> ir
the counter
of a type si
context.
Seve
the <b>s</b> tatemer
He indicate:
of interact
persons. <sup>8</sup>
tion of act
of interact
activities
<sup>inter</sup> action
that the in
<sup>activ</sup> ities
<sup>culture</sup> 10
into the +-
about a de
indicate
of inter-
Therefor Therefor
- <sup>516</sup> ,

such relationships through interaction within the group. This also was thus not specifically applicable to this research since it was presumed that interaction between the counter and focal incumbents would not necessarily be of a type similar to that which might occur within the group context.

Several of Homans' hypotheses are pertinent both to the statement and the significance of this third variable. He indicates the positive relationship between frequency of interaction and the degree of liking between two or more persons.<sup>8</sup> He also states that "an increasing specialization of activities will bring about a decrease in the range of interaction of a person concerned with any one of these activities and will limit the field in which he can originate interaction."<sup>9</sup> It is not altogether invalid to presume that the institution of education has a specialization of activities somewhat separate and variant from the larger culture.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps this specialization is carried over into the teachers' relationships with non-teachers, bringing about a decreased range of interaction. This would again indicate that a direct appraisal of friendship, intimacy of interaction, liking, etc. might be difficult to measure. Therefore, an approach to the relationship in terms of an

evaluation as social d The social dist	
as social d The social dist	
The social dist	
social dist	
small ( $n =$	
ways respon	
with whom t	
First, what	
with a frie	
that they d	
ways did th	
from other	
education.	
rough data	
the discuss	
A so Pilot or a	
resp.	
<sup>such</sup> items	
<sup>vere</sup> exclud	
<sup>see</sup> sample	
<sup>dist</sup> ributio	
<sup>Were</sup> concer	

evaluation of <u>potential</u> interaction was used and defined as social distance.

The initial entrance into the construction of a social distance scale was an open-ended interview with a small (n = 17) pilot sample. Discussion aimed at the various ways respondents perceived their relationships to other people with whom they were friendly as related to two factors. First, what types of things did, or would they like to do, with a friend that they would not like to do with someone that they did not identify as a friend? Second, in what ways did they perceive their friends as being "different" from other persons of the same occupation, religion, age, education, or other similar categories? Analysis of this rough data revealed some 57 items which had reappeared during the discussions.

A second exploratory interview with a small (n = 23) pilot sample indicated that many of these items had rather common responses, either negatively or positively. Since such items would not contribute to scale construction, they were excluded. Only those twenty-one items were retained (see samples in Appendix B) which appeared to give some distribution insofar as the attitudes of the respondents were concerned. As might have been expected the field

distributi Faced with tended to social dis apparently An addition of the pilo interviewer one items u

The

<sup>social</sup> dist

a scalar com

along this :

one to twelv

and a define

Point six al

<sup>existing</sup> bet

<sup>locates</sup> hims

tance betwee

<sup>cedure,</sup> howe

assumption m

<sup>jist</sup>ance bet

<sup>fashion</sup>. An

distribution was not nearly as broad as the pilot sample. Faced with a paper and pencil instrument, respondents tended to cluster at the positive end of the scale (low social distance) much more so than in the informal and apparently unrecorded situation of a face-to-face discussion. An additional possible biasing factor was that most cases of the pilot samples were persons already known to the interviewer. Nevertheless, as will be indicated, the twentyone items used did yield a scale of social distance.

There are at least two alternative ways by which social distance may be measured. The first is to construct a scalar continuum of the variable and to locate respondents along this scale. If, for instance, a scale ranging from one to twelve measured the distance between a respondent and a defined other, any respondent locating himself at point six along this scale has 6 units of social distance existing between himself and the defined other. If he locates himself at point eight, there are 8 units of distance between the two members of the dyad. Such a procedure, however, does introduce certain problems. The assumption must be made that each person perceives social distance between himself and a defined other in the same fashion. And one must also assume that all persons

responding h to their "fr An a social dista the more des distance dir In order to bench mark to define, existing be as a "good <sup>one</sup> item in <sup>"Social</sup> Dis <sup>second</sup> inst which he in <sup>which</sup> he pe person. Th ing in Appe Incumbent ( <sup>the</sup> respond reference 1 <sup>or v</sup>ariant the two sc

T

responding have similar personality characteristics relative to their "friendliness" with other persons.

An alternative technique which may be used to measure social distance, and this second process was thought to be the more desirable, is not to measure perceived social distance directly but to measure it in terms of differences. In order to do so, one might "zero in" or establish some bench mark for the scalar variable by asking a respondent to define, by prospective scale items, the social distance existing between himself and some person whom he identifies as a "good friend." This was done by the use of the twentyone item instrument appearing in Appendix B and labelled, "Social Distance: Counter Incumbent to Good Friend." A second instrument was later submitted to each respondent on which he indicated--by the same item situations--the distance which he perceived to exist between himself and another person. This was done by the use of the instrument appearing in Appendix B and labelled "Social Distance: Counter Incumbent to Focal Incumbent" (the specific teacher whom the respondent knew). Since this procedure gives both a reference measure and a second measure, either similar to or variant from the reference point, the difference between the two scaled measures might be looked upon as a more

dependable i to responden towards thos be minimized among respon friendship s procedure wa distance as focal positi instrument a It v <sup>carry</sup>over fi were used or <sup>case</sup> for the tried. The <sup>repetition</sup> d <sup>of the</sup> samp 'Good Friend <sup>cont</sup>act wit <sup>delive</sup>red. <sup>to Fo</sup>cal Ind Position, " <sup>seturn</sup>, usu; dependable indicator of social distance. The variation due to respondents' personality systems and their attitudes towards those persons identified as friends would at least be minimized. It also permits the removal of the variation among respondents of the scale's natural origin--or "where friendship starts" for the respondents concerned. A similar procedure was carried out for the measurement of social distance as perceived betwen the counter incumbent and the focal position (male secondary teachers in general). The instrument appears in Appendix B and is so labelled.

It was thought that item similarity might produce carryover from one instrument to another if all three measures were used on each respondent. This did appear to be the case for the small number of respondents for which it was tried. Therefore, the overall sample was split so that a repetition occurred only once for each respondent. For half of the sample, the first instrument, "Social Distance to 'Good Friend'", was administered at the beginning of the first contact with the respondents when the questionnaire was delivered. The second instrument, either "Social Distance to Focal Incumbent" or "Social Distance to the Focal Position," was administered at the time of the investigator's return, usually about a week later, to pick up the

T questionnai Friend" sca ing the sec the order of Although the single dupl advantageou admini**s**trat For for the cou the sample distance; a <sup>counter</sup> inc <sup>construct</sup> a <sup>it</sup> was obvi <sup>data</sup> contri <sup>this,</sup> a som <sup>used</sup> for sc. <sup>ment</sup>s, "Cou Incumbent to Pocal Posit With this ra  questionnaire. The respondents had not seen the "Good Friend" scale for several days at the time of their completing the second scale. For the other half of the sample, the order of instrument administration was reversed. Although there was possibly some carryover even for such a single duplication, it was thought that this was the most advantageous technique short of a long time delay between administrations.

For the total sample, then, data were available for the counter incumbent to good friend distance; for half the sample on the counter incumbent to focal incumbent distance; and for the remaining half of the sample on the counter incumbent to focal position distance. In order to construct a scale from which differences could be deduced, it was obviously necessary to have all three sets of distance data contribute to a single common scale. In order to do this, a somewhat novel system of respondent selection was used for scale construction. The three distance instruments, "Counter Incumbent to Good Friend," "Counter Incumbent to Focal Incumbent, " and "Counter Incumbent to Focal Position" were in the ratio of 2 to 1 to 1. In accord with this ratio, 64 "Counter Incumbent to Good Friend" instruments were randomly selected from the sample; these

individuals

Pocal Incun

previou**s i**r:

"Counter In

exclusions

appearing t

responded t

thought tha

distance, e.

<sup>32</sup> "Focal I

controlled

These 128 qu

<sup>technique</sup> f

questions wa

<sup>Guttman</sup> scal

Appendix C.

<sup>in the</sup> order

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Scale} & \text{Instr}\\ \text{Item} & \text{Ite}\\ \underline{N_{0.}} & \underline{N_{0}}\\ 1. & (9)\\ 2. & (6) \end{array}$ 

individuals were then excluded as 32 "Counter Incumbent to Focal Incumbent" instruments were selected; and finally, all previous individuals were excluded for the selection of 32 "Counter Incumbent to Focal Position" instruments. These exclusions eliminated biasing the scale by a respondent's appearing twice within the data--even though he would have responded to two different instruments. Since it was thought that there might be a sex difference in social distance, each of the three groups (64 "Good Friend," 32 "Focal Incumbent," and 32 "Focal Position") was also controlled to contain equal numbers of males and females. These 128 questionnaires were then analyzed by the Cornell technique for Guttman scale construction. 11 A series of questions was abstracted which met the requirements for a Guttman scale. A summary of the analysis is to be found in Appendix C. The eleven items which scaled are here listed in the order of their appearance on the final scalogram.

Scale Item <u>No.</u>	Instrument Item <u>No.</u>	
1.	(9)	What's your reaction towards discussing religion with him?
2.	(6)	How would you feel about discussing politics with this good friend?

Scale Instr Iten Ite <u>No. No</u> 3. (4) 4. (20) 5. (19)

6. (13 7. (14

<sup>8</sup>. (16 <sup>9</sup>. (18

<sup>10.</sup> (15

11. (11

Scale Item <u>No.</u>	Instrument Item <u>No.</u>	
3.	(4)	Would you want to discuss <u>his</u> job with him?
4.	(20)	How about (your husband's) going out of town together on a short business trip?
5.	(19)	How would you feel about having him as a member of your (husband's) lodge, social club, etc.?
6.	(13)	Suppose you were neighbors and you were locked out of your home during the winter and had to seek shelter in his home for an hour or so until someone came home. How would you react to this?
7.	(14)	What if this happened to him and he asked to wait in your home?
8.	(16)	How about your families having a picnic or barbecue together?
9.	(18)	How do you think you might react to accidentally meeting this good friend and his wife in a restaurant and having lunch with them?
10.	(15)	If your phone were dead and you went over to his house to report it, how would you react if you were invited to have a cup of coffee?
11.	(11)	How would you react to (your husband's) going bowling or golfing with this good friend?

. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Thes Counter Incu <sup>items</sup> on the Position" ar Focal Incum Subject type distance, re first respor <sup>categories.</sup> <sup>i.e.,</sup> had gi <sup>first</sup> item v <sup>foils</sup> 2 - 5, <sup>least</sup> favor; <sup>social</sup> dista <sup>first t</sup>en it <sup>item</sup> eleven

Response Categories

1.	I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.
2.	This might work out fairly well.
3.	"So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
4.	I doubt that I would go for this.
5.	I think I would probably try to avoid it.
The	se items are taken from the scale "Social Distance:

Counter Incumbent to Good Friend." For the corresponding items on the "Social Distance: Counter Incumbent to Focal Position" and the "Social Distance: Counter Incumbent to Focal Incumbent," see the sample instruments in Appendix B. Subject types having the most favorable, i.e., least social distance, responses answered all the first ten items in the first response category; the eleventh item in the first two categories. As subject types became decreasingly favorable, i.e., had greater social distance, they would answer the first item with foils 2 - 5, then the first two items with foils 2 - 5, then the first three with 2 - 5, etc. The least favorable response pattern, i.e., having the greatest social distance, of course was that in which all of the first ten items were responded to with foils 2 - 5, and item eleven with foils 3 - 5. Thus there was a total of

velve scal As respondents their "Foca of the latt Friend" sco a "referenc in which re Others. Th Was subtrac Positive va or "Focal F than the di

> <sup>the</sup> convers <sup>cated</sup> a gre

<sup>of the</sup> frie <u>approval of</u>

<sup>Three</sup> Possi

Exa

Good Fr

<sup>all</sup> ele

a "Soci

<sup>twel</sup>ve

twelve scale score types.

As described earlier, differences were taken between respondents' scale scores on their "Good Friend" scale and their "Focal Incumbent" or "Focal Position" scale, whichever of the latter two had been administered to them. The "Good Friend" score thus acted as a ledger mark in providing both a "reference scale" and an "anchorage point" for the manner in which respondents perceived their relationships with The "Focal Incumbent" or "Focal Position" score others. was subtracted from the "Good Friend" score, giving a positive value to the difference when the "Focal Incumbent" or "Focal Position" distance was less, i.e., lower score, than the distance to "Good Friend"; a negative value when the converse occurred. A positive difference thus indicated a greater approval of the incumbent, or position, than of the friend. A negative difference indicated a greater approval of the friend than of the incumbent or the position. Three possibilities might be cited.

Example 1: A respondent had a "Social Distance: Good Friend" scale score of one (low social distance, all eleven items answered approvingly). He also had a "Social Distance: Focal Incumbent" scale score of twelve (high social distance, all eleven items <u>not</u>
answered	
negative	
as measur	
focal inc	
Εχαπ.	
Good Frid	
all elev	
a "Socia	
one (low	
approvir.	
eleven.	
by the s	
incumbe:	
Exa	
Good Fr	
have "s	
of thre	
both is	
Perceiv	
<sup>s</sup> cales,	
Positiq	

answered approvingly). The distance difference is negative eleven. This is the greatest possible distance, as measured by the scales, between a respondent and a focal incumbent.

Example 2: A respondent had a "Social Distance: Good Friend" scale score of twelve (high social distance, all eleven items <u>not</u> answered approvingly); He also had a "Social Distance: Focal Incumbent" scale score of one (low social distance, all eleven items answered approvingly). The distance difference is positive eleven. This is the <u>least</u> possible distance, as measured by the scales, between the respondent and a focal incumbent.

Example 3: Two respondents have "Social Distance: Good Friend" scale scores of three and nine. They also have "Social Distance: Focal Position" scale scores of three and nine respectively. The distance difference for both is zero. This would indicate that each of them is perceiving the <u>same</u> social distance, as measured by the scales, to both their "Good Friend" and to the focal position.

	The s
c:	alculated,
e	leven, for
٥	f Appendix
c	4 indicated
Δ	I. <u>Sector</u> Periphe
	A f
t	he design
h	ad been to
w	ard a give
đ	levised to
e	expectation
I	primary and
	set concept
	and McEach $\epsilon$
	"sector" a:
	of expecta
	position t
	Or
	<sup>to th</sup> e tea
	expectatio
1	board memb

The social distance difference scores were thus calculated, ranging from plus eleven through zero to minus eleven, for all respondents. The data cited in Part III of Appendix C and its accompanying Appendix Tables C3 and C4 indicated that this procedure was both credible and valid.

### VI. <u>Sector Analysis of Primary and</u> Peripheral Expectations

A final statement might be made with reference to the design of this research. Since the original intent had been to examine a variety of expectations directed toward a given position, some systematic process had to be devised to sample the available range of content for expectations. Comparable plans had been suggested for primary and peripheral expectations both by Merton's roleset concept<sup>12</sup> and by the manner in which Gross, Mason, and McEachern had operationalized similar ideas with their "sector" analysis.<sup>13</sup> They defined a role sector as a "set of expectations applied to the relationship of a focal position to a single counter position."<sup>14</sup>

One might define a large number of sectors related to the teaching position for both primary and peripheral expectations. Students, parents, principals, superintendents, board members, school clerical and custodial staff, board

staff membe consultants some of the arise, or th ships of the import than activities w made. The s tive position counter to fo as a basis fo One a expectations. not have a re. had two or mo: ٠ both hold the <sup>to</sup> establish p <sup>such</sup> a cumbers <sup>that</sup> it was no hand. Both ty <sup>nate</sup> Other." As ind <sup>a bas</sup>is for it

staff members, librarians, counselors, special education consultants, college and university staffs--these constitute some of the possible directions from which expectations may arise, or the possible counter positions to which relationships of the teacher may be defined. Since some are of less import than others for the teacher in his day-to-day activities within the school, a selection was therefore made. The student, parent, other teacher, and administrative positions probably comprise the more significant sectors counter to focal incumbents. These were therefore used as a basis for item selection of expectations.

One additional category was also used to classify expectations. Some relatively critical expectations did not have a readily discernible counter position. Others had two or more counter positions whose incumbents might both hold the given expectation. For these it was impossible to establish primacy of a single counter position without such a cumbersome and particularized wording of the question that it was not thought to be feasible for the problem at hand. Both types of items were categorized as "Indeterminate Other." See Appendix Table D-1 for examples.

As indicated, the above named sectors were used as a basis for item sampling of contents for both primary and

peripheral expect analysis might t ment on the part various sectors The sector clas in both data re for this purpos either the stud sectors unless such placement placed in the VII. <u>Classifi</u> Very g sampling of se <sup>to</sup> categorize Teacher in cum ternal to the political, c <sup>voluntary</sup> as <sup>base</sup> for the <sup>Three</sup> additi <sup>originally</sup>, peripheral expectations. It was originally hoped that sector analysis might be used as an empirical variable, but disagreement on the part of the judges<sup>15</sup> in assigning items to the various sectors led to its abandonment for research purposes. The sector classification was retained, mainly for indexing in both data reporting and subsequent analyses. But even for this purpose, no expectations were classified into either the student, other teacher, administrative, or parent sectors unless at least a majority of the judges agreed on such placement. The items upon which they disagreed were placed in the "Indeterminate Other" category.

### VII. Classification of Secondary Expectations

Very similar statements might be made for content sampling of secondary expectations. The original intent was to categorize these mainly by systemic primacy or pertinence. Teacher incumbents interact in numerous social systems external to the school. A sampling of the religious, familial, political, community or civic, neighborhood, economic, and voluntary associations systems seemed to provide an adequate base for the content sampling of secondary expectations. Three additional categories (non-systemic) were also originally used for secondary expectations. They were

]) Extra-schoo

and Performance

The dis

preceding class

to warrant rest

analysis of bot

the field data,

categories. Th

(2) Personal Qu

Work, "Moonligh

Only the

original schedu

<sup>items</sup> wherein t

<sup>expectation</sup> for

<sup>What they</sup> expec

<sup>"other</sup> people, "

III D). These

<sup>such</sup> items show

as to placement

<sup>into the</sup> preced

items were re-

<sup>inves</sup>tigator.

<sup>of practically</sup>

(1) Extra-school Work, "Moonlighting," (2) Personal Behaviors and Performances, and (3) Personal Qualities and Attributes.

The disagreement of the judges was so great for the preceding classifications of secondary expectations as to warrant restructuring of the categories. By inductive analysis of both the judges' classifications of items and the field data, the items were tentatively sorted into four categories. These were (1) Community Participations, (2) Personal Qualities and Performances, (3) Extra-school Work, "Moonlighting" (no change), and (4) Comparative Items.

Only the last division requires explanation. The original schedule design had included nineteen scattered items wherein the respondents were asked to compare their expectation for a focal incumbent or the focal position to what they expected of "other folks," "The average citizen," "other people," etc. (See Appendix Table D-1, Entries under III D). These had originally been systemically sorted but such items showed the greatest disagreement among the judges as to placement. Following the re-classification of items into the preceding four categories, the secondary expectation items were re-submitted to four judges, five including the investigator. The final placement of items was the result of practically unanimous agreement among the judges.

I. <u>Rejection</u> General Hy: Incumb define exp **s**ignifican defined fo From t <sup>to the</sup> specifi (See Appendix <sup>tive</sup> technique <sup>alike</sup> on perti <sup>for any</sup> specio <sup>laritie</sup>s. The (<sub>see</sub> sample ir differences wh <sup>between t</sup>he g∈ <sup>sub-s</sup>amples wo

#### CHAPTER IV

#### ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

#### I. Rejection of General and Specific Roles

#### General Hypothesis I

Incumbents of role-defining or counter positions define expectations for a general role which are significantly different from the same expectations defined for a specific role.

From the final sample of 163 persons, 84 had responded to the specific role and 79 to the general role instruments. (See Appendix B for examples.) Any research using a comparative technique must ensure that the compared samples are alike on pertinent gross variables to identify and control for any specious findings resulting from sample dissimilarities. The gross data of the background instrument (see sample in Appendix B) were analyzed for any sampling differences which might have led to confounding variation between the general and specific role data. The twosub-samples were found not to be significantly different

ata 5% fiducia variables: (1) of Children, (S Schools, (6) C (8) Kinship to economic Class. cited **s**imilari The tw the 5% or bett neighborhood a teachers. Two these variable <sup>adequately</sup> by since the rese differences be of such contro The tw for general r $_{
m C}$ <sup>166</sup> expectatic Decisi <sup>pertinent</sup> stat <sup>between</sup> the ty tions for norr

at a 5% fiducial level with respect to the following variables: (1) Age, (2) Sex, (3) Marital Status, (4) Age of Children, (5) Attendance of Children at Public or Parochial Schools, (6) Church Membership, (7) Church Attendance, (8) Kinship to Teachers, (9) Education, and (10) Socioeconomic Class Status. The data substantiating the abovecited similarities are to be found in Appendix A, Section 2.

The two sub-samples were found to be different at the 5% or better fiducial level for years lived in their neighborhood and the respondents' acquaintanceships with teachers. Two factors made it unnecessary to control for these variables. First, both were presumed to be handled adequately by the social distance variable, and secondly, since the research data did not bear out the hypothesized differences between general and specific roles, the problem of such controls became irrelevant.

The two sample divisions, one for specific and one for general role definitions, were compared on each of the 166 expectation items for variances and means of responses.

Decisions had to be made regarding the use of pertinent statistics to evaluate the response differences between the two sample divisions. Since few of the assumptions for normalcy of the populations and response

distributions, variables, for could be met t parametric sta for tests of s raw data showe selection of e showed readily and specific procedure wou for difference increased the <sup>hypothe</sup>ses, b <sup>use</sup> of non-pa <sup>it bec</sup>ame evi <sup>was not</sup> alway <sup>in the</sup> initia A. <u>Analysis</u> Responses The c <sup>the populatio</sup> <sup>for each</sup> item <sup>Append</sup>ix Tabl

distributions, for metricity of the response category variables, for randomness of the sample selections, etc., could be met by the data, it was obvious that a nonparametric statistic would eventually have to be used for tests of significant differences. Examination of raw data showed that the initial problem would be that of selection of expectation items for final testing since few showed readily observed differences between the general and specific role responses. It appeared that an efficient procedure would be to first use standard parametric tests for differences as a "diagnostic" technique. This of course increased the possibility of improperly rejecting null hypotheses, but this error was subsequently removed by the use of non-parametric tests. As the calculations continued, it became evident that this final non-parametric procedure was not always necessary due to the lack of positive findings in the initial tests.

# A. <u>Analysis of the Variances of</u> <u>Responses on Expectations</u>

The calculation of the variances was done by using the population estimator statistic,  $"s^2"$ .<sup>1</sup> These estimates for each item and for both sample divisions are tabulated in Appendix Table D-1, under the column so headed. Using these

data, the var
was compared
for the speci
differences,
"r". <sup>2</sup> Again,
the inadequac
for the custo
of 1.47 for a
the data of T
Table 1. Num bety and
Prob. for Rejection H <sub>O</sub>
Not signifi.
5% - 1%
1%
Totals
Hypothesi
The v
<sup>cate</sup> gorie
<sup>gene</sup> ral r

data, the variance on each item for the general role sample was compared to the variance of responses on the same items for the specific role sample. To identify significant differences, calculations were made of the variance-ratio, "F".<sup>2</sup> Again, the statements should be repeated concerning the inadequacy of observations to fulfill the assumptions for the customary use of such a statistic. Using "F" values of 1.47 for a 5% fiducial level and 1.74 for a 1% level,<sup>3</sup> the data of Table 1 were observed.

Table 1. Numbers of expectation items with differences between their variances on specific role responses and general role responses.

	<u> </u>		<b>Expectations</b>					
Prob. for Rejection H <sub>o</sub>	<u>Pri</u>	mary Exp. by	<u>Peri</u>	pheral Exp. by	<u>Seco</u>	ndary Exp. by	Tot	<u>tal</u>
	Obs.	Chance	Obs.	Chance	Obs.	Chance	Obs.	Exp.
Not signifi.	31	34.2	46	55.1	52	68.4	129	152.3
5% - 1%	4	1.4	9	2.3	9	2.9	22	6.6
1%	<u> </u>	4	_3		<u>11</u>		15	<u>    1.7</u>
Totals	36	36.0	58	58.0	72	72.0	166	166.0

#### Hypothesis Under Test

The variance of the distribution of response categories to an expectation item defining the general role of teachers is not significantly

differer the spec Whi] somewhat gre ferences in chance, any would be spu statistic ma of the null meet its ass within the r in Appendix <sup>qualities</sup> an the faulty u Perh <sup>test</sup> of the v test. The both the gene and ranked. was .5475; th <sup>table.</sup>

different from the variance of that item defining the specific role of a teacher incumbent.

While the preceding table appears to indicate a somewhat greater number of items showing significant differences in their variances than would be expected by chance, any conclusions drawn from such an observation would be spurious. As previously indicated, the "F" statistic may frequently lead to the erroneous rejection of the null hypothesis if the tested distributions do not meet its assumptions. This unhappily did occur occasionally within the reported data. Expectation responses tabulated in Appendix D-1, III. Secondary expectations, C. Personal qualities and performances, Items 1 - 5, well illustrate the faulty use of the statistic due to leptokurticity.

Perhaps more useful, and certainly a more dependable test of the variance data was therefore made by a median test.<sup>4</sup> The variances of responses on all 166 items for both the general and specific role instruments were pooled and ranked. For the total 332 items the median variance was .5475; their distribution is recorded in the following table.

Numb Table 2. gene the = Stated for Spe or General Ro Less than .547 Greater than Totals This : primary, peri will be analy of Table 2 we the following When defining is no sid of speci: their ov

Table 2. Numbers of expectation items for specific and general roles showing variances above and below the overall median variance, .5475.

			Expect	ations		
	Prin	nary	Perip	oheral	Seco	ndary
Stated for Specific or General Role	S	G	S	G	S	G
Less than .5475	6 🕈	10	17	19	58	56
Greater than .5475 Totals	<u>30</u> 36	<u>26</u> 36	<u>41</u> 58	<u>39</u> 58	<u>14</u> 72	<u>16</u> 72

This immediately suggested differences between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations. These will be analyzed in Section II of this chapter. The data of Table 2 were then collected into summary form to test the following hypothesis:

When the variances are pooled for all expectations defining both the specific and general roles, there is no significant difference between the numbers of specific role items observed above and below their overall median variance. Table 3. Total roles overa = Number of Item Having Varianc Less than .547 Greater than Total s The d stated null H variances on overall medi significantl role. Sin <sup>between</sup> the <sup>the</sup>se were <sup>individ</sup>ual <sup>anal</sup>ysis i <sup>Not</sup> one of <sup>between</sup> th

Table 3. Totals of expectations for specific and general roles having variances above and below their overall median variance, .5475.

Number of Items	Speci	fic Gen	eral
Having Variance	Rol	e F	Role Total <b>s</b>
Less than .5475	81		85 166
Greater than .5475	85		81 166
Totals	166	1	.66 332
2	$x^2 = .10$	8.75 > F	» > .70

The data thus did not warrant the rejection of the stated null hypothesis. It therefore appears that when the variances on all expectation items are dichotomized by the overall median, those which define the specific role are not significantly different from those which define the general role.

Since the data of Table 2 suggested differences between the primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations these were <u>separately</u> analyzed by median tests based on the individual medians for each of the three categories. This analysis is reported in Appendix Tables D-2, D-3, and D-4. Not one of these three tests showed significant differences between the specific and general role variances as

*dichotomized* B. Analysis on Expec Arbi to the respo the calculat both the spe expectation for both sam the stipulat section also "t"<sup>5</sup> were mad of which iter metric analys of probabilit <sup>were</sup> "signifi The d as indicative responses to <sup>once</sup> again d the characte Several of t

dichotomized by their individual group medians.

## B. <u>Analysis of the Means of Responses</u> on Expectations

Arbitrary weights of one through five were assigned to the response categories just as had been the case for the calculation of variances. Means were calculated for both the specific and general role responses on all 166 expectation items. These are tabulated for each item and for both sample divisions in Appendix Table D-1. Although the stipulations of data inadequacy cited in the preceding section also applies here, nevertheless calculations of "t"<sup>5</sup> were made for each item, again purely for diagnosis of which items might feasibly be subjected to a non-parametric analysis. The items were then sorted for the degree of probability that the calculated differences in means were "significant." These data are reported in Table 4.

The data of Table 4 might have been interpreted as indicative of certain slight differences in mean responses to specific and general role expectations, but once again discretion had to be exercised in evaluating the characteristics of the response distributions. Several of the so-called "significant" items showed skewness,

Numbers of expectation items with differences between their means on specific role responses and general role responses. Table 4.

uo	
means	
their	
between	nses.
differences	l role respo
with	genera
items	and
expectation	ole responses
of	й
Numbers	specific
Table 4.	

					Expectati	suo			
Prob.* for	"t" "200 .4 5. 4	<u>Prin</u>	nary The second se	Peri	pheral	Secon	idary	Tot	al
Ou HOTISALAV		. sdo	Exp. by Chance	0bs.	Exp. by Chance	. sdO	Exp. by Chance	0b <b>s</b> .	Exp.
Not signif.		17	18.0	24	29.0	30	36.0	71	83.0
50%	.674841	9	3.6	7	5.8	ъ	7.2	18	16.6
40%	.842-1.035	m	3.6	2	5.8	4	7.2	12	16.6
30%	1.036-1.281	7	3.6	8	5.8	6	7.2	19	16.6
20%	1.282-1.644	4	3.6	ო	5.8	13	7.2	20	16.6
10%	1.645-1.959	Г	1.8	4	2.9	4	3.6	6	8.3
5%	1.960-2.325	0	1.08	ß	1.74	4	2.16	б	4.98
2%	2.326-2.575	Т	.36	Ч	.58	٦	.72	m	1.66
1%	2.576 & up	36	. <u>36</u> 36.00	-1 58	.58 58.00	<u></u> 72	.72 72.00	 166	<u>1.66</u> 166.00

Hypothesis Under Test

The mean of the responses to an expectation item defining the

general role of teacher is not significantly different from the

mean of that item defining the specific role of a teacher incumbent.

\*For dependability of these findings see accompanying text. \*\*See f.n. 5, this chapter. some had distributions that were leptokurtic, others platykurtic, and a few even showed some bimodality.

Therefore, a median test for differences in means was used just as it had been for variances as being a somewhat more suitable statistic forreaching dependable conclusions. The means of responses for all 166 items on both the general and specific role instruments were pooled and ranked. For the total 332 means, 50% of them were less than 2.855 and 50% greater.

Table 5. Numbers of expectation items for specific and general roles showing mean responses above and below their overall median mean, 2.855.

			Expect	ations		
	Pri	mary	Perip	heral	Seco	ndary
Stated for Specific or General Role	S	G	S	G	S	G
Less than 2.855	17	17	29	31	36	35
Greater than 2.855	19	19	29	27	36	37

The data of Table 5 were collected into summary form

When the means are pooled for all expectations defining both the specific and general roles, there is no significant difference between the numbers of specific role items and general role items observed above and below their overall median mean.

Table 6. Totals of expectations for both specific and general roles having means above and below their overall median means, 2.855.

Expectations Stated for				
Specific Role	General Role	Totals		
82	83	165		
84	83	167		
$\frac{166}{r^2} = 000$	166	332		
	Expe Specific Role 82 84 166 $x^2 = .000$	Expectations Stated for Specific General Role Role $82 \qquad 83$ $\frac{84}{166} \qquad \frac{83}{166}$ $x^2 = .000$		

The data thus did not warrant the rejection of the stated null hypothesis. It therefore appears that when the means of all expectation items are dichotomized by the overall median mean those which define the specific role are not significantly different from those which define the general role.

## C. <u>Conclusions Concerning the Concepts of</u> <u>General and Specific Role</u>

From the findings thus evidenced it seems untenable to accept the hypothesis introducing this section, that incumbents of role-defining or counter positions state expectations for a general role which are significantly different from those which similar incumbents state for a specific role. Instead, it would appear that the general and specific roles of the male secondary school teacher, as defined by the expectations covered in this study, do not differ significantly.

It would, of course, have been possible to select in support of the hypothesis certain expectations from the total range of items used: namely, those which did show differences in response between the specific and general role samples. However, two factors militated against the advisability of such a procedure. First, some item contents were introduced as a result of exploratory interviews wherein respondents suggested certain areas in which they thought they had somewhat "different" expectations for a particular teacher than they did for other teachers. Thus, if any bias were introduced into the final instrumentation as a result of this, it would have been in the

direction of over-sensitivity to the possible differences between the general and specific roles. And the data of Table 4 would certainly not indicate that this was the case.

Secondly, a rather dubious assumption must accompany any selection of significantly different items from a pool of items. It is necessary to assume that these differences are not due to chance divergences but rather are the result of the operation of the hypothesized concepts. Again, the data of Table 4 indicate that such an assumption was unwarranted for this investigation since there was so little variation in the observed deviations from those which might be expected by chance. Careful examination of those items which did show significant differences revealed no uniformities of difference which were deducible from the conceptualizations proposed for investigation.

When these conclusions are examined in terms of their substantive content, they lead toward a statement of invariability of role definition. The investigated role of male secondary school teacher (as stated by the selected respondents on the included items) did not, when defined for a particular individual person appear to be different from the same role defined for "most" incumbents of the position.

Many interpretations can be made of such findings but most are at best only speculative. Questions can be raised concerning the adequacy of the instrumentation to point up the differences between the originally hypothesized specific and general roles. One might ask whether proper selection was made of the contents of the expectations but due to the variety of areas sampled by the instruments such a defection seemed quite unlikely.

Another and perhaps warranted criticism might be directed at the adequacy of the instructional material accompanying the instrumentation. It may well be that the respondents were unable to maintain the necessary frame of reference throughout the questionnaire. Perhaps the response, per se, received major attention and the dimension of a specific or general focal incumbent was underemphasized or forgotten. A cue to such a possibility was given the investigator during an occasional informal discussion of the basic goals of the study with perhaps a fourth of the respondents following completion of the field contact. In several instances, the respondents suggested that they had in fact noticed that they expected "different things" from a specific teacher (respondents from the general role sample). In a few cases, the converse also occurred with

respondents from the specific role sample. Since a few respondents did note this alleged "difference," it is obviously possible that such a shift in frame of reference might elsewhere <u>not</u> have been noted and resulted in the vitiation of differences between those responses presumed to have defined the general and specific roles. Such interpretations are obviously guite tenuous.

A more basic question is concerned with possible "special" characteristics attributable to the position which was selected for investigation. The introductory statements in Chapter III of this study described the "separateness" of the institution of education in American society, and extended this into an assumption of rather high clarity of definition of the teaching role. In the light of the findings of this research on the concepts of general and specific role, those statements might well be extended into a question as to the possibility of this being another "unique" characteristic of the teaching role or position.

Additional statements suggesting such a possibility might be examined. Barzun<sup>6</sup> concludes his view of "The Teacher in America" by describing two aspects of the role that render it "different" from other occupational roles. One is based on economic premises, wherein he describes a

lack of congruity between the economic rewards afforded the teaching position and the socio-economic achievement level expected of its incumbents. Terrien's study furnishes additional evidence for such a view. Whether or no this discordance should produce either an unusual mode of definition of other expectations defined for the teaching role cannot be stated with confidence. Barzun further describes the problems arising from the difficulties of fulfilling the duties and obligations expected of the educator when at the same time there is restriction and disavowal of the facilities afforded the position to implement its enactment. But once again, whether this discordance between expected ends and permitted means is uniquely characteristic of the teaching role, and if so, whether this would result in unusual qualities for the expectations held for the teaching role cannot be verified. Such extrapolations seem at best only speculations, rather than logical extensions of objective data.

Only comparative role studies could provide evidence of the possible uniqueness of the teaching position in comparison to other occupational positions. Necessarily, however, role theorists at present are more involved with developing and validating conceptualizations for understanding
!

**1** -

.

the social phenomena relevant to a single role rather than attempting "cross-role" research.

During the design stage of this study, serious consideration was given to the inclusion of two of Parson's pattern variables--that of diffuseness-specificity and that of universalism-particularism. Although problems of operationalization and increased complexity of design led to their abandonment as research variables, nevertheless they were assumed to be both present and operant in the social situation under investigation.

Parsons defines diffuseness-specificity as being a dilemma producing characteristic attributable to a social object. An incumbent of any counter position is faced with responding to the object via one of two alternative orientations. He may see the social object in terms of the manifold relational aspects of alter to himself, wherein ego's evaluation is based upon a broad and complete involvement of both actors. Or he may see the other in terms of a restricted set of criteria based on the "limited and specific type of significance"<sup>8</sup> which the object has for his system of orientation. It was assumed that the general role would be based on an orientation of specificity and the specific role on that of diffuseness.<sup>9</sup>

It was also assumed that a counter incumbent would

have consistent resolutions of the "dilemma whether to treat the objects in the situation in accordance with a general norm covering all objects in that class (universalism) or whether to treat them in accordance with their standing in some particular relationship to him . . . independently of the object's subsumability under a general norm (particularism)."<sup>10</sup> The general role was assumed to require a universalistic orientation; the specific role, a particularistic one. But neither this assumption nor that of the diffuseness-specificity variable seem to have been borne out by the data.<sup>11</sup>

# II. Acceptance of Primary and Peripheral Expectations as Compared to Secondary Expectations

# General Hypothesis II

The consensus among counter incumbents is significantly different between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations.

Due to the similarities between the general and specific role data, the preceding section might suggest the possibility of pooling responses. However, since both the instructions and the expectation item stubs of the two

instrumentations had in fact been different (see examples in Appendix B), the specific and general role data were therefore retained in separate form for the analyses of this section. By the dual analysis, the separate medians for both the specific and general role response data could be used, thus removing the imbalance which would have been introduced by the pooled median variance, .5475, used in the preceding section. By this procedure, the data of Table 3 were redistributed to obtain perfect algebraic dichotomies. The marginal sums of the "highs" and "lows" of the following tables therefore balance.

Analysis of the Variances of Responses on Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations

The data of Table 2 were redistributed for the first test of the above general hypothesis.

It was evident that significant differences in response variances were generated in accord with the hypothesized concepts of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations. Thus, subsequent attempts were made to locate more precisely the source of such differences. Since the differences between the variances of primary and peripheral expectations did not appear to be so marked, they were

Α.

Table 7. Numbers of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the median variance of specific and general role responses.

	Specific Role				
Variance	Primary	Peripheral	Secondary	Totals	
Less than .5615	7	17	59	83	
Greater than .561	5 _29		<u>13</u>	83	
Totals	36	58	72	166	
	x	2 = 52.764	p < .001		
	<u>General Role</u>				
Less than .5285	8	19	56	83	
Greater than .528	5 <u>28</u>	_39	_16	83	
Totals	36	58	72	166	
	x	2 = 40.230	p < .001		

collected into a summary form suitable for testing the following hypothesis:

When the variances of primary and peripheral expectations are pooled, there is no significant difference between the numbers of primary and peripheral expectations observed above and below their overall median variance.

	Spe			
Variance	Primary	Peripheral	Total	
Le <b>ss</b> than .7545	19	28	47	
Greater than .7545	17	30	_47	
Totals	36	58	94	
	$x^2 = .045$			
	.98 $>$ p $>$ .95			
	Ge	neral Role		
Less than .6935	14	33	47	
Greater than .6935	_22	25	_47	
Totals	36 x <sup>2</sup>	58 = 2.206	94	
	. 5	0 > p > .30		

Table 8. Numbers of primary and peripheral expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses.

The data thus did not warrant the rejection of the stated null hypothesis. When primary and peripheral expectations are pooled and dichotomized by their overall median variance, those items which define primary expectations do not show significantly greater or lower variances than those which define peripheral expectations. This statement holds for such expectations when stated either for the specific or general role. The differences present in Table 7 are thus not accounted for by any differences between primary and peripheral expectations.

Primary and peripheral expectations were next compared to secondary expectations to determine if the latter concept produced the differences indicated in the initial analysis of Table 7. The following table tests the differences between primary and secondary expectations. It is interesting to note that although the median variances of general and specific role expectations are slightly different, the dichotomized item distributions for both general and specific roles are identical. This would provide additional evidence corroborating the lack of discrimination generated by the originally hypothesized concepts of general and specific roles.

The data thus warrant the rejection of the null hypothesis:

When the variances of primary and secondary expectations are pooled, there is no significant difference between the numbers of primary and secondary expectations observed above and below their overall median variance.

Table 9. Numbers of primary and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses.

	Specific Role				
Variance	Primary	Secondary	Total		
Le <b>ss</b> than .5065	4	50	54		
Greater than .5065	32	22	54		
Totals	36	72	108		
	$x^2 = 30.375$				
	p < .001				
	General Role				
Less than .463	4	50	54		
Greater than .463	32	22	54		
Totals	36	72	108		
	$x^2 = 30.3$	375			
	p < .001				

This rejection obviously holds when primary and secondary expectations are stated either for the general role or for the specific role.

A similar analysis was carried out (see Table 10) for peripheral and secondary expectations, and again the identical distributions for both general and specific role items are noted. An additional coincidental datum is seen in the fact that for the specific role responses the median variance for the pooled primary and secondary expectations, .5065, is identical to the median for peripheral and secondary expectations. Such a datum also is seen for the general role data when the median of .463 holds for both primary and peripheral expectations when either is pooled with secondary expectations. Although certainly not statistically corroborative evidence, nevertheless such observations do point out the demonstrated lack of differences between primary and peripheral expectations.

Table 10. Numbers of peripheral and secondary expectation items with variance above and below the overall median variance of specific and general role responses.

	Specifi		
Variance	Peripheral	Secondary	Totals
Less than .5065	15	50	65
Greater than .5065	_43	_22	65
Totals	58	72	130
	$x^2 = 22.69$ p < .001	94	
	General	Role	
Less than .463	15	50	65
Greater than .463	_43	_22	65
Totals	58	72	130
	$X^2 = 22.69$ p $\langle .001$	94	

The preceding table tests the hypothesis that: When the variances of peripheral and secondary expectations are pooled, there is no significant difference between the numbers of peripheral and secondary expectations observed above and below their common median variance.

It is apparent that this null hypothesis may be rejected for both such a statement of differences when peripheral or secondary expectations are stated either for the general role or for the specific role.

In summary, this section has presented evidence that primary and peripheral expectations are not significantly different as indicated by a median test of variances of responses on items neither when specific role expectations nor when general role expectations were being stated by the respondents. Primary and peripheral expectations, on the other hand, both show significantly lower variances than secondary expectations when tested by their division on their common medians. This was indicated to be the case for both specific and general role expectations.

# B. Analysis of the Means of Responses on Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary Expectations

As may have been earlier deduced from a careful observation of Table 5, the means of responses on primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations did not signify differences between the three concepts. Rearranging the data of Table 5 demonstrates this more clearly. It is worthy of note that when the means of <u>all</u> items in <u>all</u> categories are pooled, their single common median mean remains numerically constant for any comparative breakdown which might be made.

The data of Table 11 are directed toward testing the following hypothesis:

When the means of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations are pooled and dichotomized by their common median mean, there are no significant differences in the numbers of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations observed above and below their common median mean.

This null hypothesis may not be rejected either for expectations defining the specific role nor for those defining the general role. Since Table 11 demonstrates no differences in the overall distribution, there was no need to make further tests between primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations.

Table 11. Numbers of primary, peripheral, and secondary expectations showing means above and below their overall median mean, specific and general roles.

	Specific Role				
Variance	Primary	Peripheral	Secondary	Total	
Less than 2.855	17	29	36	82	
Greater than 2.855	_19	_29	_36	84	
Totals	36	58	72	166	
	$x^2 = .000$				
	<u>General Role</u>				
Le <b>ss</b> than 2.855	17	31	35	83	
Greater than 2.855	19	_27	_37	83	
Totals	36	58	72	166	
	x •	2 = .444 70 > p > .50			

# C. <u>Conclusions Concerning the Concepts of</u> <u>Primary, Peripheral, and Secondary</u> <u>Expectations</u>

It has been shown for the role of the male secondary school teacher, as stipulated by the selected respondents on the included items, that there is little difference

between the respondents' definitions of primary and peripheral expectations. The operational definitions of primary and peripheral expectations included two indicators which distinguished them from secondary expectations. First, for both primary and peripheral expectations, the actor is definitely identified as an incumbent of the teaching position; for secondary expectations, he is not. Second, for primary and peripheral expectations, the expected behavior, or attribute, is to be displayed within a social system which is either central to or associated with the institution of education; for secondary expectations, the expectation is directed towards the focal incumbent as he acts in "external" social systems, other than the institution of education. Thus, the above two factors may be abstracted as being associated with a higher variance of responses to the expectations covered by this study's instrumentation. This variance was proposed as an inverse measure of consensus among respondents, i.e., expectations with low variances are indicative of a high consensus; a high variance indicates low consensus.

The following conclusions may thus be stated. Whether or not respondents are defining expectations for specific actors or for a position, they show less consensus

in their expectations for behaviors or attributes expected of a male secondary school teacher when he is readily identified as a teacher and when the expectation is to be fulfilled within the institution of education. Conversely, when the focal incumbent is not readily identifiable as a teacher, and when he is seen in a situation external to education, counter incumbents show more consensus on the expectations which they hold for him. And, to repeat, these same statements hold for definitions of the general role, or position, just as they do for the specific role defined for the focal incumbent.

Similar statements <u>cannot</u> be made for the prescriptiveness nor for the proscriptiveness of expectations. Respondents were neither more nor less stipulative in their expectations for teachers' behaviors and attributes in or out of school as indicated by response means. There was only more <u>agreement</u> as to what teachers should or should not do outside the institution of education.

The higher consensus on secondary expectations might be explained by two factors. And both of these depend on the respondents' incidence of direct involvement in given situations. First, the less likely it is that respondents have been involved in a given situation, perhaps the less

likely it is that they will agree upon what they expect for that situation. Primary and peripheral expectations dealt with situations further removed from the respondents' usual frame of reference than was the case for secondary expectations. Respondents may have less frequently considered the alternatives available for primary and peripheral expectations. Perhaps they had neither learned nor developed a normative set of expectations for situations so far removed from their usual fields of action. Conversely, secondary expectations, being external to the school, referred to situations in which respondents may themselves have interacted at one time or another. Given this past experience they may better perceive the norms which regulate such situations, and thus show more agreement as to what "should or should not" be expected.

The other factor that may be associated with the greater consensus shown on secondary expectations reassigns Turner's variable of "reflexiveness"--originally discussed under the social distance conceptualization in Chapter I of this study. Secondary expectations dealt with teachers found in situations external to the school. Respondents in this investigation were all neighbors of teachers. Thus they might more frequently have found themselves in

interaction situations vis-a-vis teachers, where secondary expectations may no longer be hypothetical and attitudinal, but must become phenomenal and behavioral. Given this possibility, perhaps the teachers became more "real" alters and the respondents, being placed in more "reflexive" positions, more concisely defined their expectations for both the teachers and themselves.

# III. <u>Rejection of the Effect of Social</u> <u>Distance on Expectations</u>

#### General Hypothesis III

The differences between the general and specific roles as defined by counter incumbents is related to their social distance to (evaluations of potential interaction with) incumbents of the focal position.

As originally postulated, this could not of course be tested for the differences <u>between</u> general and specific roles since this portion of the hypothesis was not acceptable on the basis of the data presented in Section I of this chapter. Sample structure, however, had been designed so that hypotheses of difference <u>within</u> general and specific roles could be generated and tested.

# A. Analysis of the Effect of Social Distance on Expectations

Half of the general role respondents and half of the specific role respondents had been scaled for their social distances to focal incumbents to test General Hypothesis III. The other halves of both the general and specific role sample segments had been scaled for their social distance to the focal position. The social distance difference distributions for the total sample were examined to determine how detailed an analysis might be made without dispersion of respondents into so many scale categories as to be meaningless. A median split on social distance differences seemed suitable in order to locate differences for further analysis. Using a median of minus .5 for the focal incumbent difference scores and minus 1.5 for the focal position scores resulted in approximately halved groups (see Table C-5 in Appendix). This resulted in four sample divisions, each division dichotomized into respondents having high or low social distance to either counter incumbents or positions, depending upon which instrumentation had been administered to them.

Using these four halved sample divisions, the expectation item responses for each of the eight groups were then

accumulated to test the following null hypotheses:

- There are no significant differences between the specific role expectations stated by counter incumbents having low social distance to focal incumbents and those having high social distance to focal incumbents.
- 2. There are no significant differences between the specific role expectations stated by counter incumbents having low social distance to the focal position and those having high social distance to the focal position.
- 3. There are no significant differences between the general role expectations stated by counter incumbents having low social distance to focal incumbents and those having high social distance to focal incumbents.
- 4. There are no significant differences between the general role expectations stated by counter incumbents having low social distance to the focal position and those having high social distance to the focal position.

Using the above-cited median splits of respondents, all 166 expectation items were sorted into the low social

distance group and the high social distance group. Since the initial division of specific role data and general role data had been maintained, there were thus four sets of data which could be analyzed by a median test of the above null hypotheses.

Examination of the expectation distributions for the sample divisions quickly revealed three factors. First, that on most items the small n's of the four dichotomized groups had resulted in distributions in the five possible response categories (ranging from "Absolutely Must" to "Absolutely Must Not") which would require collapse of cells in order to subject the data to statistical test of the above hypotheses. Second, that many of the expectation distributions clearly showed practically no difference between the high-low divisions of any of the four groups (general role data for focal incumbent and focal position distances, specific role data for the same). Third, that when differences on expectation items did appear to exist, this occurred for only one or two of the four scaled social distance groups.

Three operational decisions were made to handle the preceding problems. In order to deal with the low frequency cells, it was apparent that no single mode of collapsing

.

٢

data would be applicable for all expectation items. If, for instance, some items were collapsed to collect the "Absolutely Must" and "Preferably Should" categories, the other three categories likewise being collapsed; then on the other items <u>all</u> responses might well be found in the last three categories, "May or May Not," "Preferably Should Not," and "Absolutely Must Not." Since it was obviously unreasonable to believe that all expectation items should have similar distributions, the decision was made to collapse expectation items individually at whatever point was most suitable for rendering both sides of the split nearly equal for <u>all</u> of the four sample divisions' totalled responses. This resulted in four possible "cutting points" on any single item: 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 4.5.

The second problem was even more clearly delineated when the collapsed data were examined. It was obvious that, for 71 out of the total 166 expectations there were no differences between the responses of the high and low social distance groups for any of the four sample divisions. These items were therefore excluded from subsequent statistical tests.

The third problem was resolved by testing for differences between the high and low social distance responses

vi.e: app • exp div wei dif or on ta Ta -Sc Di Gi L f f 0 when any one of the dichotomized four sample groups did appear to have slightly different distributions.

These three decisions resulted in a total of 95 expectation items which, for one or more of the four sample divisions seemed to have differential responses and which were, therefore, tested for statistically significant differences. The four null hypotheses of difference based on social distance could be rejected for single expectations only in those several instances indicated in the following table.

Table 12. Rejection of null hypotheses of difference in expectations based on social distance difference scores.

	Hol	н <sub>о</sub> 2	н <sub>о</sub> 3	H <sub>O</sub> 4	
Social Distance Difference for:	<u>Specific</u> Focal Incumbent	<u>c Role</u> Focal Position	<u>General</u> Focal Incumbent	<u>Role</u> Focal Position	Rejections Expected by Chance
Greater than 10%	<b>9</b> 0	87	90	85	85.5
10% - 5%	4	3	2	3	4.75
5% - 2%	0	2	2	3	2.85
<b>2% -</b> 1%	0	3	1	2	.95
Less than 1%	1	0	0	2	.95

From the above, it was evident that not one of the four hypotheses might be rejected. Just as was noted earlier for general and specific role differences, the selection of those items which did show differences in expectations for

the various dichotomized social distance measures would obviously be untenable due to the lack of significant findings any more frequently than might be expected from chance distributions. Further, it should again be emphasized that only 95 of the original 166 expectations were analyzed in Table 12; the remaining 71 showed no differences by simple visual observation. This would even further contribute to the finding that social distance did not seem to be related to the manner in which respondents define expectations either for the specific or general role of teacher.

When such a finding is paraphrased into less formal language, the following conclusion is evident:

When a respondent lives near a teacher the social distance which he perceives existing between himself and his neighbor appears to be irrelevant to his definition of the teaching role. It appears that it is irrelevant not only to what he expects of teachers in general but also to what he expects of the individual neighboring teacher. This seemed such a logically indefensible finding that several additional exploratory analyses were attempted.

The first such exploration was to sort the <u>extremes</u> of respondents on their social distance difference scores. Visual observation immediately indicated this procedure

, N

to be no more fruitful than the initial tests had been.

Another trial was attempted by using the extremes of the respondents on their social distance <u>scale</u> score, not making the adjustment to the difference score by the use of the "Good Friend" scale score. And again no trend in findings was evident.

As a last resort, an entirely different approach was tried. Thirty-six expectation items were selected to which could be attributed a connotation of "friendliness," "permissiveness," or "favorableness" toward the teaching role. For this procedure some items could be scored directly, some were reverse-scored and some were scored high for the "May or May Not" central category and low for the extremes. Respondents were scored on these items and 16 high scoring (favorable) and 16 low scoring (unfavorable) respondents were then located. Their social distance difference scores were examined and they were found to be quite uniformly scattered throughout the total distribution noted in Appendix Table C-5. A final exploration was made by locating these respondents on the distribution of social distance scale scores (not difference scores). This was equally unrewarding since they were again scattered throughout the total sample distribution.

Thus, these explorations of the data tended to further verify the finding evidenced earlier in this section, that social distance to teachers was unrelated to respondents' definition of the teaching role.

# B. <u>Conclusions Concerning the Influence</u> of Social Distance on Expectations

In order to justify such an unanticipated set of negative findings as evidenced above, several ex post facto, and ad hoc, observations might be made. It will be recalled that the decision to use neighbors of teachers as a sample base had been made in the hopes that they would provide a range of "friendships" with, or social distances to, the neighboring teachers. That this hope was fulfilled is, of course, evidenced by the fact that it was possible to scale the social distances to subject teachers. But this does not answer the question of what segment of the total possible range was in fact covered by this scale.

Sixteen respondents who had social distance difference scores of -7 to -11, i.e., who perceived either their neighbor or teachers in general much less favorably than their "Good Friends" were identified. Their responses were carefully examined on both the scalar items, as well as the nonscalable items, of their social distance schedules

(see samples, Appendix B). Two of these respondents, both for the Focal Incumbent measurement incidentally, evidently had rather uncordial relationships with their subject teacher, since nearly all of the twenty-one items had been answered, "I think I would probably try to avoid it." But for the remaining fourteen respondents, a guite different perspective was indicated. Although few definitely approving responses appeared, there was also no remarkably high incidence of strongly unenthusiastic responses. In terms of the face content of the items, it would be totally unwarranted to describe these persons as being either unfriendly with, or even neutral in their orientation to, their neighbor or teachers in general. Thus it might be that even though scaling procedures did order respondents along a social distance continuum, the range was such as to produce little variation in the manner in which they defined role expectations for the focal incumbents. In short, perhaps a large enough proportion of the sample was sufficiently well-acquainted with teachers to have formed relatively common perceptions both of the teaching role and of the teacher incumbents and thus show little difference in their stated expectations.

#### CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

As common to any investigation conclusions are restricted by experimental design and its implementation. Delimitations and definitions of concepts and variables, the selection and choice of operational indicators for the dimensions to be studied, and finally the sampling procedures and methods of data analysis--all contribute both to the dependability of findings and to the extent that they may be generalizable to other similar areas of observation.

This investigation resulted in three major conclusions: one dealing with the concepts of general and specific roles; another with the categorization of expectations as primary, peripheral, or secondary; and a third with the effect of social distance on expectations.

# I. General and Specific Roles

Evidence was presented that persons acquainted with male secondary school teachers expected about the same things of these specific teachers as another similar group of respondents expected of most male secondary school teachers

in general. The concepts of general and specific roles thus failed in this investigation to be productive of significant differences in the expectations held for male secondary teachers. The general and specific role concepts as defined in this study could not be empirically validated.

The general role has been delimited as the composite set of expectations directed towards focal incumbents as a class rather than as individuals. General role expectations were stated by counter incumbents when their object of interest or action was the focal position, qua position, devoid of identifiable personnel. The specific role, on the other hand, was the "personalized" aspect of the general role. It was defined on the phenomenal and particular level when the object of interest was a discrete and specific incumbent of the focal position.

The initial assumption of this study was that the introduction of a personal referent for the expectations defining the specific role would result in observable variations from general role expectations. But this could not be demonstrated except for an insignificant number of expectations.

A disturbing, and unwarranted, conclusion would be that persons do not adapt and adjust their expectations for

an incumbent of a position in the light of that individual's personal and particular characteristics. This may or may not be the case; neither its proof nor its refutation can be deduced from this study's evidence. The specific expectations of several counter incumbents for a single focal incumbent may be quite different from their general role expectations for the focal position. And if this were so, the concepts would still be valid. But this study was not designed to examine such single cases nor can its evidence be interpreted for this situation. It has only compared the collected expectations held for numerous focal incumbents to the collected expectations held for the focal position in general. And here the "individualized" or specific, dimension of expectations was not accompanied by significant variations.

This very lack of difference between general and specific role expectations provides remarkable substantiation of the assumptions of role theory. Comprehensive social theory must always deal with two aspects of social reality. Phenomenal fields must be delimited to relatively stable, persistent, and repetitive events which can be excluded conceptually and observationally from other events. And diverse concepts and their appurtenant observations must be

articulated by theory in such a way as to explain both the phenomena of interrelationships and of change. In short, theory must provide for both system and process.

If differences between general and specific role data had been observed they could have been used to explain at least one aspect of social change. Although this was not possible, the very lack of differentiation by the concepts did give additional confirmation of the normative aspect of a role. Role-expectations were demonstrated to be a stable and persistent set of observations little affected by the personal qualities of the specific persons for whom they were defined.

#### II. Primary and Secondary Expectations

Given the overall stability of the field of observation--expectations stated for the teacher role--findings demonstrated that all expectations do not belong to a single, unitary, and homogeneous category. Instead it was shown that at least two distinct forms of expectations may be conceptually identified and validated empirically. Primary (and peripheral) expectations were defined as expectations for the attributes and the behaviors expected of actors within the social system containing the position being studied. Further, in situations where primary expectations are applicable, the actor is readily identified as an incumbent of that position. Secondary expectations referred to expected qualities or performances pertinent to a social system external to, and other than, that containing the position under study. The actor is not readily identified as an incumbent of the position under examination. Instead, he is more readily identified in some other role. Primary (and peripheral) expectations constitute Merton's role-set; secondary expectations, his status-set.

Respondents in this study showed greater variance in their stipulation of primary and peripheral expectations for male junior and senior high school teachers than they did on secondary expectations stated for the same teachers. Thus the concepts of primary and peripheral expectations were substantiated as being productive of observable and significant differences from the secondary expectations examined in this study. Empirical validation was provided for Merton's definitional postulations of the role-set and the status-set.

The finding also suggests at least a starting point for delineating the boundaries of a social position by means of expectations. As respondents state their secondary

expectations, two modes of response are possible for them. They may not assume the prerogative of stipulating an expectation and thus reply that the focal incumbent "may or May Not" have the attribute or adhere to the indicated performance. If respondents tend to show a high consensus for this non-stipulative mode of response on an expectation this would, in large part, validate its exclusion from the role or position in question.

Conversely, if there is strong agreement on an expectation which shows a highly prescriptive or proscriptive mode of response as well, the high consensus alone would not justify its placement in the primary or peripheral category. A strongly stipulated expectation might be the result of cultural norms being given primacy which are relatively universal. Such an expectation could apply to any person regardless of whether or not he was an incumbent of the position under study. On the other hand, and this perhaps is particularly true of organizations such as the school, persons may be well acquainted with the social system parent to the role. This knowledge may lead to uniform reproduction of the system's norms in their role expectations. Not only would it be necessary in both these cases to use the criterion of low response variance, but

also that of the actual content of the expectation as well. The content criterion is of course inherent to the definition of primary and secondary expectations.

## III. Social Distance

At the inception of this study, an assumption had been made that all expectations would not have similar and recurrent modes of response and that uniformities of variation might be observable. This was evidenced by the differentiation produced by the concepts of primary and secondary expectations. But any attempt to validate differences between concepts should be accompanied by efforts to make at least some statements concerning correlates or causality. To this end a social distance variable was proposed as related to the hypothesized variations between general and specific role expectations. Corollary hypotheses were also generated for similar differences within the expectations defined for the general role and within those defined for the specific role. These were based upon the assumption that respondents who were relatively more friendly or better acquainted with their neighbor teachers, i.e., had a lower social distance to them, would direct somewhat different expectations toward these teachers than would another group of respondents

2

t.

(
relatively less friendly or less well acquainted with their neighbor teachers, i.e., having a greater social distance to them.

But the validity of these assumptions could not be demonstrated.

The social distance between respondents and specific male secondary teachers was unrelated to their definition of specific role expectations. Further, it was unrelated to their definition of general role expectations.

Likewise, the social distance between respondents and male secondary school teachers in general was not related to their statement of general role expectations. Nor was it related to their statement of specific role expectations.

Two measures of social distance were developed by the use of scale differences. The first was a measure of the distance between the respondents and a specific teacher; the second was the distance between a respondent and teachers in general. The use of a social distance difference measure rather than direct scale scores or types led to the inclusion of a "good friend" scale as a reference measure. This not only precluded the use of any item contents referring to teaching activities, but also required that the prospective scales be regulated to minimize inter-scale variations. To

126

,

1

81

Û,

1

୍

accomplish this, Guttman techniques were used to scale the social distance from respondents to the three different social objects: (1) a "good friend"; (2) a focal incumbent, a specific teacher; and (3) the focal position, teachers in general. Items were duplicated on all three instruments, changing only the referent "good friend," "teacher that you know, " or "most male secondary school teachers" to suit the appropriate distance that was to be measured. Responses to all three instruments were collected and distributed on a single scalogram. Items were extracted which were scalar for all three referents. In short, a single common scale was used to measure the social distance both to a "good friend"; and to a known teacher; as well as to teachers as a group. Thus difference measures could be readily generated since a single base scale had been used.

Although the social distance measure did prove to be totally unrewarding as an empirical variable related to the other dimensions of this investigation, the actual construction of the social distance scale, per se, was an unexpected success, and hopefully a worthwhile adaptation of the historical concept.

The inter-personal social distance dimension probably comprises many situational variables and subjective evaluations.

127

But a set of items was finally extracted which were evidently neither bound by situational contexts nor confounded by individual respondents' variations. The same items could be used to scale the social distance not only to specific persons but to social positions as well. Since item content were relatively generic the scale or an adaptation of it should be applicable for the scaling of the inter-personal social distance to many positions other than that studied in this investigation.

### FOOTNOTES

#### FOOTNOTES

#### CHAPTER I

<sup>1</sup>Wilbur B. Brookover, "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," <u>The Journal of Educational Sociology</u>, 29:3, 1955. Roland L. Warren, "Cultural, Personal and Situational Roles," <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, 34:104-111, November-December, 1949, approaches a similar problem in analyzing adjustment to roles, as well as the interrelationships of roles, when he defines the "cultural role" as being "interaction patterns prescribed by the culture" and personal roles as "personal adjustment to role patterns." Annabelle Motz, "The Role Conception Inventory: A Tool for Research in Social Psychology," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 17:465, 471, 1952, approaches this same phenomenon by utilization of the terms general or public roles and specific or personal roles.

<sup>2</sup>Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 17. This agrees with the evaluations of both L. J. Neiman and J. W. Hughes, "The Problem of the Concept of Role -- a Re-survey of the Literature, " Social Forces, 30:148, 1951, and Theodore Newcomb, "Role Behaviors in the Study of Individual Personality and of Groups," Journal of Personality, 18:276, 1950. Examples of explicit emphasis upon this aspect of the concept might be cited in: inter alia, Theodore M. Newcomb, Social Psychology (New York : The Dryden Press, 1950), p. 275-87. Eugene L. Hartley and Ruth E. Hartley, Fundamentals of Social Psychology (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 486-87. Hubert Bonner, Social Psychology (New York: American Book Company, 1953), p. 255. Ralph H. Turner, "Role-taking, Role Standpoint, Reference-Group Behavior, " The American Journal of SociOlogy, 61:317, January, 1956. Jackson Toby, "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis, " Social Forces, 30:323, March, 1952.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. <u>inter alia</u>, Theodore M. Newcomb, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 280-82; S. A. Stouffer, "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 14:717, 1949.

<sup>4</sup>Robert K. Merton, <u>Social Theory and Social Structure</u> (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 132-34.

<sup>5</sup>Gross, et al., <u>op. cit</u>., see Chapter Four, pp. **48-69**, "A Language for Role Analysis," esp. p. 67. Much of the terminology in this study was taken from the role analysis vocabulary redacted in the Gross, et al., work. In many ways, their explorations provided satisfactory operationalization of theoretical concepts which hitherto had not been thoroughly validated at an empirical level.

<sup>6</sup>Gross, et al., <u>op. cit</u>., p. 48.
<sup>7</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 51.
<sup>8</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
<sup>9</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 59.

<sup>10</sup> Several conceptual elements are of necessity included in this definition. Gross, et al., <u>op. cit</u>., p. 58, delimit an expectation to an "evaluative standard applied to an incumbent of a position." The initial premise of the investigation reported herein was that there might be variation between the expectations stated for a position and those stated for incumbents of it. And Gross' definition does not include both perspectives. Also, the validity of Gross' "expectations" would be indeed difficult to establish for, again, this investigation questioned whether or not the evaluative standards are, in fact, always "<u>applied</u>."

The use of the term specification rather than "standard" is simply the recognition that data comes prior to the generalization in inductive methods. An individual may state an evaluative specification for a focal incumbent but this does not become a "standard" until stiuplated by many respondents. Further the use of "evaluative standard" implied that the expectation is not a discrete social fact but is an outgrowth of a more comprehensive value system. While this is completely valid and conceptually sound, it tends to becloud the issue if an expectation is to be defined operationally.

Credit should also be given to Bruce Biddle, et. al. in their <u>Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher</u> (Columbia: University of Missouri Press) for their conceptualization of "attributed" or second-order cognitions-the cognitions that "A" thinks "B" holds for "C". See especially Volume 5, "Own and Attributed Cognitions for the Teacher," p. 4, and Volume D, "Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions," pp. 8-9. This led to the inclusion in this study's definition of "counter incumbents' <u>own</u> statement of evaluative specifications that <u>they</u> hold" in order to delineate precisely that first-order cognitions, or expectations, were to be studied in this investigation.

Biddle does not however define an "expectation" in the evaluative or normative mode. He instead follows the lead of Theodore R. Sarbin in Chapter 6, "Role Theory" of Gardner Lindzey (Editor), <u>Handbook of Social Psychology</u>, Volume I (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954), p. 225. Biddle also defines an expectation in the predictive mode as "a cognition maintained by a subject consisting of a subjective probability map concerned with the incidence of a set of characteristics for an objectperson or position. The characteristics in question are beyond the immediate perceptual range of the cognizer," Volume D, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 8. That which this study has defined as an expectation Biddle refers to as a norm--"an evaluative (or approval) map about the varieties of possible characteristics for an object-person or position," <u>loc. cit</u>.

<sup>11</sup>Brookover, <u>op. cit</u>.
<sup>12</sup>Gross, et al., <u>op. cit</u>., p. 59.
<sup>13</sup>Loc. cit.
<sup>14</sup>Ibid., Chapt. 7-9.

<sup>15</sup><u>Ibid</u>., Chapt. 10-13. <sup>16</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 166. <sup>17</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 103. <sup>18</sup><u>Ibid</u>., Appendix Tables A-1 through A-6. <sup>19</sup>Warren, op. cit.; Motz, op. cit.; and Brookover,

op. cit.

20 Merton, <u>op. cit</u>., 369-70. Also see his "The Role-Set," British Journal of Sociology, 8:106-20, 1957.

<sup>22</sup>It should be here recognized that many variables may impinge upon actors in such a way as to affect the ongoing interaction system. Of particular importance among these are the personality structures, the individual needs systems, and the idiosyncratic characteristics of the actors. But the commitment of the sociologist is not to examine the idiomorphy of an action system, rather to abstract the "recurrent and repetitive" aspects of a multiplicity of such systems in order to acquire an increased ability of prediction and generalization. As is the case for most sociological research, it was assumed that the above indicated variables were normally disturbuted in the subject Population.

<sup>23</sup>Charles E. Cooley, <u>Human Nature and the Social</u> <u>Order</u> (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1902, Revised edition, reprinted 1922.

<sup>24</sup>George Herbert Mead, <u>Mind, Self, and Society</u> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 175 et Seq.

> 25 <u>Ibid</u>., p. 376.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>26</sup>Ralph H. Turner, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 317.

<sup>27</sup>Walter Coutu, "Role-Playing vs. Role-Taking: An Appeal for Clarification," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 16:180-7, 1951. His distinction of the concepts is recognized and appreciated.

28
Specific reference will be made to numerous studies in these areas as pertinent research is examined. Excellent statements of the effects of the diverse variables which impinge upon interpersonal relations in interaction are given in: Henry W. Riecken and George C. Homans, "Psychological Aspects of Social Structure," Chapter 22 in Gardner Lindzey, editor, Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), Vol. 2; Leon Festinger, et al., Theory and Experiment in Social Communication (Ann Arbor: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, Univ. of Michigan, 1950); Leon Festinger, S. Schachter and K. Beck, Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York: Harper, 1950). A systematic analysis of an extended list of such variables, defined as "group-properties" is made by Robert K. Merton, 1957a, op. cit., pp. 310-332. All of the above, however, consider these within a group interaction context, and the applicability to this study was thus at best only speculative.

<sup>29</sup>This is obviously a question of degree. R. G. Barker's "The Social Interrelations of Strangers and Acquaintances," <u>Sociometry</u>, 5:169-179, 1942, demonstrates bench marks or base lines from which definitions start. These foundations are generally based on valued personal characteristics. "Good looks, enthusiasm, sense of humor, etc." It is worthy of note, however, that even these do nevertheless require some modicum of interaction for their perception.

# CHAPTER II

# I. Theoretic Formulations

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this chapter no emphasis will be laid upon the rigorous control of vocabulary. The usage of role, status-role, position, office, etc., will depend upon context in order to maintain some conformity with the conceptualizations of the authors being discussed.

<sup>2</sup>William James, <u>The Principles of Psychology</u> (New York: Henry Holt, 1890).

John Dewey, <u>Human Nature and Conduct</u>, <u>An Introduction</u> <u>to Social Psychology</u> (New York: Henry Holt, 1922). James M. Baldwin, <u>Social and Ethical Interpretations</u> <u>in Mental Development</u> (New York: Macmillan), 3rd edition, 1902.

Charles H. Cooley, <u>Human Nature and the Social</u> <u>Order</u> (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, Revised edition, 1922).

<sup>3</sup> Mead, <u>op. cit</u>.

<sup>4</sup>Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," Chapt. 6 in Gardner Lindzey, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 224.

<sup>5</sup>Richard T. Lapiere and Paul R. Farnsworth, <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949).

<sup>6</sup>Alfred Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss, <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology</u> (New York: Dryden Press, 1949).

<sup>7</sup>Eugene L. Hartley and Ruth E. Hartley, <u>Fundamentals</u> of Social Psychology (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955).

<sup>8</sup>Walter Coutu, <u>Emergent Human Nature</u> (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949). <sup>9</sup>A. Radcliffe Brown, "Social Organization of the Kariera of Australia" in <u>Source Book in Anthropology</u>, A. L. Kroeber and T. T. Waterman, editors, revised edition, 1931 (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1931), p. 279.

10 Ralph Linton, <u>The Study of Man</u> (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1936), p. 113.

> <sup>11</sup>Loc. cit. <sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

13 Everett Hughes, "The Institutional Office and the Person," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, 43:404, November, 1937.

> 14 Loc. cit.

15 Robert Dubin (Editor), <u>Human Relations in Adminis</u>tration (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951), p. 254.

<sup>16</sup>Henry Pratt Fairchild, et al. (Editors), <u>Dictionary</u> of <u>Sociology</u> (Ames, Iowa: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1955), p. 307.

17<u>Ibid</u>., p. 293.

<sup>18</sup>Richard C. Sheldon, "Some Observations on Theory in Social Science," Chapter 2, Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (Editors), <u>Toward a General Theory of Action</u> (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954).

19 Talcott Parsons, <u>The Social System</u> (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), p. 39.

> 20 Loc. cit. 21 Ibid., p. 23.

.

,

<sup>22</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 25.
<sup>23</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
<sup>24</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
<sup>25</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.

<sup>26</sup>Gardner Murphy, <u>Personality: A Biosocial Approach</u> <u>to Origins and Structure</u> (New York: Harper, 1947), p. 516 et seq. It is interesting to note that Bonner, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 256, reverses terms, i.e., uses role-status, to achieve the same end.

<sup>27</sup>Charles P. Loomis and J. Allan Beegle, <u>Rural</u> <u>Sociology</u> (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> Kenneth D. Benne and Paul Sheats, "Functional Roles of Group Members," <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, IV 2, (1948), 41-49.

<sup>29</sup>Hartley and Hartley, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 401.
<sup>30</sup>Merton, 1957a, <u>op. cit</u>., Chapter VIII.
<sup>31</sup><u>Ibid</u>., pp. 228-30.
<sup>32</sup><u>Ibid</u>., pp. 246-47, 290-91.
<sup>33</sup><u>Ibid</u>., Chapt. IX.
<sup>34</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 312, 315, 317.
<sup>35</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 319.
<sup>36</sup>Linton, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 113.

<sup>37</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 114.
<sup>38</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 113.
<sup>39</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 114.

<sup>40</sup><u>Ibid.</u>, p. 114. This conceptualization of the multiple perspective of status and role is also examined in Linton's <u>Cultural Background of Personality</u> (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1945), pp. 76-78. He makes a useful discrimination between "active" and "latent" statuses which Merton does not distinguish.

41
Merton, 1957a, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 369.
.
42
Loc. cit.

43 Frederick L. Bates, "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," <u>Social Forces</u>, 34:313-321, 1956.

<sup>44</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 313.
<sup>45</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
<sup>46</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
<sup>47</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 314.

<sup>48</sup>Bruce Biddle, et al., Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961).

Volume A, <u>The Present Status of Role Theory</u>; Volume B, <u>Bibliographies on Role Terms</u>, <u>Role Conflict</u>, and the <u>Role of the Teacher</u>; Volume C, <u>A Program for the Processing</u> of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected <u>Central Tendency Differences</u>; Volume D, <u>Bibliographies on</u> <u>Role Methodology and Propositions</u>; Volume 1, <u>Orientation</u>, <u>Methods and Materials</u>; Volume 2, <u>General Characteristics of</u> <u>the School Teacher's Role</u>; Volume 3, <u>Positional Differences</u> <u>in Teacher Role</u>; Vol. 4, <u>Role of the Teacher and Occupational</u> <u>Choice</u>; Vol. 5, <u>Own and Attributed Cognitions for the Teacher</u>; Vol. 6, <u>Recognition and Resolution of Role Conflict Among</u> <u>Teachers</u> (Summer, 1962); Vol. 7, <u>Teacher Cognitions and</u> <u>Teacher Behavior</u>.

<sup>49</sup>Biddle, Vol. A., <u>op. cit</u>., p. 32.
<sup>50</sup>Neiman and Hughes, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 149.
<sup>51</sup>Gross, Mason and McEachern, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 17.
<sup>52</sup>Neiman and Hughes, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 149.

# II. Empirical Studies

Parsons, <u>op. cit.</u>; Loomis and Beegle, <u>op. cit.</u>; Merton, op. cit.; Biddle, op. cit.; George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950), pp. 111, 113, 133, 361, does not frequently use the concept, instead using the norms per se which are associated with a given position, see pp. 11-12, 124; Charles Loomis in Social Systems (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960) not only provides a critical treatment of status-role as both a structural and a functional or processual unit as well, see p. 19-20, but also gives many excellent implementations of this usage. Also see Eugene Jacobsen, et al., "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations, " Journal of Social Issues, VII, 3 (1951), 18-27; William Caudill, et al., "Social Structure and Interaction Processes in a Psychiatric Ward, " American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXII (April, 1952), 314-334; Scott A. Greer, Social Organization (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955), esp. pp. 21-26; Wm. J. Goode suggests several useful articulations between role theory and institutional theory in his "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role-status Obligations, " American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (November, 1960), 247-58.

<sup>2</sup>Hartley and Hartley, <u>op. cit.</u>; Newcomb, <u>op. cit.</u>; Sarbin, <u>op. cit.</u>, esp. pp. 226-29; Lois Barclay Murphy, <u>Personality in Young Children</u> (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956); also see Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., "Adjustment of the Individual to his Age and Sex Roles," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, VII. (1942), 617-20; C. C. Bowman, "Role-playing and the Development of Insight," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXVIII (1949), 195-199; M. S. Olmstead, "Character and Social Role," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXIII (July, 1957), 49-57; Sheldon Stryker, "Role-taking Accuracy and Adjustment," <u>Sociometry</u>, XX (December, 1957), 286-96; David Mechanic and Edmund H. Volkart, "Stress, Illness Behavior, and the Sick Role," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXVI (February, 1961), 51-58.

<sup>3</sup>Linton, <u>The Cultural Background of Personality</u>, esp. Chapt. 3; Newcomb, <u>op. cit</u>.; Gardner Murphy, <u>op. cit</u>.; Stansfeld Sargent, "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in John H. Rohrer and Muzafer Sherif (Editors), <u>Social Psychology at the Crossroads</u> (New York: Harper, 1951); Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif, <u>An Outline of Social Psychology</u> (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), utilize a homotaxic analysis of the person via ego-involvements and ego-attitudes which are partially equatable with a role-analysis of personality, see esp. Chapt. 17 and 18; also see Joseph Ben-David, "Roles and Innovations in Medicine," <u>American</u> Journal of Sociology, LXV (May, 1960), 557-68; Joseph R. Gusfield, "Occupational Roles and Forms of Enterprise," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXVI (May, 1961), 571-80.

<sup>4</sup>Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LVII (1952), 470-77; Oswald Hall, "The Stages of a Medical Career," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LIII (March, 1948), 327-36.

<sup>5</sup>Eugene L. Hartley and Dorothy C. Krugman, "Notes on Children's Role Perceptions," <u>The Journal of Psychology</u>, XXVI (1948), 399-405; Oswald Hall, "Types of Medical Careers," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LV (1949), 243-53; Motz, <u>op. cit.</u>; also her "Conceptions of Marital Roles by Status Groups," <u>Marriage and Family Living</u>, XII (1950), 136; Leonard Reisman, "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXVII (March, 1949), 305-10; Evelyn Millis Duvall, "Conceptions of Parenthood," <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, LII (November, 1946), 193-203; S. F. Miyamoto and S. F. Dornbush, "A Test of Interactionist Hypotheses of Self-perception," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXI (1956), 399-403; Richard Videbeck and A. P. Bates, "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," <u>Sociometry</u>, XXII (1959), 1-11.

Among many others: Logan Wilson, The Academic Man (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942); Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940); Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938); Mirra Komarovsky and S. S. Sargent, "Research into Sub-Cultural Influences upon Personality, " Culture and Personality (New York: The Viking Fund, 1949), pp. 143-155; Emory Kimbrough, Jr., "The Role of the Banker in a Small City," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), 316-322; L. V. Manwiller, "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI, (1958), 315-54; Rae Sherwood, "The Bantu Clerk: A Study of Role Expectations, " Journal of Social Psychology, XLVII (1958), 285-316; David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960); William A. Glaser, "Doctors and Politics, "American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, (November, 1960), 230-45.

<sup>7</sup>Among many others: D. Katz and K. W. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXVIII (1933), 280-90; G. M. Gilbert, "Stereotype Persistence and Change Among College Students, " Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 245-54; Allen L. Edwards, "Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes, " Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV (1940), 566-72; H. J. Eysenck and S. Crown, "National Stereotypes: An Experimental and Methodological Study, " International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, II (1948), 26-39; Helen Mayor Hacker, "Women as a Minority Group," Social Forces, XXX (1951), 60-69; S. W. Fernberger, "Persistence of Stereotypes Con-Cerning Sex Differences, " Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIII (1948), 97-101; Robert Sommer and M. Lewis Killian, "Areas of Value Differences: (1) A Method for Investigation (2) Negro-White Relations, " Journal of Social Psychology, XXXIX (1954), 227-44.

<sup>8</sup>W. W. Charters and Theodore M. Newcomb, "Some Attitudinal Effects of Experimentally Increased Salience of a Membership Group" in Guy E. Swanson, et al., <u>Readings in Social Psychology</u> (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952);
H. H. Kelley and E. H. Vokert, "The Resistance to Change of Group-Anchored Attitudes," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XVII (1952), 453-65; Evelyn Millis Duvall, <u>op. cit.</u>;
H. E. O. James and C. Tenen, "Attitudes Towards Other Peoples," in <u>UNESCO International Social Science Bulletin</u>, III (Autumn, 1951), 553-560.

9 Inter alia: Kurt W. Back, "Interpersonal Relations in a Discussion Group, " Journal of Social Issues, IV (Fall, 1948), 61-65; Kenneth D. Benne and Paul Sheats, op. cit.; E. W. Bovard, "The Experimental Production of Interpersonal Affect, " Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 521-28; John Gullahorn, "Distance and Friendship as Factors in the Gross Interaction Matrix, " Sociometry, XV (1952), 123-34; Renato Taguiri, "Relational Analysis: An Extension of Sociometric Method with Emphasis Upon Social Perception, "Sociometry, XV (1952), 91-104; also various articles in his, with Luigi Petrullo, Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958); likewise various articles in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (Editors), Group Dynamics (Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1953); J. A. Precker, "Similarity of Valuings as a Factor in Selection of Peers and Near-Authority Figures, " Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 406-14.

<sup>10</sup>J. Block, "The Assessment of Communication: Role Variations as a Function of Interactional Context," Journal of Personality, XXI (1952), 272-86; Merl E. Bonney, "A Sociometric Study of the Relationship of some Factors to Mutual Friendships on the Elementary, Secondary, and College Levels," <u>Sociometry</u>, IX (1946), 21-47; Fritz Heider, in his <u>The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations</u> (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), exemplifies a further emphasis which is being seen on interpersonal perceptions. Although most writers in this area are not currently using traditional sociometric data, their work is to a large extent an expansion and further analysis of many of the fundamental postulations of sociometric social psychology. See, e.g., Peter Blau, "Patterns of Choice in Interpersonal Relations," <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (February, 1962), 41-55.

<sup>11</sup>David Aberle and Kasper D. Naegele, "Middleclass Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes Towards Children," <u>American Journal of Ortho Psychiatry</u>, XXII (1952), 366-78; H. H. Harlan, "Some Factors Affecting Attitude Toward Jews," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, VII (1942), 816-27; W. H. Sewell, A. O. Haller and M. A. Straus, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, XXII (1957), 67-73; E. J. Thomas, "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXIV (1959), 30-37.

<sup>12</sup> Among many others: Robert S. Ort, "A Study of Role-Conflicts as related to Class Level," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, XLVII (1952), 425-532; Samuel A. Stouffer, <u>op. cit.</u>; also his, with Jackson Toby, "Role Conflict and Personality," in Parsons and Shils, 1954, <u>op. cit.</u>; F. James Davis, "Conception of Official Leaders Roles in the Air Force," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXII (March, 1954), 253-58; Jerome Laulicht, "Role Conflict, the Pattern Variable Theory, and Scalogram Analysis," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXIII (1954), 250-54; J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (1955), 30-40.

<sup>13</sup>J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Role, Role-Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, XIX (1954), 164-75; John Gullahorn, "Measuring Role Conflict," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXI (1956), 299-303; J. P. Sutcliffe and M. Haberman, "Factors Influencing Choice in Role Conflict Situations," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, XXI (1956), 695-703; John P. Spiegel, "The Resolutions of Role Conflict Within the Family," <u>Psychiatry</u>, XX (1957), 1016; Jackson Toby, <u>op. cit.</u>; Walter I. Wardell, "The Reduction of Strain in a Marginal Social Role," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXI (1955), 16-25; J. W. Carper and H. S. Becker, "Adjustment to Conflicting Expectations in the Development of Identification with an Occupation," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXVI (1957), 51-56.

÷  14 Herbert Blumer, "Sociological Analysis and the 'Variable,'" <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXL (1956), 683-90.

15 Bates, op. cit.; Biddle et al., op. cit.; Brookover, op. cit.; Goode, op. cit.; Gross, et al., op. cit.; Turner, op. cit.; Warren, op. cit.; also see J. Ruesch and A. R. Prestwood, "Interaction Processes and Personal Codification," Journal of Personality, XVII (1950), 391-430; William C. Trow, "Role Functions of the Teacher in the Instructional Group," p. 30-50 in Nelson B. Henry (Editor), <u>The Dynamics of Instructional Groups</u> (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1960).

<sup>16</sup>I. E. Bender and A. H. Hastorf, "The Perception of Persons: Forecasting Another Person's Responses in Three Personality Scales," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, XLV (1950), 556-61; Bowman, <u>op. cit.</u>; Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., and Rosalind F. Dymond, "The Empathic Responses," <u>Journal of Consulting Psychology</u>, XII (November, 1949), 355-59; Rosalind F. Dymond, et al., "Measurable Changes in Empathy with Age," <u>Journal of Consulting</u> <u>Psychology</u>, XVI (1952), 202-206; Harrison G. Gough, "A Sociological Theory of Psychopathy," <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, LIII (March, 1948), 359-66; B. Notcutt and A. L. M. Silva, "Knowledge of Other People," <u>Journal of Abnormal and</u> <u>Social Psychology</u>, XLVI (1951), 30-37.

## CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>Robin M Williams, Jr., <u>American Society</u> (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), pp. 266-72; J. O. Hertzler, <u>American</u> <u>Social Institutions</u> (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), pp. 375-83; Also Willard Waller, <u>The Sociology of Teaching</u> (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932), esp. Chapters 2 and 9; Robert J. Havighurst and Bernice L. Neugarten, <u>Society and Education</u> (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957), pp. 181-85; and Wilbur B. Brookover, <u>A Sociology of</u> <u>Education</u> (New York: American Book Co., 1955), Chapters 3 and 7.

<sup>2</sup>Lloyd and Elaine Cook, <u>A Sociological Approach to</u> <u>Education</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), Chapt. 18. Also Robert J. Havighurst, et al., <u>Who Shall Be Educated</u>, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944), pp. 107-109.

<sup>3</sup>Biddle in his <u>Present Status of Role Theory</u>, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 76, indicates over a thousand studies recorded in this area. He states that the "teacher role has been studied more extensively than any other (role)." Unhappily, prolificity is not a necessary correlate of either quality or sophistication.

<sup>4</sup>The term "Classroom" does not imply that all such learnings are learned only within the classroom. Further, it is recognized that educational policy today officially defines legal curricula to include many learnings far afield from this basic core. And finally, that the content of this core varies somewhat both with time and place.

<sup>5</sup>The following individuals were of great assistance to the investigator in carrying out this portion of the study:

> Leo A. Haak, Ph.D., Dept. of Social Science, M.S.U. John C. Howell, Ph.D., Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, M.S.U. Albert E. Levak, Ph.D., Dept. of Social Science, M.S.U. Arthur M. Vener, Ph.D., Dept. of Social Science, M.S.U.

Fred Stillman, deceased, former teacher Lansing
Eastern High School
Irma Smith, retired, former teacher Lansing Eastern
High School
Thomas Brewer, layman, St. Louis, Michigan
Winifred Grant, layman, Lansing, Michigan
Jane M. Snyder, layman, Lansing, Michigan

<sup>6</sup>Originally operationalized in his "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (1925), 299-308.

<sup>7</sup>Since the initial statements, investigators have often metaphrased the conceptualization into social distances between other types of positions; inter alia, Forrest Wilkinson, "Social Distance Between Occupations," <u>Sociology</u> and Social Research, XIII (1928-29), 234-44; Emory S. Bogardus, "Social Distance and its Practical Implications," <u>Sociology</u> and Social Research, XXII (1938), 463-76; Robert A. Ellis, "Social Status and Social Distance," <u>Sociology and Social</u> <u>Research</u>, XL (1956), 240-46; and Leonard I. Pearlin and Morris Rosenberg, "Nurse-Patient Social Distance in a Mental Hospital," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (February, 1962), 56-65.

8 George C. Homans, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 111, 113, 133 and 361.

> 9 Ibid., p. 406.

10 See discussion introducing this chapter. Cf. references cited in fn. 1, this chapter.

Louis Guttman, "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," <u>Educational and Psychological</u> <u>Measurements</u>, VII (1947), 247-80.

> <sup>12</sup>Merton, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 369-70. <sup>13</sup>Gross, et. al., <u>op. cit</u>., p. 62. <sup>14</sup>Loc. cit. <sup>15</sup>See fn. 5, this chapter.

#### CHAPTER IV

<sup>1</sup>Standard procedures were used for the calculation of variance estimates. The item categories were given weights from one to five, assigning one to the "Absolutely Must" and five to the "Absolutely Must Not" foils. The no answer responses were not included. The standard equation:

$$s^{2} = \frac{(x_{1} - \bar{x})^{2}}{n - 1}$$

was used in its form for group scores with origin at zero, the groups being the category weights of one through five. The computational equation used was:

$$s^{2} = \frac{\Sigma fx^{2} - (\Sigma fx)^{2} / n}{n - 1}$$

in which "f" is the number of persons responding in a particular category, "x" the weight of the category, and "n" the sample size. Discussions of procedures for such calculations of sample variance are to be found in most of the introductory statistics texts such as: Cyril H. Goulden, <u>Methods of Statistical Analysis</u> (New York: John Wiley, 1952), pp. 17-20; Margaret J. Hagood and Daniel O. Price, <u>Statistics for Sociologists</u> (New York: Henry Holt, 1952), pp. 124-25; A. C. Rosander, <u>Elementary Principles of Statistics</u> (New York: C. Van Nostrand, 1951), pp. 16-80; Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, <u>Statistical Inference</u> (New York: Henry Holt, 1953), pp. 114-23. The usual precautions for careful transliteration of symbols is of course applicable to all of the above references.

<sup>2</sup>Customary procedures were used for the calculation of variance-ratios using

$$F = \frac{\frac{s}{q}}{\frac{s}{s}^{2}}$$

in which  $s_g^2$  is the variance of responses within the general role sample division for a particular item and  $s_g^2$  the matching variance for the specific role sample division. The inversion of course was used when the greater variance was found in the specific role sample. The references cited in the preceding footnote are again relevant here.

<sup>3</sup>These represent "F" values for 75 degrees of freedom for the numerator and 70 degrees of freedom for the denominator of the variance-ratios and were taken from Walker and Lev, op. cit., Table X, p. 469.

<sup>4</sup>On this and subsequent statistical tests of data using median tests by chi-square, calculations were made in accord with the recommendations of Sidney Siegel, <u>Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 111-16. The conventional computational equation for chi-square was used.

$$X^{2} = \frac{N(|AD - BC| - \frac{N}{2})^{2}}{(A B) (C D) (A C) (B D)}$$

This of course introduced the correction for continuity required by the single degree of freedom characteristic of a two by two table.

<sup>5</sup>Standard computations were made for "t" by the use of the equation that

$$t = (\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1 + n_2 - 2)}{(n_1 + n_2) (s_1^2 (n_1 - 1) + s_2^2 (n_2 - 1))}}$$

É.

This form of the equation for "t" tests may be found in Rosander, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 470 and in Gouldnen, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 56. It is only, of course, applicable in those cases where variates are unpaired and the variances of the two test groups are not different. On the several items where variances were significantly different between the general and specific role responses, the degrees of freedom were corrected in accord with the expression (7.26) of Walker and Lev, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 158. Perhaps it is worth noting that the degrees of freedom for items having similar variances ranged from 161 (no NA's) to 155 (six NA's). Critical "t" values were used therefore for 120 degrees of freedom. For those items having significant "F's", the corrected degrees of freedom was reduced to below 120 in only three instances. In Table 4 of the text these items are reported in the proper probability row, rather than under their numerical "t" value.

<sup>6</sup>Jacques Barzun, <u>Teacher in America</u> (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., Inc., 1944), pp. 261-72.

<sup>7</sup>Frederick W. Terrien, "Who Thinks What About Educators," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LIX (1953), 150-58.

<sup>8</sup>Parsons and Shils, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 83.

<sup>9</sup>Note that there has been no transposition of terms. The pattern-variable refers to the actor's orientation toward a social object. The role term refers to a class of social objects.

10<u>Ibid</u>., p. 81.

<sup>11</sup>These apparently erroneous assumptions might be contrasted with Peter Blau's successful operationalization of the variable in his "Operationalizing a Conceptual Scheme: The Universalism-Particularism Pattern Variable," <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (April, 1962), 159-69. Blau summarizes his findings by indicating that the variable can be operationalized <u>only</u> when it "unequivocally refers to social systems" and not to individuals nor to cultural norms; p. 169. His operational indicators of the variable, however, are based upon persons' evaluations of others made either upon standards of similarity to themselves, particularism, or upon standards independent of their own characteristics, universalism. These indicators seem to fall somewhat short of his descritpion of them as systemic variables.

÷Ľ

ţ

t.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberle, David F., and Kaspar D. Naegele, "Middle-class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes Towards Children," <u>American Journal of Ortho Psychiatry</u>, XXII (1952), 366-378.
- Back, Kurt W., "Interpersonal Relations in a Discussion Group," Journal of Social Issues, IV (Fall, 1948), 61-65.
- Baldwin, James M. Social and Ethical Interpretations in <u>Mental Development</u>. New York: Macmillan Co., 1902, third edition.
- Barker, R. G. "The Social Interrelations of Strangers and Acquaintances," <u>Sociometry</u>, V (1942), 169-179.
- Barnard, Chester I. <u>The Functions of the Executive</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Barzun, Jacques. <u>Teacher in America</u>. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., Inc., 1944, pp. 261-272.
- Bates, Frederick L., "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXIV (1956), 313-321.
- Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public Schoolteacher," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LVII, (1952), 470-77.
- Ben-David, Joseph. "Roles and Innovations in Medicine," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXV (May, 1960), 557-68.
- Bender, I. E., and Hastorf, A. H. "The Perception of Persons: Forecasting Another Person's Responses in Three Personality Scales," <u>Journal of Abnormal</u> and Social Psychology, XLV (1950), 556-61.

- Benne, Kenneth D. and Sheats, Paul. "Functional Roles of Group Members," Journal of Social Issues, IV (1948), 41-49.
- Biddle, Bruce, et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961.
  - Vol. A. The Present Status of Role Theory.
  - Vol. B. <u>Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role</u> Conflict, and the Role of the Teacher.
  - Vol. C. <u>A Program for the Processing of Ordinal</u> <u>Data and Computation of Significance</u> for Selected Central Tendency Differences.
  - Vol. D. <u>Bibliographies on Role Methodology and</u> Propositions.

. .

- Vol. 1. Orientation, Methods and Materials.
- Vol. 2. <u>General Characteristics of the School</u> <u>Teacher's Role</u>.
- Vol. 3. Positional Differences in Teacher Role.
- Vol. 4. Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice.
- Vol. 5. <u>Own and Attributed Cognitions for the</u> <u>Teacher</u>.
- Vol. 6. <u>Recognition and Resolution of Role Conflict</u> <u>Among Teacher</u>.
- Vol. 7. <u>Teacher Cognitions and Teacher Behavior</u>.
- Blau, Peter. "Operationalizing a Conceptual Scheme: The Universalism-Particularism Pattern Variable," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (April, 1962), 159-169.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. "Patterns of Choice in Interpersonal Relations," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (February, 1962), 41-55.
- Block, J. "The Assessment of Communication: Role Variations as a Function of Interactional Context," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Personality</u>, XXI (1952), 272-86.
- Blumer, Herbert. "Sociological Analysis and the 'Variable,'" American Sociological Review, XXI (1956), 683-90.
- Bonner, Hubert. <u>Social Psychology</u>. New York: American Book Company, 1953. 439 pp.

- Bonney, Merl E. "A Sociometric Study of the Relationship of some Factors to Mutual Friendships on the Elementary, Secondary, and College Levels," <u>Sociometry</u>, IX (1946), 21-47.
- Bogardus, E. S. "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, IX (1925), 299-308.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Social Distance and its Practical Implications," <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, XXII (1938), 462-76.

- Bovard, E. W. "The Experimental Production of Interpersonal Affect," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 521-28.
- Bowman, C. C. "Role-Playing and the Development of Insight," Social Forces, XXVIII (1949), 195-199.
- Brookover, Wilbur B. <u>A Sociology of Education</u>. New York: American Book Co., 1955. Chapters 3 and 7.
  - . "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," <u>The Journal of Educational Sociology</u>, XXIX (1955), 2-13.
- Carper, J. W. and Becker, H. S. "Adjustment to Conflicting Expectations in the Development of Identification with an Occupation," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXVI (1957), 51-56.
- Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (Editors). <u>Group</u> <u>Dynamics</u>. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Co., 1953. 642 pp.
- Caudill, William, et al. "Social Structure and Interaction Processes in a Psychiatric Ward," <u>American Journal</u> of Orthopsychiatry, XXII (April, 1952), 314-334.
- Charters, W. W. and Theodore M. Newcomb. "Some Attitudinal Effects of Experimentally Increased Salience of a Membership Group," in Guy E. Swanson, et al. <u>Readings</u> <u>in Social Psychology</u>. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952.
- Cook, Lloyd and Elaine Cook. <u>A Sociological Approach to</u> Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

. i Da )( ); Da Ŋ

3

Zi

ſ

C

C

- Cooley, Charles H. <u>Human Nature and the Social Order</u>. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1902; Revised edition; Reprinted, 1922.
- Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr. "Adjustment of the Individual to his Age and Sex Roles," <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, VII (1942), 617-620.
- Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr., and Dymond, Rosalind F. "The Empathic Responses," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XII (November, 1949), 355-359.
- Coutu, Walter. <u>Emergent Human Nature</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949. 447 pp.

. "Role-Playing vs. Role-Taking: An Appeal for Clarification," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XVI (1951), 180-87.

- Davis, F. James. "Conception of Official Leaders Roles in the Air Force," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXXII (March, 1954), 253-58.
- Dewey, John. <u>Human Nature and Conduct</u>, An Introduction to <u>Social Psychology</u>. New York: Henry Holt, 1890.
- Dubin, Robert (Editor). <u>Human Relations in Administration</u>. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951. 573 pp.
- Duvall, Evelyn Millis. "Conceptions of Parenthood," American Journal of Sociology, LXX (November, 1946), 193-203.
- Dymond, Rosalind F., Hughes, Anne S., and Raabe, Virginia L. "Measurable Changes in Empathy with Age," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Consulting Psychology</u>, XVI (1952), 202-206.
- Edwards, Allen L. "Four Dimensions in Political Stereotypes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXV (1940), 566-72.
- Ellis, Robert A. "Social Status and Social Distance," Sociology and Social Research, XL (1956), 240-46.

- Eysenck, H. J. and Crown, S. "National Stereotypes: An Experimental and Methodological Study," <u>International</u> <u>Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research</u>, II (1948), 26-39.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt, et al. (Editors). <u>Dictionary of</u> <u>Sociology</u>. Ames, Iowa: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1955. 342 pp.
- Fernberger, S. W. "Persistence of Stereotypes Concerning Sex Differences," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIII (1948), 97-101.
- Festinger, Leon, Schachter, S., and Back, K. <u>Social Pressures</u> in Informal Groups. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Festinger, Leon, et al. <u>Theory and Experiment in Social</u> <u>Communications</u>. Ann Arbor: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950.
- Getzels, J W., and Guba, E. G. "Role, Role-Conflict, and Effectiveness: An Empirical Study," <u>American</u> Sociological Review, XIX (1954), 164-175.

. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Sociology</u>, XXIX (1955), 30-40.

- Gilbert, G. M. "Stereotype Persistence and Change Among College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 245-254.
- Glaser, William A. "Doctors and Politics," <u>American Journal</u> of Sociology, LXVI (November, 1960), 230-245.
- Goode, William J. "Norm Commitment and Conformity to Rolestatus Obligations," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXVI (November, 1960), 247-258.
- Gough, Harrison G. "A Sociological Theory of Psychopathy," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LIII (March, 1948), 359-366.

- Greer, Scott A. <u>Social Organization</u>. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955.
- Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. <u>Explorations in Role Analysis:</u> Studies of the School <u>Superintendency Role</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958. 379 pp.
- Gullahorn, John. "Distance and Friendship as Factors in the Gross Interaction Matrix," <u>Sociometry</u>, XV (1952), 123-134.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Measuring Role Conflict," <u>American Journal</u> <u>of Sociology</u>, LXI (1956), 299-303.

- Gusfield, Joseph R. "Occupational Roles and Forms of Enterprise," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXVI (May, 1961), 571-580.
- Guttman, Louis. "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," <u>Educational and Psychological</u> <u>Measurements</u>, VII (1947), 247-280.
- Hacker, Helen Mayer. "Women as a Minority Group," <u>Social</u> Forces, XXX (1951), 60-69.
- Hagood, Margaret J. and Price, Daniel O. <u>Statistics for</u> <u>Sociologists</u>. New York: Henry Holt, 1952.
- Hall, Oswald. "Types of Medical Careers," <u>American Journal</u> of Sociology, LV (1949), 243-53.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. "The Stages of a Medical Career," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LIII (March, 1948), 327-36.
- Harlan, H. H. "Some Factors Affecting Attitude Toward Jews," American Sociological Review, VII (1942), 816-827.
- Hartley, Eugene L. and Hartley, Ruth E. <u>Fundamentals of</u> <u>Social Psychology</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955. 740 pp.

- Hartley, Eugene L. and Krugman, Dorothy C. "Notes on Children's Role Perceptions," Journal of Psychology, XXVI (1948), 399-405.
- Havighurst, Robert J., et al. <u>Who Shall Be Educated</u>. New York: Harper and Bros., 1944.
- Havighurst, Robert J. and Neugarten, Bernice L. <u>Society</u> <u>and Education</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.
- Heider, Fritz. <u>The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958. 322 pp.
- Henry, Nelson B. (Editor). <u>The Dynamics of Instructional</u> <u>Groups</u>. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1960.
- Hertzler, J. O. <u>American Social Institutions</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961.
- Homans, George C. <u>The Human Group</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1950. 484 pp.
- Hughes, Everett. "The Institutional Office and the Person," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, XLIII (November, 1937), 404-413.
- Jacobsen, Eugene, Charters, W. W., Jr., and Lieberman, Seymour. "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, VII, 3 (1951), 18-27.
- James, H. E. O. and Tenen, C. "Attitudes Towards Other Peoples," in <u>UNESCO International Social Science</u> <u>Bulletin</u>, III (Autumn, 1951), 553-560.
- James, William. <u>The Principles of Psychology</u>. New York: Henry Holt, 1890.
- Katz, D. and Braly, K. W. "Racial Prejudice and Racial Stereotypes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXX (1935), 175-193.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, XXVIII (1933), 280-290.
- Kelley, H. H. and Volkert, E. H. "The Resistance to Change of Group-Anchored Attitudes," <u>American</u> Sociological Review, XVII (1952), 453-65.
- Kimbrough, Emory, Jr. "The Role of the Banker in a Small City," Social Forces, XXXVI (May, 1958), 316-322.
- Komarovsky, Mirra and Sargent, S. S. "Research into Sub-Cultural Influences Upon Personality," <u>Culture and</u> <u>Personality</u>. New York: The Viking Fund, 1949.
- Kroeber, A. L. and Waterman, T. T. (Editors). Source Book in Anthropology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931. 571 pp.
- LaPiere, Richard T. and Farnsworth, Paul R. <u>Social Psychology</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949. 626 pp.
- Laulicht, Jerome. "Role Conflict, The Pattern Variable Theory, and Scalogram Analysis," Social Forces, XXXIII (1954), 250-254.
- Lindesmith, Alfred and Strauss, Anselm L. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1949. 549 pp.
- Lindzey, Gardner (Editor). <u>Handbook of Social Psychology</u>. 2 volumes. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.
- Linton, Ralph. <u>The Cultural Background of Personality</u>. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1945. 157 pp.
  - . <u>The Study of Man</u>. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1936. 503 pp.
- Loomis, Charles P. <u>Social Systems</u>. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960.
- Loomis, Charles P. and Beegle, J. Allan. <u>Rural Sociology</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957. 488 pp.

- Manwiller, L. V. "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (1958), 315-54.
- Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mechanic, David and Volkart, Edmund H. "Stress, Illness Behavior, and the Sick Role," <u>American Sociological</u> Review, XXVI (February, 1961), 51-58.
- Merton, Robert K. <u>Social Theory and Social Structure</u>. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957a. 645 pp.
- . "The Role-Set," <u>British Journal of Sociology</u>, VIII (1957b), 106-120.
- Miyamoto, S. F. and Dornbusch, S. F. "A Test of Interactionist Hypotheses of Self-perception," <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, LXI (1956), 399-403.
- Motz, Annabelle Bender. "Conceptions of Marital Roles by Status Groups," <u>Marriage and Family Living</u>, XII (1950), 136.

. "The Role Conception Inventory: A Tool for Research in Social Psychology," <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, XVII (1952), 465-471.

- Murphy, Gardner. <u>Personality: A Biosocial Approach to</u> <u>Origins and Structure</u>. New York: Harper, 1947.
- Murphy, Lois Barclay. <u>Personality in Young Children</u>. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1956. 424 pp.
- Neiman, L. J. and Hughes, J. W. "The Problem of the Concept of Role--a Re-survey of the Literature," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXX (1951), 141-149.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. "Role Behaviors in the Study of Individual Personality and of Groups," Journal Of Personality, XVIII (1950), 276.

<u>Social Psychology</u>. New York: The Dryden **Press**, 1950. 690 pp.

- Notcutt, B. and Silva, A. L. M. "Knowledge of Other People," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 30-37.
- Olmstead, M. S. "Character and Social Role," <u>American</u> Journal of Sociology, LXIII (July, 1957), 49-57.
- Ort, Robert S. "A Study of Role-Conflicts as Related to Class Level," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 425-432.
- Parsons, Talcott. <u>The Social System</u>. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951. 575 pp.
- Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. (Editors). <u>Toward</u> <u>a General Theory of Action</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. 506 pp.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. and Rosenberg, Morris. "Nurse-Patient Social Distance in a Mental Hospital," <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, XXVII (February, 1962), 56-65.
- Precker, J. A. "Similarity of Valuings as A Factor in Selection of Peers and Near Authority Figures," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1952), 406-14.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. "Social Organization of the Kariera of Australia," in Kroeber, A. L. and Waterman, T. T. (Editors). <u>Source Book in Anthropology</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1931. 571 pp.
- Riecken, Henry W. and Homans, George C. "Psychological Aspects of Social Structure," Chapter 22 in Lindzey, Gardner (Editor). <u>Handbook of Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954.
- Reismann, Leonard. "A Study of Role Conception in Bureaucracy," <u>Social Forces</u>, XXVII (March, 1949), 305-310.
- Rohrer, John H. and Sherif, Muzafer (Editors). <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology at the Crossroads</u>. New York: Harper, 1954.

- Rosander, A. C. <u>Elementary Principles of Statistics</u>. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1951.
- Ruesch, J. and Prestwood, A. R. "Interaction Processes and Personal Codification," <u>Journal of Personality</u>, XVIII (1950), 391-430.
- Ryans, David G. <u>Characteristics of Teachers</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory," Chapter 6 in Gardner Lindzey (Editor). <u>Handbook of Social Psychology</u>, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.
- Sargent, Stansfeld. "Concepts of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," in Rohrer, John H. and Sherif, Muzafer (Editors). Social Psychology at the Crossroads. New York: Harper, 1954.
- Sewell, W. H., Haller, A. O. and Straus, M. A. "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspiration," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXII (1957), 67-73.
- Sheldon, Richard C. "Some Observations on Theory in Social Science," Chapter 2 in Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. (Editors). Toward a General Theory of <u>Action</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. 506 pp.
- Sherif, Muzafer and Sherif, Carolyn W. <u>An Outline of Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>. New York: Harper, 1956. 792 pp.
- Sherwood, Rae. "The Bantu Clerk: A Study of Role Expectations," Journal of Social Psychology, XLVII (1958), 285-316.
- Siegel, Sidney. <u>Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral</u> <u>Sciences</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956. 312 pp.
- Sommer, Robert and Killian, M. Lewis. "Areas of Value Differences: 1. A Method for Investigation. 2. Negro-White Relations," Journal of Social Psychology, XXXIX (1954), 227-244.

- Spiegel, John P. "The Resolutions of Role Conflict Within the Family," Psychiatry, XX (1957), 10-16.
- Stouffer, S. A. "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XIV (1949), 707-17.
- Stouffer, S. A. and Toby, Jackson. "Role Conflict and Personality," in Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. (Editors). Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954. 506 pp.
- Stryker, S. "Role-taking Accuracy and Adjustment," Sociometry, XX (December, 1957), 286-296.
- Sutcliffe, J P and Haberman, M. "Factors Influencing Choice in Role Conflict Situations," <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, XXI (1956), 695-703.
- Swanson, Guy E., Newcomb, Theodore M., and Hartley, Eugene
  L. <u>Readings in Social Psychology</u>. New York:
  Henry Holt and Co., 1952. 680 pp.
- Tagiuri, Renato. "Relational Analysis: An Extension of Sociometric Method with Emphasis Upon Social Perception," Sociometry, XV (1952), 91-104.
- Tagiuri, Renato and Petrullo, Luigi. <u>Person Perception and</u> <u>Interpersonal Behavior</u>. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958. 390 pp.
- Terrien, F. W. "Who Thinks What About Educators," <u>American</u> <u>Journal of Sociology</u>, LIX (1953), 150-58.
- Thomas, E. J. "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XXIV (1959), 30-37.
- Toby, Jackson. "Some Variables in Role Conflict Analysis," Social Forces, XXX (March, 1952), 323-327.
- Torgerson, Warren S. <u>Theory and Methods of Scaling</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958. 460 pp.
- Turner, Ralph H. "Role-taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," <u>American Journal of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, LXI (January, 1956), 316-328.

- Trow, William C. "Role Functions of the Teacher in the Instructional Group," in Henry, Nelson B. (Editor). <u>The Dynamics of Instructional Groups</u>. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1960.
- Videbeck, Richard and Bates, A. P. "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," <u>Sociometry</u>, XXII (1959), 1-11.
- Walker, Helen M. and Lev, Joseph. <u>Statistical Inference</u>. New York: Henry Holt, 1953.
- Waller, Willard. <u>The Sociology of Teaching</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1932.
- Wardell, I. Walter. "The Reduction of Strain in a Marginal Social Role," <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, LXI (1955), 16-25.
- Warren, Roland L. "Cultural, Personal, and Situational Roles," <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, XXXIV (November-December, 1949), 104-111.
- Wilkinson, Forrest. "Social Distance Between Occupations," Sociology and Social Research, XIII (1928-29), 234-244.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. <u>American Society</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952. 557 pp.
- Wilson, Logan. <u>The Academic Man</u>. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.
- Znaniecki, Florian. <u>The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge</u>. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF THE SAMPLE

•

### APPENDIX A

#### REVIEW OF THE SAMPLE

Section 1. Sample Definition, Exclusions, and Attrition

I. Definition of the Sample-base

Table A-1. Delimitation and exclusions for homogeneity of sample-base.

	Total	1 Exclusions				
	Men Teachers	Special Teachers	Rural Residence	Residence Changes	Other	Ba <b>s</b> e Drawn
Senior High	77	27	10	6	9	25
Junior						
High	118	30	24	18	7	39
	195	57	34	24	16	64

The 1959-60 Lansing School Directory, published in December of 1959, listed 195 male junior and senior high school teachers employed in the Lansing schools, not including full-time physical education teachers, coaches, nor any administrative employees. Additional exclusions were made to refine the sample-base to a group of teachers as consistent as possible with the position defined for study in the text.

## Special Teachers

Special teachers were first excluded comprising a group of: (1) speech correction specialists, hearing specialists, and physical therapists, (2) teachers of driver education, (3) teachers of industrial arts, (4) part-time teachers, (5) teachers of mentally retarded and gifted children, (6) business and industrial coordinators, and (7) non-teaching heads of departments.

# Rural Residence

A second exclusion was made for teachers who lived in rural-farm areas and who lived in near-by communities not contiguous to the Lansing-East Lansing area. These included 34 teachers.

# **Residence** Changes

Cross-referencing the remaining sample-base to a 1958-59 Lansing School Directory indicated that 24 teachers were either new employees or had moved during the year. These were also excluded since one of the major goals of this study was to relate differing role expectations to social distance. It was assumed that teachers who had recently moved would not be well enough known to their

. .

neighbors for such a dimension to have become clearly defined in the minds of prospective respondents.

# <u>Other</u>

Finally, certain other teacher-base members were excluded whose rather "different" personal characteristics might have confounded the teaching expectations held for them. These were 16 in number and included Negroes, foreign exchange teachers, teachers with marked physical disabilities, young men still residing with their parents, and classroom teachers who had formerly been well-known in the Lansing area as coaches of major sports.

II. Field Exclusions of Teachers and Adjacent Residences

	Exc	lusions	<u>Remai</u>	nders
	Teacher Addre <b>ss</b> es	Respondent Addre <b>sses</b>	Teacher Ba <b>s</b> e	Respondent Addresses
Teacher Non-Area			_	
Residents	8	-	56	118
Teacher Apartment				
Dwellers and				
Roomers	5	10	51	108
Teacher <b>s</b> Moved	2	4	49	104
"No neighbor <b>s</b> "	2	5	47	99
"Single" adjacent				
address	0	4	47	95
Respondents moved	0	2	47	93
No response	0	1	47	92

Table A-2. Field exclusions of teacher sample-base and adjacent residences.

#### Additional Teacher Non-area Residents

The drawn sample-base had consisted of 64 male secondary school teachers. Identifications were made in a 1959 Lansing City Directory and in a 1960 Lansing Bell Telephone Directory of prospective respondents who were neighbors of the sample-base teachers. During this procedure eight additional teachers were identified as non-area residents, having either moved or not having been listed correctly in the Lansing School Directory. These included teachers who lived in rural farm areas and in the nearby communities of Williamston, Holt, Mason, DeWitt, and Haslett, Michigan. These were also excluded from the sample-base in accordance with the original sample design.

# Respondent Selection

For the remaining base of 56 members, 118 neighboring addresses were selected and were contacted by mail. In 11 cases of the 56, it had been impossible to select uniformly "adjacent" addresses. This was due to 11 teachers living (1) on corner lots, (2) in new subdivisions with vacant homes or lots adjacent, (3) at the ends of streets and courts, (4) next door to apartments or non-residential buildings. Wherever reasonably nearby addresses were obvious,

they were selected and possible replacements were also drawn for these teachers. This accounts for the 6 "extra" addresses in excess of the possible 112, i.e., 56 x 2.

#### Apartment Dwellers and Roomers

During the period of contacting respondents additional losses were incurred. Four of the 56 member sample base were apartment dwellers who had not been so identified during the drawing of the sample. This accounted for residents at eight addresses adjacent to apartment buildings who, as might have been expected, were not acquainted with the sample-base teacher who lived in the apartment. Efforts to replace them with apartment residents who were acquainted with the teacher were so unsuccessful that these teachers, together with their respondent pairs, were excluded from the sample-base. One teacher lived in a rented room. The adjacent pair of respondent addresses did not know a teacher resided in the neighborhood. This sample unit, the teacher and two adjacent addresses, was also excluded.

# Teacher Residence Change

From the remaining base of 51 teachers, 2 had lived at the given address for but a few months and had subsequently

moved. Only one of the matching four respondent addresses knew that their neighbor had been a teacher. One of the teachers had moved to another school system, and it was assumed that the other had not been in residence at his new address long enough to become well known to his neighbors. Both sample units were therefore excluded. Two other teachers also had moved, but the respondents were retained since their former neighbors (teachers) had lived near them for a protracted time.

### No Adjacent Address

-----

Two teachers from the ll mentioned in Sample Selection, lived in isolated locations for which there were no adjacent homes. The nearest four addresses and one "extra," did not know of a teacher in the area. It was therefore necessary to exclude these sample units also.

#### Respondent Address Losses

Of the ll "unusual" teacher addresses mentioned in <u>Respondent Selection</u>, the two cited above were total losses. The remaining nine only yielded 14 usable neighboring addresses. Four respondent address losses were therefore incurred by default. The occupants of seven respondent addresses had moved. Due to vacancies and new residents, :

•

replacements could be made for only five of these cases.

It should be noted that these respondent address losses required no teacher base exclusion or loss.

## No Response Address

One respondent address had an unlisted telephone and house-calls brought no response. Two other homes were temporarily vacant. Only two replacements were obtained for these three cases.

#### III. Respondent Attrition

During the actual field work, additional respondent losses were incurred. Some of these resulted in address and matching losses, others not. A projection of the preceding section indicated that 92 homes adjacent to 47 teachers' homes were available for study. Final data from these indicated later that a total of 194 respondents might have been available. Respondent attrition reduced this total possible to 163. The losses were as shown in Table A-3.

#### Refusals

During the course of the field work, actual refusal was encountered from only four addresses. One of these was occupied by an older couple, one by one young unmarried

	Res Losses	pondent Replacements	Rema Respondents	ining Addresses
Total Possible			194	92
Refusals	7	3	190	90
Illne <b>ss</b> and Death	6	0	184	87
Respondents not acquainted with teahcer	6	0	178	87
N A'S	8	0	170	86
Mi <b>s</b> cellaneous	7	0	163	83
Final Sample used for analysis			163	83

Table A-3. Attrition of respondents and addresses.

woman, and also the last two by young unmarried women--two at each address. Only two addresses could be obtained as replacements. These yielded but three respondents.

# Illness and Death

At two addresses one of the occupants had been hospitalized. At another there had been a death. These netted six respondent losses which could not be replaced.

# Respondents Not Acquainted with Teacher

At eight homes only one of the possible respondents was acquainted with the teacher. In six of these cases, only a single set of instruments was delivered to the other occupant. In the remaining two, the respondents who did not know the teacher seemed disappoinged at being "left out." They were therefore given "General Role" expectation instruments and were asked to use the "Counter Incumbent to Focal Position" social distance instrument. Since the eight residences did give a representative picture of the actual situation, no attempt was made to secure replacements for the six losses.

Unknown until the data recording stage was the fact that there were an additional seven respondents who also did not know their adjacent teachers. These, together with the two just cited, comprised the nine persons not acquainted with a teacher of Appendix Table A-10. Fortuitously, appropriate instrumentations had been left these seven respondents in all cases for the expectation measures (General Role Instruments), but two of them had been given "Counter Incumbent to Focal Incumbent" social distance measures. They were not considered as losses.

#### No Answers

Two respondents from the same address had used free responses to expectations rather than following the format requested. Six others had sufficiently high NA's that their instruments were not included for analysis. These latter came, however, from addresses for which other completed instruments were available.

#### Miscellaneous

Two respondents, one address, accidentally destroyed their instruments. Although they offered to duplicate their efforts, the investigator did not force the issue.

Three respondents, one address, took instruments with them on a vacation, with promise of mail-backs. They were returned only after data analysis had commenced.

Two respondents, one address, left town; again probably on an extended vacation. The instruments were never recovered.

IV. Sample Summary

Table A-4 indicates that it was possible to secure sample address pairs for but 36 members of the final teacher base-sample. For the other 11 only a single respondent address could be used or was available.

	Teacher Base	Adjacent Addre <b>ss</b> es	<u>Respo</u> Specific Role	<u>ndent</u> s General Role
Base members with paired addresses	36	72	73	70
Base members with single adjacent address	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u> 83	<u>11</u> 84	<u>9</u>

Table A-4. Summary of sample pairing for specific and general roles.

Early in the field work, it had been recognized that this defect was going to be unavoidable. Whenever it appeared that a teacher base-member was going to yield but a single adjacent address, respondents at that address were given appropriate instrumentations, general or specific role, in order to maintain balance in these categories.

A decision had to be made with regard to the 20 persons of whom the 11 Specific Role respondents were based on five base-teachers while the 9 General Role respondents were based on six different base-teachers.

Late in the field work stage of this study four respondents at two different addresses had proferred to the investigator a totally unexpected situation. They had completed their instrumentations, not with reference to their teacher neighbor, but instead by referring to some other teacher--described as a family friend without further identification. This, of course, produced a known "mismatch" in the paired data. But it was also recognized that additional error of this same sort might be present within the data and unidentified.

Since matching error might already be present in the basic data, and since four of the unpaired homes did in fact represent the real situation where there was no adjacent pairing address, the decision was made to retain all such single addresses and their respondents. A visual check evinced no readily observable variation or unusual response patterns for their data.

# Section 2. Respondent Background Data and Validation of Sample Matches

The ensuing tables describe the gross data characteristics of the sample members who took part in this study. Chi squares are in test of the hypotheses of no difference between the two sample segments.

Sample Segment					
Years	Specific	General	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
20-29	7	7			
30-39	27	28			
40-49	21	17	<sup>2</sup> 25		
50-64	23	21	X = .35		
65 and over	6	6	.98 ∕ þ <b>∕</b> .98		

Table A-5. Ages of respondents.

Table A-6. Sex of respondents.

Sample Segment					
Sex	Specific	General			
Male	41 •	40	$x^2 = .04$		
Female	43	39	.99 > p > .98		

Table A-7. Marital status of respondents.

	Sample Segment			
Marital Status	Specific	General		
Married	80	70	$x^2 = 2.43$	
Single, widowed, divorced	4	9	.20 > p > .10	

...

.

	Samp	le Segment	
Age of Children	Specific	General	
None	13	16	
Pre-school age	4	9	
Elementary age	27	15	$x^2 = 6.65$
Junior or senior high school age	9	13	.20 > p > 10 '
Beyond public school age	31	26	

Table A-8. Respondents having children.\*

\*Respondents were single coded for the oldest agegroup in which they had children.

Table A-9.	Attendance of respondents'	children	at public
	or parochial school.		
		•	

	<u>Samp</u> ]		
School	Specific	General	
Public	59	59	2
Parochial	12	7	$X^2 = 1.15$
Not applicable	13	13	.70 / p / .50

Table	<b>A-</b> 10.	Respondents'	church	attendance.
-------	---------------	--------------	--------	-------------

·	Sample Segment				
Frequency of Attendance	Specific	General			
More than a third of the time	56	52	$x^2 = .00$		
Less than a third of the time	28	27	p = 1.00		

.

Table A-11. Respondents' church membership.

		Sample Segment			
Church	Membership	Specific	General		
	Yes	60	59	$x^2 = .22$	
	No	24	20	.70 > p > .50	

Table A-12. Respondents length of residence in neighborhood.

. ,

	Sample Segment			
Years	Specific	General		
0 - 4	20	31	$x^2 - 6.36$	
5 - 9	25	25	.05 > p > .02	
10 and over	39	23	· · ·	

· .

:

	Sample	Sample Segment	
	Specific	General	<i>.</i>
Related	15	18	$x^2 = .62$
Unrelated	69	61	.50 > p > .30

Table A-13. Respondents' kinship to male secondary teachers.

Table A-14. Respondents' acquaintance with male secondary teacher.

		-	
	Samp.	le Segment	
	Specific	General	
Intimate or Good Friend	36	26	
Casual Friend	37	27	$x^2 - 15.60$
Distant Acquaintance	3	7	.01 > p > .001
Only know him	8	10	
Not know any	0	9	

Table A-15. Respondents' educational level.

	Sample Segment		
	Specific	General	
Less than 9 years	4	3	
9 - 1 <b>2 years</b>	45	47	x <sup>2</sup> - 70
1 - 3 years of college	21	16	x = .72 .95 > p > .90
4 or more years of college	14	13	

	Weighted Total	Sampl	<u>t</u>	
	Characteristics	Specific	General	
"Upper-Middle"	26 - 37	25	30	v <sup>2</sup> – 1 41
"Lower-Middle"	38 - 51	42	33	X = 1.41 .30 $\rangle$ p $\rangle$ .20
"Upper-Lower"	52 - 64	. 17	16	

Table A-16. Social class level of respondents.\*

\*In order to provide further validation of the sample matches, a measure was made of the socio-economic class levels of respondents. Since this was not to be used as an experimental variable, the Warner I. S. C.<sup>1</sup> seemed adequate for the task at hand.

Three status characteristics were readily available. Respondent data furnished (1) Occupation. This was rated in accordance with Warner's Revised Scale.<sup>2</sup> At the time of the delivery of instruments to the respondents, evaluations were also made of (2) House Type and (3) Dwelling Area. These were also rated in accordance with Warner's stipulations.<sup>3</sup>

Given these three measures, they were weighted 3, 4, and 5, respectively, and summed.<sup>4</sup>

Although ethnicity was recognized an additional contributing variable to social class level, the sample had a sufficiently narrow range of variation that any additional correction proved unnecessary. The above distributions were generated on the basis of Warner's placement for "Old Americans."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>W. Lloyd Warner, et al., <u>Social Class in America</u> (New York: Harper and Brothers, Torchbook Edition, 1960. See Chapters 8 and 9.

> <sup>2</sup>Warner, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 136-38, 140-41. <sup>3</sup>Warner, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 143-154. <sup>4</sup>Warner, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 185. <sup>5</sup>Warner, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 183.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

# CONTACT LETTER

This summer the Michigan State University Bureau of Educational Research is sponsoring a research project of a social-psychological nature, dealing with various aspects of educational systems.

We think you would find it interesting, maybe even fun, to take part in a survey of this sort. It would not take very much of your time, and it would give you a good opportunity to express how you feel about certain areas of education. Most importantly, you would be helping all of us -- parents, youngsters, teachers, and research workers -to learn more about how to do the best possible job for our schools.

During the next week or so, one of my colleagues or I would like to contact you by phone and ask foryour help in two ways. First, to make an appointment to explain briefly the specific purposes of the study and bring you a questionnaire which we hope you will fill out at your convenience. Second, to talk with you for a few minutes about the research when we return to pick up the questionnaire, again at your convenience. Your name appeared in a sample drawn from the Lansing area, and, of course, you and your answers would not be identified in any way. If you wish any additional information, you may call me either here at the University, ED 2-1511 Ext. 2454 or at my home, IV 4-9511.

Since the study may possibly turn out to be quite important for the confirmation of certain aspects of socialscientific theory, we earnestly request your assistance. As a small token of our indebtedness to you we will be happy to send you a summary of the research when it is completed if you so desire. Mainly, however, I believe that the satisfaction coming from your contribution to a better understanding of human relations will be in itself rewarding to you.

.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. Snyder Department of Social Science

Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan Department of Social Science

This questionnaire is part of the research which is being done to examine what we Americans want from our schools. There are studies finding out what we expect of our boards of education and of our school administrators. Some are concerned with curricular questions -- what types of courses should be offered and what should be studied in them. Others are concerned with questions about financing education and still others with colleges and universities.

In this particular research, we are trying to analyze what we expect of our teachers -- what kind of people we want them to be and how we expect them to teach our youngsters. We're interested in how you feel about the points covered in the questionnaire, so if by any accident you know any teachers, please don't discuss this with them until after you've finished. If you did, you might find it quite difficult to give us your ideas about things and it is your attitude that we're interested in. Other studies will examine how teachers feel about similar questions. Incidentally, if we left two copies in your household, please be sure to fill them out individually. After you are through, however, you may find it interesting to discuss it with your wife or husband, but please be sure not to change your original responses.

Your name was drawn from one of a number of areas of Lansing where several teachers reside, and we hope that a few of you will be acquainted with some of these teachers. Please don't worry about remaining anonymous. Your questionnaire is numbered and that will be its only identification once it leaves your hands.

We are doing several different types of interviews. Some of them are concerned with expectations which we have for teachers as a group; others for teachers as <u>individuals</u>. There are also slightly different questionnaires for persons who are acquainted with a teacher and others for those who do not know one. You will see what type you have as you read the instructions to the various parts of this questionnaire. We would like to thank you very much for the way you're helping us. Needless to say, social research simply cannot be carried out without the help of persons like yourself, and in consequence we would have very few accurate scientific findings about how we relate ourselves to each other. So thank you again, your cooperation will reward all of us by giving us more insight into the complexities of human relations.

Sincerely yours,

Pickup Date:

Time:

•

C. A. Snyder Department of Social Science ED 21511, Ext. 2454 IV 49511

 $\mathbf{CovL}$ 

# GROSS DATA

First of all we would like to know a few things about you and your family. Please check the proper response.

- 1. What is your age?
   \_\_\_\_1. 0 19

  - **6.** Over 65
- 2. Sex
  - \_\_\_\_1. M.
  - \_\_\_\_2. F.
- 3. Marital status
  - \_\_\_\_l. Single
  - 2. Married
  - 3. Widowed
  - 4. Divorced
- 4. Do you have children?
  - l. None
  - \_\_\_\_2. Of Pre-school age
  - \_\_\_\_3. Elementary school age
  - \_\_\_\_4. Junior or high school age
  - 5. Beyond public school age
- 5. Do your children attend (will they or did they?)
  - \_\_\_\_l. Public school
  - \_\_\_\_2. Parochial school
- 6. Do you attend church at least a third of the time? \_\_\_\_\_1. Yes 2. No

- 7. Are you a church member? <u>1. Yes</u> 2. No
- 9. Are you related to a male secondary school teacher in any way?
  1. Yes
  - \_\_\_\_2. No
- 10. If yes, what is this relationship?
- 11. Are you acquainted in any
  way with a male secondary
  school teacher?
  \_\_\_\_1. Yes
  - 2. No
- 12. If yes, how would you
   describe this acquaintance ship?
  - \_\_\_\_l. Intimate friend
    - \_\_\_\_2. Good friend
    - \_\_\_\_3. Casual friend
  - \_\_\_\_4. Distant acquaintance
    - \_\_5. No relationship exists other than the fact that I know him.

12. Continued

.

How else might you describe how well you know him?

13. How many years of school have you attended?

\_\_\_\_1. 8 years or less

- 2. 9 11 years
- \_\_\_\_3. 12 years (H.S. graduate
- \_\_\_\_4. 1 3 years of college
- \_\_\_\_5. 4 or more years of college

14. What is your occupation?

\_\_\_\_\_

# SOCIAL DISTANCE: COUNTER INCUMBENT TO FOCAL POSITION (INSTRUCTIONS)

If by any coincidence you happen to know a male junior or senior high school teacher, please forget this temporarily. We'd like to find out more about what you think of most of these teachers or of "<u>typical</u>" men teachers in secondary school.

In the following set of questions we are not so interested in what you would actually do, but rather what you would like to do based on the degree of friendship which you would like to have exist between yourself and most of such male junior or senior high school teachers. You might for instance wish to have most of them only as distant acquaintances. If so, please try to answer on this basis. If you think you would like to have most of such teachers as your best friends, then answer the following questions just as though they were. Remember, we're asking about how you think you might react to most male secondary school teachers, the average ones, not the exceptional ones that you and many other people might want to have as a special friend, nor the possible "other kind" if there happen to be any like that, nor any particular one

that you may happen to know. For the ladies, some questions will be answered for your husband's friendship with such a teacher.

It is quite likely that many of the following situations would never occur for reasons that you'll see as you go through the questions. Nevertheless, please try to do your best to reply to them as though they might actually take place. Please use the following key to answer these items:

- 1. I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.
- 2. This might work out fairly well.
- 3. "So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
- 4. I doubt that I would go for this.
- 5. I think I would probably try to avoid it.

Please put the number of the response that suits you best in the blank before each question. SOCIAL DISTANCE: COUNTER INCUMBENT TO FOCAL POSITION

- 1. I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.
- 2. This might work out fairly well.
- 3. "So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
- 4. I doubt that I would go for this.
- 5. I think I would probably try to avoid it.
- 1. Do you think that you would want to work in the same office (or shop or store, etc.) with most male secondary school teachers?
- \_\_\_\_ 2. Would you want to work for one?
- 3. Would you want to talk about your job with a teacher?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Would you want to discuss their jobs with them?
- 5. If you thought teachers might be able to give you some help in their area of expertness, how would you feel about approaching one of them?
- 6. How would you feel about discussing politics with most such teachers?
- 7. How would you feel hearing a male secondary school teacher tell an off-color or sexy joke at a party?
- 8. How about your (husband's) telling one in front of a teacher?
- 9. What's your reaction towards discussing religion with most male secondary school teachers?
- \_\_\_\_10. What about your families going to church together?
  - \_\_\_ll. How would you react to (your husband's) going bowling or golfing with most such teachers?
- \_\_\_l2. How about (your husband's) going with a male secondary school teacher on a hunting or fishing trip?
  - \_\_\_\_13. Suppose you were neighbors and you were locked out of your home during the winter and had to seek shelter in a teacher's home for an hour or so until someone came home. How would you react to this?
- \_\_\_\_13. Suppose you were neighbors and you were locked out of your home during the winter and had to seek shelter in his house for an hour or so until someone came home. How would you react to this?
- \_\_\_\_14. What if this happened to him and he asked to wait in your home?
- 15. If your phone were dead and you went over to his house to report it, how would you react if you were asked to sit down and have a cup of coffee?
- 16. How about your families having a picnic or barbecue together?
- \_\_\_\_17. How would you feel about your families taking a vacation together?
- \_\_\_\_18. How do you think you might react to accidentally meeting this teacher and his wife in a restaurant and having lunch with them?
- \_\_\_\_19. How would you feel about having him as a member of your (husband's) lodge, social club, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_20. How about (your husband's) going out of town with him on a short business trip?
- \_\_\_\_2l. This is a tough one, but what might be your opinion of having him marry into your family? Brother-in-law, son-in-law?

# SOCIAL DISTANCE: COUNTER INCUMBENT TO FOCAL INCUMBENT (INSTRUCTIONS)

Earlier you'were asked if you happened to know a male junior or senior high school classroom teacher. We'd like to find out more about how well you would like to know him.

In the following set of questions we are not so much interested in what you would actually do, but rather what you would like to do based on the degree of friendship which you would like to have exist between yourself and this teacher. You may for instance be only a distant acquaintance, and you may not wish to increase the intimacy of this friendship - if so, please try to answer on this basis. If you would like to have him as one of your best friends, answer them just as though he were. Or, if you wish that you were not quite so friendly as you actually are, then try to answer them that way. For the ladies, some questions will be answered for your husband's friendship with him.

It is quite likely that many of the following situations would never occur for reasons that you'll see as you go through the questions. Nevertheless, please try to do your best to reply to them just as though they might actually take place. Please use the following key to answer these items:

192

1. I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.

- 2. This might work out fairly well.
- 3. "So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
- 4. I doubt that I would go for this.
- 5. I think I would probably try to avoid it.

Please put the number of the response that suits you best in the blank space before each question.

# SOCIAL DISTANCE: COUNTER INCUMBENT TO "GOOD FRIEND" (INSTRUCTIONS)

Now, let's forget about teachers for the time being, and talk about an entirely different subject, how we relate ourselves to our friends. We are doing this in order to compare our friendships with teachers to our friendships with other persons.

In the next few questions please try to answer all of them with reference to some man that you (and your husband) think of as a good friend. Please try not to answer one question for one of your friends and another question for some other friend. Instead, try to think of the same person all the way through.

In the following set of questions we are not so interested in what you would actually do, but rather what you would like to do based on the degree of friendship which you would like to have exist between yourself and this good friend. You may for instance be only fairly good friends, and you may not wish to increase the intimacy of this friendship - if so, please try to answer on this basis. If you would like to have him as one of your <u>best</u> friends, answer them just as though he were. Or, if you wish that

196

you were <u>not quite so friendly</u> as you actually are, then try to answer them that way. For the ladies, some questions will be answered for your husband's friendship with the man in mind.

It is quite likely that many of the following situations would never occur for reasons that you'll see as you go through the questions. Nevertheless, please try to do your best to reply to them just as though they might actually take place. Please use the following key to answer these items.

- 1. I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.
- 2. This might work out fairly well.
- 3. "So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
- 4. I doubt that I would go for this.
- 5. I think I would probably try to avoid it.

Please put the number of the response that suits you best in the blank before each question. SOCIAL DISTANCE: COUNTER INCUMBENT TO "GOOD FRIEND"

- 1. I would like to think that I'd enjoy it.
- 2. This might work out fairly well.
- 3. "So-so," I feel quite neutral about this.
- 4. I doubt that I would go for this.
- 5. I think I would probably try to avoid it.
- 1. Do you think that you would want to work in the same office (or shop, store, etc.) with this good friend?
- 2. Would you want to work for him?
- 3. Would you want to talk about your job with this good friend?
  - \_\_\_\_ 4. Would you want to discuss his job with him?
- 5. If you thought this friend might be able to give you some help in his area of expertness, how would you feel about approaching him?
- 6. How would you feel about discussing politics with this good friend?
- 7. How would you feel hearing this good friend tell an off-color or sexy joke at a party?
- 8. How about your (husband's) telling one in front of him?
- 9. What's your reaction towards discussing religion with him?
- 10. What about your families going to church together?
- \_\_\_\_ll. How would you react to (your husband's) going bowling or golfing with this good friend?
- \_\_\_\_12. How about (your husband's) going with this good friend on a hunting or fishing trip?

- 13. Suppose you were neighbors and you were locked out of your home during the winter and had to seek shelter in his home for an hour or so until someone came home. How would you react to this?
- \_\_\_\_14. What if this happened to him and he asked to wait in your home?
- 15. If your phone were dead and you went over to his house to report it, how would you react if you were invited to have a cup of coffee?
- 16. How about your families having a picnic or barbecue together?
- \_\_\_\_17. How would you feel about your families taking a vacation together?
- 18. How do you think you might react to accidentally meeting this good friend and his wife in a restaurant and having lunch with them?
  - 19. How would you feel about having him as a member of your (husband's) lodge, social club, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_20. How about (your husband's) going out of town together on a short business trip?
- \_\_\_\_21. This is a tough one, but what might be your opinion of having him marry into your family? Brother-inlaw, son-in-law?

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SPECIFIC ROLE EXPECTATIONS INSTRUMENT

The next section is the main part of this research. We will ask you all sorts of questions about what you expect of this particular teacher that you indicated you know. Even though you may not know him at all well, please don't worry about it. We're simply interested in what your opinions and attitudes are while you have a particular person in mind rather than a group of people. Lots of times when we talk about a special group such as salesmen, engineers, secretaries, nurses, doctors, etc.--or teachers--we talk about them as a group somewhat differently than we do when we talk or think about one of these persons as an individual. On some of the questions you would probably expect about the same thing of all teachers regardless of who they are or whether they are men or women. On others there might be a difference between men and women and on still others you might expect something different from the teacher that you know. So please, try to always keep this person in mind as you answer each question.

You may see a few questions where you might think that he <u>should</u> or <u>should not</u> do something quite different from what he might actually do -- please be sure to give us

200

your judgment of what you think he <u>ought</u> to do, putting the number of your answer in the blank before each question.

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not.

These will be repeated at the top of every page. Good luck - hope it won't be too boring for you. If any of the questions seem quite "nosey"--and some will-remember there is no identification of either you or the teacher, it's only a more accurate way of getting at what we expect of <u>all</u> our teachers. INSTRUCTIONS FOR "GENERAL ROLE: EXPECTATIONS" INSTRUMENT

The next section is the main part of this research. We will ask you all sorts of questions about what you expect of men teachers in our junior and senior high schools. In this part, please <u>don't</u> answer with any particular person or teacher in mind, but try to give us your judgment of what you expect of most men teachers. On some of the questions you would probably expect about the same thing of our women teachers; on others there might be a difference between men and women. So please bear in mind that we're always talking about the men classroom teachers of our secondary schools.

You may see a few questions where you might think that men teachers <u>should</u> or <u>should not</u> do something quite different from what they actually do -- please be sure to give us <u>your</u> judgment of what you think they <u>ought</u> to do, putting the number of your answer in the blank before each question.

- Absolutely must
  Preferably should
  May or may not
  Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

These will be repeated at the top of every page. Good luck -- hope it won't be too boring for you.

202

\*Note:

The following pages, 204 to 225, are samples of the instruments used for the expectations relevant to the general and specific roles. There were actually two complete instruments used, one for each conceptualization. In the interests of economy, only the instructions (preceding page) and the first two pages (pages 206 and 210) of the general role instrument are included. With the exceptions of minor changes in the page headings, the subjects of sentences, and occasional modifying pronouns (his - their, etc.), the two instruments were identical.

#### SPECIFIC ROLE EXPECTATIONS

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- 1. Assign considerable homework?
- 2. Help and advise students with their personal problems?
- 3. Be expected to report <u>all</u> major disciplinary problems to his principal?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Personally contact parents if a student cheats repeatedly?
- 5. Should he or should he not teach controversial issues without regard for local values and feelings?
- 6. Accept the responsibility for decisions made by students whom he has appointed to an office?
- 7. Eat lunch with other teachers apart from students?
- 8. Be expected to chaperon class dances, sell tickets, usher, and otherwise work at athletic and other special evening programs?
- 9. Usually attend school board meetings?
  - 10. Give detailed direction and supervision to students' work?
    - \_\_\_\_11. Consult with parents only during school hours?

- \_\_\_\_13. Belong to professional teacher organizations?
- \_\_\_\_14. Wear a political campaign button outside of school?
- \_\_\_\_15. Take the lead in initiating neighborhood improvements?
- 16. Be allowed to smoke in a teachers' lounge?
- \_\_\_\_17. In the case of student-parent arguments over school work, should he usually side with the students?
- \_\_\_\_18. If a youngster's parents did not want him to go to college, and this teacher knew that the student was extremely able, should he try to win over the parents?
- 19. Usually defend the decision of another teacher to students, even though he disagrees with the other teacher's decision?
  - \_\_\_\_20. Use his own judgment in interpreting school rules in specific cases?

## GENERAL ROLE EXPECTATIONS\*

In the following situations, what do you expect of most junior and senior high school men teachers?

Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- 1. Assign considerable homework?
- 2. Help and advise students with their personal problems?
- 3. Be expected to report <u>all</u> major disciplinary problems to their principal?
- 4. Personally contact parents if a student cheats repeatedly?
- 5. Should they or should they not teach controversial issues without regard for local values and feelings?
- 6. Accept the responsibility for decisions made by students whom they have appointed to an office?
- 7. Eat lunch with other teachers apart from students?
- 8. Be expected to chaperon class dances, sell tickets, usher, and otherwise work at athletic and other special evening programs?
- 9. Usually attend school board meetings?
- \_\_\_\_10. Give detailed direction and supervision to students' work?
- 11. Consult with parents only during school hours?

£.	Mave chefi work week rescritted to 40 hours.
13.	Belong to professional teacher organizations?
14.	Wear a political campaign button outside of school?
15.	Take a lead in initiating neighborhood improvements?
16.	Be allowed to smoke in a teachers' lounge?
17.	In the case of student-parent arguments over school work, should the teachers usually side with the student?
18.	If a youngster's parents did not want him to go to college, and teachers knew that he was extremely able, should they try to win over the parents?
19.	Usually defend the decision of another teacher to students, even though they disagree with the other teacher's decision?

\_\_\_\_20. Use their own judgment in interpreting school rules in specific cases?

\*SEE NOTATION PAGE 203.

.

12. Have their work week restricted to 40 hours?

#### SPECIFIC ROLE EXPECTATIONS

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- \_\_\_\_21. Be required to attend and actively participate in P.T.A.?
- \_\_\_\_22. Solicit student contributions to charity drives?
- 23. Should his personal standards of conduct in a classroom be any different from those of other good citizens?
- \_\_\_\_24. Give special attention to poor students' work during class time, even though it slows down class progress?
- 25. Be expected to exchange views on teaching methods with other teachers?
- \_\_\_\_26. Take an active part in a veterans' organization if he were a veteran?
- \_\_\_\_27. Deal with a problem student on the basis of what other teachers have told him?
- \_\_\_28. Supervise student trips to businesses, museums, industries, etc., outside school hours?
- \_29. Invite students to his home?
- \_30. Help an occasional needy student financially?

- \_\_\_31. Should his classroom work be supervised rather closely by his principal?
- \_\_\_\_32. Be any more strict with his own children than other people are with theirs?
- 33. Continue as a teacher if he were divorced?
- \_\_\_\_34. If he had to borrow money to meet current expenses, should he apply for a signature loan from a credit company rather than a bank?
- \_\_\_\_35. Be expected to take an active part in local service clubs such as the Kiwanis, Rotary, Exchange, Lions, etc.?
- 36. Use occasional mild swear words in a classroom?
- \_\_\_\_37. Adjust his teaching methods to conform with those of the other teachers in their school?
- 38. Have coffee breaks?
- \_\_\_\_39. Usually defend a decision of his principal `to parents, even though he disagrees with his decision?
- 40. Be expected to contact parents personally if a student over-emphasizes clubs, sports, or other extra class activities?

### GENERAL ROLE EXPECTATIONS\*

In the following situations, what do you expect of most junior and senior high school men teachers?

Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- \_\_\_\_21. Be required to attend and actively participate in P.T.A.?
- \_\_\_\_22. Solicit student contributions to charity drives?
- 23. Should their personal standards of conduct in a classroom be any different from those of other good citizens?
- \_\_\_\_24. Give special attention to poor students' work during class time, even though it slows down class progress?
- \_\_\_\_25. Be expected to exchange views on teaching methods with other teachers?
- <u>\_\_\_26. Take an active part in a veterans' organization if</u> they are veterans?
- \_27. Deal with a problem student on the basis of what other teachers have told them?
- 28. Supervise student trips to businesses, museums, industries, etc., outside school hours?
- 29. Invite students to their homes?
- 30. Help an occasional needy student financially?

- \_\_\_\_31. Should their classroom work be supervised rather closely by their principal?
- \_\_\_\_32. Be any more strict with their own children than other people are with theirs?
- \_\_\_\_33. Continue as teachers if divorced?
- \_\_\_\_34. If men teachers had to borrow money to meet current expenses, should they apply for a signature loan from a credit company rather than a bank?
- \_\_\_\_35. Be expected to take an active part in local service clubs such as the Kiwanis, Rotary, Exchange, Lions, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_\_36. Use occasional mild swear words in a classroom?
- \_\_\_\_\_37. Adjust their teaching methods to conform with those of the other teachers in their school?
- \_\_\_\_38. Have coffee breaks?
- \_\_\_\_39. Usually defend a decision of their principal to parents, even though they disagree with his decision?
- 40. Be expected to contact parents personally if a student over-emphasizes clubs, sports or other extra class activities?

\*SEE NOTATION PAGE 203.

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- \_\_\_\_41. Have a better education than the average person?
- 42. If something came up that he had to discuss a controversial issue in the classroom, should he support local values and feelings even if the facts contradict them?
- \_\_\_\_43. Step in and try to stop students who are behaving <u>improperly</u> away from the school (rowdyism, necking in public, fighting, swearing, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_44. Step in and try to stop students who are doing something <u>illegal</u> away from school (drinking, driving without a license, vandalism, smoking, etc.)?
- 45. An average high school teacher has about 150 students in his classes. Should he be expected to know every one of them by name?
- 46. Should he take part in a strike for higher salaries?
  - \_\_\_\_47. Be expected to help organize and work on school fund drives?
- \_\_\_\_48. Use class time for organization of and helping on school fund drives?
  - \_\_\_\_49. Attend most of the public evening performances, such as the school band and orchestra concerts, senior plays, graduation exercises, and other special programs?

- \_\_\_\_50. Make suggestions to parents if they do not appear to be dealing with their child properly?
- 51. If he were a teacher who specialized in a class that had vocational application, should he know enough detail about his subject to hold down a job in business or industry (journalism - newspaper work, chemistry lab work, accounting - office, auto shop - garage, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_52. Be permitted to smoke in classrooms after class hours?
- \_\_\_\_53. Should or should not his children be expected to do better work in school than most other youngsters?
- 54. Should his children be better behaved than most other youngsters?
- \_\_\_\_55. Should or should not this teacher go to church regularly?
- 56. Wear a political campaign button in school?
- \_\_\_\_57. Informally endorse one of his friends if the friend were running for a political office?

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- \_\_\_\_58. Live in a house that is somewhat "better than average?"
- 59. Be expected to be somewhat more active in community affairs than the average citizen?
- 60. Take an active part in social fraternal organizations such as the Elks, Moose, Eagles?
- \_\_\_\_61. Be any more widely informed on many subjects than the average person?
- 62. Use language colored with occasional swear words, outside school?
- \_\_\_\_63. Give special attention to brilliant students' work during class time, even though it slows down the class progress?
- 64. Try to maintain firmly disciplined and formal classrooms?
- \_\_\_\_65. Assist with and encourage extra-curricular activities?
- 66. Be permitted to leave the classroom if the students do not require his immediate attention?
- \_\_\_\_67. Usually defend the decision of another teacher to parents, even though he disagrees with the other teacher's decision?

- 68. Talk over the behavior of a problem student with other teachers?
- \_\_\_\_69. Determine for himself what he will teach in a particular course?
- 70. Accept the criticism without protest if unjustly reprimanded or bawled out by his superintendent or principal?
- 71. Personally contact parents (other than by report cards) if a student is likely to fail?
- 72. Have a sense of humor?
- 73. Should or should not his friends consist mainly of other teachers?
- 74. Sit with students if he were to eat in the school cafeteria?
- \_\_\_\_75. Attend most professional meetings and conventions in his area?
- 76. Ever refuse to chaperon class dances, sell tickets, usher or otherwise work at athletic and other special evening programs if he does not wish to work at them?

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

- \_\_\_77. Contact the parents of students whom he has seen behaving <u>improperly</u> away from school (rowdyism, necking in public, fighting, swearing, etc.)?
- 78. Contact the parents of students whom he has seen doing something <u>illegal</u> away from school (drinking, driving without a license, vandalism, smoking, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_79. Carry his lunch to work?
- 80. Be expected to carry out decisions of the administration which he believes to be unsound?
- 81. If parents wanted their child to go to college, and his teacher knew that the student was likely to fail, should he try to dissuade the parents?
- \_\_\_\_82. Should his education have emphasized <u>methods of</u> <u>teaching</u>, (counseling of students, educational philosophy, and psychology - the how-to-do-it of teaching) more than the subject matter which he teaches?
  - \_\_\_\_83. Should he or should he not be expected to remain at work until 5 o'clock?
- \_\_\_\_84. Do you expect him to try to do a better job in bringing up his youngsters than other folks?

- \_\_\_\_85. Should he speak up for the election of particular school board candidates?
- \_\_\_\_86. Know more people on his block than his neighbors do?
- 87. Should his personal standards of conduct outside the school be any different from those of other good citizens?
- \_\_\_\_88. Should he or should he not report another teacher who is violating a school rule?
- 89. Belong to a Country Club, if he can afford it?
- 90. Help a friend running for political office by passing out campaign literature for him?
- \_\_\_\_91. Help this friend by making a public speech endorsing him if he were asked to do so?
- 92. Usually defend a decision of his principal to students, even though this teacher disagrees with the principal's decision?
- 93. Be expected to take an active part in church social groups?
- \_\_\_\_\_94. Be expected to teach a Sunday school class?
- \_\_\_\_95. Have more reading materials in his home than most other people do?

The next set of questions (96-110) deal with what you think this particular teacher that you know should be like. Using the same answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

In your judgment, should he or should he not be -

- \_\_\_\_96. A good public speaker?
- \_\_\_\_\_97. Married (with children)?
- \_\_\_\_\_98. Practical?
- \_\_\_\_\_99. Personally ambitious?
- 100. Single?
- \_\_\_101. Jewish?
- \_\_\_\_102. Educationally "conservative"?
- \_\_\_\_103. Tactful?
- \_\_\_\_104. A firm disciplinarian?
- \_\_105. Protestant?
- \_\_\_\_106. Married (no children)?
- \_\_\_107. Easygoing?
- \_\_\_\_108. Skilled in public relations?
- \_\_\_\_109. Educationally "progressive"?
- \_\_\_110. Catholic?

Now, back to the original routine -- should he or

should he not?

- \_\_\_\_lll. Buy a new Chevrolet, Ford, Plymouth or other low priced car every year if he could afford it and wanted to do so?
- 112. What about a new Cadillac, Lincoln, Imperial, etc., every year if he could afford it and wanted to buy one? (Remember we're not talking about whether he can or can't afford it, but how you would feel about it if he could.)

.

In the following situation, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

Should he or should he not?

- \_\_\_\_113. Should he have a major voice in determining educational policy? (what courses should be required, which elective; 9 months vs. 12 month school year; question of separation of gifted or retarded children into special classes; degree of emphasis on athletics and other extra curricular activities, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_ll4. Take an active part in secret fraternal organizations such as the Masons, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, Oddfellows, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_115. If his income as a teacher is not enough to meet his basic family expenses and he wished to work at other jobs evenings or Saturdays, do you think he should or should not do so?
  - \_\_ll6. What about his taking other jobs during the summer if he needs the money and wishes to work?

Even if you perhaps do not agree with teachers' taking extra jobs, if this teacher did so, how would you feel about his taking the following types of jobs? Should he or should he not accept a job as a -

- \_\_ll7. Factory worker?
- 118. Department store clerk?

\_\_\_119. Bartender?

- \_\_\_120. Real estate, insurance or car salesman?
- 121. Office worker?
- 122. Counselor at a boys' camp?
- 123. Nightwatchman or plant protection?
- 124. Magazine, book, or encyclopedia salesman?
- 125. Gas station attendant?

- - - - - - - - - - - -

- \_\_\_\_126. Now, should he or should he not avoid discussion of controversial issues in the classroom if the facts do not support local values and feelings?
- 127. Ever smoke in front of students?
- 128. In the case of student-parent arguments about school work, should this teacher usually side with the parents?

In the following situation, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school man teacher that you know? Using these answers

Absolutely must
 Preferably should
 May or may not
 Preferably should not
 Absolutely must not

- 129. Should he buy household appliances on easy-payment plans if he wishes to?
- \_\_\_\_130. Be any more intelligent than the average citizen?
- \_\_\_\_131. Belong to a union such as the American Federation of Teachers?
- 132. Be selected for the lay administration of his church; committees, vestry, elders, service groups, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_133. Work with and help his own children educationally more than other people do?
- \_\_\_134. Be expected to take an active part in various charitable drives and organizations outside the school?
- \_\_\_\_135. Try to keep his house and grounds in any better repair and condition than others in his neighborhood?
- \_\_\_\_136. Wear shorts when others do golfing, gardening, on picnics, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_137. Should or should not his friends consist mainly of people outside the teaching profession?

- \_\_\_\_138. If a student has social problems dating, getting along with other students, running around with the "wrong" group, etc., - should this teacher call this to the parents' attention?
- 139. Should he be selected to take part in neighborhood improvement activities (rezoning, curbs, paving, sidewalks, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_140. Be any more conscientious about paying his debts on time than other people are?
- \_\_\_\_141. Be any more courteous to people than other folks are?
- \_\_\_\_142. Be expected to help with Boy Scouts, YMCA, or similar youth organizations?
- \_\_\_\_143. Have charge accounts in local stores, if he wished to do so?
- \_\_\_\_144. Spend summers at further study to keep up to date and to improve his education?
- \_\_\_\_145. Use language that is "better" than average?
- \_\_\_\_146. Speak against the election of particular school board candidates?
- \_\_\_\_147. Should this teacher smoke in public?
- \_\_\_\_148. Should his own education have emphasized the specialized subject matter which he teaches --- more than methods of teaching?

In the following situations, what do you expect of this particular junior or senior high school teacher that you know? Using these answers

- 1. Absolutely must
- 2. Preferably should
- 3. May or may not
- 4. Preferably should not
- 5. Absolutely must not

If this particular teacher that you happen to know spent extra time on the following activities, do you feel that he should or should not receive additional pay for them?

- 149. Coaching?
- \_\_\_\_150. Teaching in night-school?
- 151. Directing school plays?
- \_\_\_\_152. Working at athletic events?
- \_\_\_\_153. Working at evening programs, concerts, plays, etc.?
- 154. Directing the year-book or school paper?
- \_\_\_\_155. Supervising trips to museums, industries, businesses, libraries, etc.?
- \_\_\_\_156. Attending P.T.A. meetings?
- \_\_\_\_157. Chaperoning school dances?

Should he or should he not receive expenses for (158-160)

- 158. Attending professional conferences?
- 159. Continued study in evening classes?

\_\_\_\_160. Continued study during the summer?

Now, back to the original routine again to finish up. Should he or should he not

- 161. Drink an occasional bottle of beer in his home?
- \_\_\_\_162. What about at a bar or nightclub?
- \_\_\_163. Drink an occasional cocktail or highball in his
  home?
- \_\_\_\_164. What about at a bar or nightclub?
- \_\_\_\_165. Be any more conscientious about his civic responsibilities than other good citizens?
- \_\_\_\_166. If he were offered a nomination for a part-time political office, should he or should he not accept?

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURES FOR SCALING SOCIAL DISTANCE

.

### APPENDIX C

## PROCEDURES FOR SCALING SOCIAL DISTANCE

I. Construction of Social Distance Scale

Following the procedure indicated for the selection of subjects in Chapter III, arbitrarily weighted scores were assigned and the respondents ranked. Occasional subjects in each of the three contributing groups had no answer responses. Since at this point it was not known whether the omitted items would scale or not, the respondents were not dropped until this became evident. They were not replaced since only three subjects, one in each group, had omitted a scalar item. The subsequent table, therefore, adds to an "n" of 125 rather than the initial 128.

The first trial necessitated the combining of some categories to bring the response proportions inside the recommended 20% - 80% marginals. It was also evident that female respondents were not scalable on questionnaire items seven and eight; the items were therefore dropped. By the fourth trial, all items had been dichotomized, sixteen were remaining, and the reproducibility of the scale had reached

227

86%. At this point, the investigator reordered respondents within scale scores in order to eventually attain an acceptable reproducibility. On the twelfth trial, including two reinsertions, a set of questions was abstracted which fulfilled the following requirements<sup>1</sup> for a Guttman scale.

"l. <u>Number of Answer Categories</u>. (italicized) For dichotomous items, at least ten items should be used."<sup>2</sup> Eleven dichotomous items were scalable.

"2. <u>Range of Marginal Frequencies</u>. (italicized) . . . Few, if any, items should have more than 80 per cent of the subjects in their most popular category."<sup>3</sup> The last two lines of the following table indicate the maximum marginal distribution is found in scale item eleven which has a 78% -22% distribution.

"3. <u>The Pattern of Errors</u>. (italicized) . . . no large number of subjects should be found who all have the same nonscale pattern of responses."<sup>4</sup> This was not evident in the cumulative scalogram, nor was it evident for the three

<sup>1</sup>Warren S. Torgerson, <u>Theory and Methods of Scaling</u> (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 317-24.

<sup>2</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 324. <sup>3</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>. <sup>4</sup><u>Loc. cit</u>.
contributing segments. This latter statement will be validated later.

"4. Item Reproducibility. (italicized). The individual items should all have reproducibilities of 0.85 or more."<sup>5</sup> The lowest is scale item number nine with a Rep. of 0.87.

"5. Improvement. (italicized). Each item category should have more non error than error."<sup>6</sup> All items met this requirement.

And finally, using .90 as an acceptance level for the coefficient of reproducibility, the scalar items satisfied the requirements for a Guttman scalar measure of that universe of content which had been defined as social distance.

<sup>5</sup>Loc. cit. 6 Loc. cit.

Scale Item No.	Questionnaire Item No.	Errors	Non-errors	Item Rep.	Fav. Resp.	Unfav. Resp.	% Fav.	% Unfav.
1	9	15	110	.88	40	85	32	68
2	6	11	114	.91	40	85	32	68
3	4	14	111	.89	54	71	43	57
4	20	11	114	.91	53	72	42	58
5	19	13	112	.90	66	59	53	47
6	13	7	118	.94	69	56	55	45
7	14	7	118	.94	76	49	61	39
8	16	9	116	.93	81	44	65	35
9	18	16	109	.87	78	47	62	38
10	15	8	117	.93	92	33	74	26
11	11	13	112	.90	97	28	78	22

Table C-1. Analysis of item responses on cumulated social distance scale.

Total errors = 124

Total possible correct responses = 1375

$$\text{REP} = 1 - \frac{124}{125 \times 11} = 91.0\%$$

## II. Verification of Social Distance Scale

Since a somewhat unusual technique had been used for scale construction, i.e., the attempt to place three measures-social distance to three different social objects--all on the same scalar base, an error analysis was carried out for <u>each</u> of the three "sub-scales" in order to locate any possible concentration of error.

One of the problems encountered in measuring situational social distance is that of the sex difference. In order to minimize this, items were included which asked female respondents for evaluations of how they would react to their husband's taking part in the described situations. See questionnaire item numbers 8, 11, 12, 19, and 20 on the three social distance instruments in Appendix B. It was, of course, unknown as to how this would affect scaling procedures, and therefore respondents were posted on the original scalograms with two colors denoting sex. Since two items had to be dropped as non-scalable across the sex variable (questionnaire numbers seven and eight) an analysis was made for the contributory error of sex in the This is reported by the first four lines of final scales. Appendix Table C-2. It is evident that no items were defective, i.e., reproducibility below .85, for either sex.

Another problem incurred by such a combined scalar analysis was whether total error might have been concentrated in one of the sub-scales. Each of the three sub-scales was therefore analyzed for error as also tabulated in Appendix Table C-2. Again, it is evident that no items were defective, i.e., reproducibility below .85, for any of the three scales.

III. Validation of Social Distance Scale

A question which had to be answered was whether the abstracted scale was actually measuring a universe of content related to friendship, intimacy, liking, etc. Since one scale purportedly measured distance to a "good friend," subjects would probably evaluate these "good friends" as less distant than they would either the teacher whom they knew or teachers as a group. A null hypothesis testable by scaling data could be based on this previous statement.

## Hypothesis

For the subject sample, there is no significant difference between the social distances from counter incumbents (1) to their good friends, (2) to focal incumbents (the male secondary school teachers that they knew), and (3) to focal positions (most male secondary school teachers).

							Social	l Dist	tance		_
						Co	unter	Incur	mbent	to	
Scale Item No.	Ma Err.	le <b>s</b> Rep.	Fema Err.	ale <b>s</b> Rep.	Goo Frie Err.	od end <b>s</b> Rep.	Foo Incur Err.	cal mbent Rep.	Foca Posit Err.	al tion Rep.	Errors
					1.0				~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		
T	ΤT	.93	17	.89	19	•88	6	. 92	٢	•96	28
2	14	.91	18	.89	19	.88	6	. 92	7	.91	32
3	14	.91	19	.88	17	.93	7	.91	9	.88	33
4	18	.88	6	.96	14	.91	4	.95	6	.92	24
5	13	.92	15	.91	15	.91	8	.90	5	.94	28
6	8	.95	7	.96	9	.94	2	.98	4	.95	15
7	9	.94	8	•95	8	.95	5	.93	4	.95	17
8	21	.87	10	.94	12	.92	8	.90	11	.86	31
9	22	.86	18	.89	18	.88	11	.86	11	.86	40
10	8	•95	9	.94	7	•96	4	.95	6	.92	17
11	9	.94	_16	.90	<u>12</u>	. 92	8	.90	5	. 94	_25
Total Er-											
rors	147		143		150		69		71		290
"n" (78 Total Possi)	156 3 Resp ole	p.) (	160 80 Re:	sp.)	158		77		78		313
rect	1716		1760		1738		847		858		3443
Rep. 9	6 9:	1.4	9	1.9	93	1.4	9:	1.8	93	1.7	
	Ove	rall	repro	ducik	oility	for	all so	cale <b>s</b>	: 91	.6%	

Table C-2. Error analysis of social distance scales.

To test this hypothesis the data of Appendix Table C-3 were halved on the empirical median for all three scales. This cutting point occurred between scale scores five and six. Those respondents scoring from one to five were categorized as having a low social distance to the defined other, those from six to twelve as high. This cumulation is shown in Appendix Table C-4.

Table C-3.	Analysis	of	scores	on	the	separate	distance	scales.

	Numbers From C	of Responden Social Distan Counter Incumb	its Having ice pent to:
Scale Score	Good Friend	Focal Incumbent	Focal Position
1	32	10	9
2	19	5	2
3	16	6	7
4	19	5	3
5	12	5	5
6	17	11	10
7	3	4	1
8	23	7	7
9	3	0	3
10	5	9	2
11	6	9	11
12	6	6	18
Totals:	161	77	78

	Number <b>s</b> From	of Respond Social Dist Counter Inc	ent <b>s</b> Havin ance umbent to:	a 
Scale Score	Good Friend	Focal Incumbent	Focal Position	Totals
1-5 (low distance)	98	31	24	155
6-12 (high distance) Totals:	<u>63</u> 161	<u>46</u> 77	<u>52</u> 78	<u>161</u> 316
x <sup>2</sup> =	13.9 p	< .001		

Table C-4. High and low scores on the separate social distance scales.

The data in Appendix Table C-4 demonstrates that the null hypothesis of difference may be rejected. Examination shows that respondents are more likely to perceive their friends at a lesser social distance than they are either focal incumbents or the focal position. It therefore seemed reasonable to accept the validity of the social distance instruments in their scalar form.

		Number of	f Respondents or	
	Specific	Role	and <u>General</u>	Role
Difference Score* for	Focal Incumbent	Focal Position	Focal or Incumbent	Focal Position
8				
7	1			1
6	0		1	1
5	1	1		
4	0		1	1
3	1		1	
2	2		2	
1	3	3	3	3
0	14	12	9	9
-1	3	5	2	2
-2	5	3	1	4
-3	0	2	2	4
-4	2	2	3	4
-5	2	4	5	1
-6	2	1		
-7	0	1		
-8	2	2	2	1
-9	2	5	1	1
-10			1	2
-11	1	1	1	1

Table C-5. Complete and accumulated distributions of respondent's social distance difference scores.

\*The "Difference Score" is the difference between a respondent's scalar social distance to a "Good Friend" less his scalar social distance to a focal incumbent of the focal position, whichever the case may be. (see pp. 73-74 of text).

APPENDIX D

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF EXPECTATION DATA

• н Н 2 ,

- Ayu

n pue	stio arti( ot?"	n for Specific Role: "In cular junior or senior hig	the fo h scho	vilow m lo	ing an te	situa eache	tions, r that	wha t you	t do kno	you e v? Sh	xpect ould h	of this e or sh	t tould he
a a	stion nd se	n for General Role: "In t enior high school men teac	he fol hers?	i lowi Shoi	ng s: uld (	ituat. they	ions, or sh	what ould	do 1 they	/ou ex not?"	pect o	f most	junior
			PRIMAH (A. S	ry EX Stude:	PECTN nt Se	ATION	S (						
	No.	S Item	<b>ample</b> S(84) G(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMM	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	<b>8</b> 2	Γ & Prob.	١X	t & Prob.
н	27	Deal with a problem student on the basis of what other teachers	່	00	ഗ	14	39 ני	25 20		.719	1.34	4.01	.083
2	Ч	Assign considerable homework?	າ ທີ່	ר אר	32 4	10 37 35	- 6 r		- 0 -	.607 532	1.14 ns	<b>4.</b> 00 2.58	800. 2000.
m	10	Give detailed directions and supervision to stu- dents' work?	ט מ ט	38 31	37 39	96		00	- N -	.457	1.02 ns	1.63	.782
4	64	Try to maintain firmly disciplined and formal classrooms?	ა ი	29 20	42 41	8 12	2 5	Ч 2	-10	.750 .779	1.04 ns	1.87 2.06	1.434 .20
ъ	104	Be a firm disciplinarian?	ი ი	28 15	39 51	13 10	7 7	00	ч	.536 .428	1.25 ns	1.84 1.99	1.333 .20

•

Response distributions on expectations stated for general and specific roles.

Table D-1.

1													
	No.	S Item	ample S(84) G(79)	AM	PS PS	3 °	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 N <b>A</b>	8 S	F & Prob.	• ×	t & Prob.
Q	66	Be permitted to leave the classroom if the students do not require their immediate atten- tion?	აი	0 m	2 <b>4</b> 16	35 28	24 29	0 m	0	.585 .858	1.47* .05	3.00 3.17	1.233
7	17	In the case of student- parent arguments over school work, should the teachers usually side with the students?	ა ი	00	m 00	63 50	14	<b>4</b> M	ч о	.346 .443	1.28 ns	3.23 3.19	.345 ns
ω	24	Give special attention to poor students' work durin class time, even though i slows down class progress	י לים הארים	44	21 14	15 17	38 37	юю		1.106 1.061	1.04 ns	3.23 3.35	.712 .50
σ	63	Give special attention to brilliant students' work during class time, even though it slows down class progress?	ບ <b>ນ</b>	0 1	ro 4	20	45 54	12 13	0 0	.593 .573	1.03 ns	3.78 3.94	1.304
0	36	Use occasional mild swear words in a classroom?	ບັນ	<b>ч 0</b>	0 4	மம	27 23	50 47	н н	.522 .768	1.47*	4.51 4.44	.551 ns

PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

able D-1.

	No.	Sai S Item G	mple (84) (79)	AM L	P 2	e MMM	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	ره م م	F & Prob.	ı ×	t & Prob.
		(B.	oth	er T	eache	er Se	ctor)						
ч	25	Be expected to exchange views on teaching											
		methods with other teachere.	ט ע	19	46	17	-1 -	00		.488	1.02	2.00	.346
8	37	Adjust their teaching methods to conform with	)	) 1		) 1	1	>	1				
		those of the other teachers in their school?	იი	M M	28 11	34 24	13 32	ώ	ч ч	.911 .970	1.06 ns	2.88 3.40	3.393*** .001
m	68	Talk over the behavior of a problem student with	ß	Ч	46	26	6	Ч	Ч	.567	1.12	2.55	.851
		other teachers?	ტ	n	44	25	7	0	0	.508	su	2.46	.40
4	19	Usually defend the decision of another teacher to students, even though they disagree with the other teacher's decision?	ט ט ב	5 11	32 28	21 24	22 14	4 1	п 0	1.064 .977	1.09 ns	<b>2</b> .86 2.56	1.843 .10
ы	67	Usually defend the decision of another teacher to parents, even though they	с с										
		disagree with the other teacher's decision?	ა ა	~ ~	22	30	22	94	2 0	.928 938	1.01 76	3.10	.000
		INCTOTION & TONIOUS	כ	4	2	2	2	r	>		011	シュ・フ	D11

able D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

	No.	Sam S(S S(S Item G()	ole 34) 79)	AM	PS 2	NMM	4 PSN	5 SMN	6 NS	8 N	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.	
		(c. )	Admin	listr	rativ	e Sec	ctor)							
н	31	Should their classroom work be supervised rather closely by their principal?	იი	<b>4</b> M	26 24	22	24 25	70	Г 7	111.1 .908	1.22 ns	3.02 2.97	.314 ns	
2	Μ	Be expected to report <u>all</u> major disciplinary problems to their principal?	იი	27 27	30 23	21 13	1 2 13	<b>7</b> 7	ч о	.920 1.375	1.49* .05	2.08 2.23	.875 .40	
m	80	Be expected to carry our decisions of the adminis- tration which they believe to be unsound?	აი	6 1	31 24	16 2 <b>4</b>	21 22	ю м	мО	1.278 1.041	1.23 ns	<b>2.</b> 85 <b>2.</b> 90	.276 ns	
4	92	Usually defend a decision of their principal to students, even though they disagree with his decision?	აი	00	45 42	19 17	10	<b>7</b> P	<b>6</b> 0	.725 .813	1.12 ns	2.45 2.36	.581 ns	
S	39	Usually defend a decision of their principal to parents, even though they disagree with his decision?	ი ი	0 0	37 27	20	13 12	άr	0 0	1.015 1.293	1.27 ns	2.56 2.75	1.128 .30	
9	69	Determine for themselves what they will teach in a particular course?	აი	04	30 16	18 17	31 35	мю	Ч 2	.894 1.094	1.22 ns	3.09 3.30	1.334 .20	

Pable D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

Table D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

	a no.	Sa S S S S S S	umple ;(84) ;(79)	AM AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	0, N	F & Prob.	١X	t & Prob.
	13	Should they have a major voice in determining educational policy? (what courses should be required, which elective; 9 mo. vs. 12 mo. school year; question of separ- ation of gifted or retarded children into special classes; degree of emphasis on athletics											
		and other extra curricu- lar activities, etc.)	n n	10	<b>4</b> 2 <b>4</b> 6	12 8	16 8	- 0	ωO	.976 .723	1.35 ns	2.46 2.09	2.529 <b>*</b> .02
			D.	Par	ent	Secto	۲.						
Ч	11	Consult with parents <u>only</u> <u>during</u> school hours?	ი ი		1 <b>4</b> 19	36 30	27 22	99	0 1	.845 .951	1.13 ns	3.21 3.10	.746 .50
2	71	Personally contact parents (other than by report cards) if a student is likely to fail?	ა ი ი	26 2 <b>4</b>	<b>4</b> 3 <b>4</b> 2	11 12	Ч 2	Ч 0	0 ר	.649 .496	1.31 ns	1.90 1.87	.261 ns
m	4	Personally contact parents if a student cheats repeatedly?	ט ט 	54 46	21 27	<u>ر</u> ، ح	0 0	00	0 1	. 566 . 382	1.48* .05	1.49 1.47	.130 ns

				- 5]								
Q No.	Item	<b>Sample</b> S(84) G(79)	AM	PS PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	œ ۲	F & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
4 128	In the case of student- parent arguments about school work, should the teachers usually side with the parents?	ັ ທ ບ	чо	14 11	59 61	10	- 0	<i>N</i> O	.336	2.09* .01	*2.98 2.90	1.025 .40
	(E.	Indeter	mina	te O	ther	Secto	<b>(</b> ,					
1 102	<b>Be educationally</b> "conservative?"	<b>ო</b> ი	5 4	18 20	35 36	22 17	0 0	4 M	.753 .653	1.15 ns	2.93 2.99	.454 ns
2 109	Be educationally "progressive"?	ሪ ቢ	15 9	43 44	19 19	с <b>4</b>	00	<b>4</b> M	.566	1.07 ns	2.13 2.24	.639 ns
3 82 4 148	Should there education have emphasized <u>methods</u> of teaching (counseling of students, education- al philosophy, and psychology, the how-to- do-it of teaching) more than the subject matter which they teach? Should their own edu- cation have emphasized the specialized subject matter which they teach	ა ი ს	Ϋ́Υ	22 18	20	31	1 2		L.246 L.127	l.ll ns	3.27 3.17	.570 ns
	more than methods of teaching?	ሪ ር	11	43 41	13 21	15 9	00	ч ч	.883 .661	1.3 <b>4</b> ns	2.39 2.41	.144 ns

able D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued

	No.	Sa S Item	amp1e 5 (84) 5 (79)	1 AM	PS PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	N N	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.
ъ	Ŋ	Should they or should they not teach contro- versial issues without regard for local values and feelings?	ოთ	N M	17 13	14 18	34 33	16 9	че	1.202 1.073	1.12 ns	3.54 3.42	.714 .50
Q	42	If something comes up that they have to discuss a controversial issue in the classroom, should they support local values and feelings even if the facts contra- dict them?	ი თ	м O	12 9	24 10	28 41	13 19	4 0	1.111 .821	1.35 ns	3.45 3.89	2.796** .01
2	126	Now, should they or should they not avoid discussion of controversial issues in the classroom if the facts do not support local values and feelings?	ი ი ი ი ი ი	M N	24 19	23 17	30 30	4 7	чы	.937 1.123	1.20 ns	3.12 3.25	.809

Table D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

able D-1. PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

	O.No.	S Item	ample S(84) G(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	s 2	F & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
ω	51	Should those teachers who specialize in classes that have vocational applica- tion know enough detail about their subject to hold down a job in busi- ness or industry (journalism - newspaper work, chemistry - lab work, accounting - office, auto shop - office, etc.)?	ა ი	30 27	40 35	10 16	н <i>ю</i>	00	0 0	554 590	1.06 ns	1.81 1.89	. 50
σ	48	Use class time for or- ganization of and helping on school fund drives?	0 U	о н	ഗവ	19 14	46 44	13 15	0 1	.596	1.21 ns	3.81 3.85	.322 ns
0	20	Use their own judgment in interpreting school rules in specific cases?	ა ი	8 10	38 34	15 15	19 14	4 v	Р О	1.160 1.253	1.08 ns	2.67 2.62	.371 ns

able D-1. II. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS

(A. Student Sector)

	о. No.	Sa S Item	umple 5(84) 5(79)	1 AM	P 2	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	w ∽	F & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
-	43	Step in and try to stop students who are behaving <u>improperly</u> away from the school (rowydism, necking in public, fighting, swearing, etc.)?	ს თ	13 10	29 38	19 25	17	μũ		1.324 .694	1.91* .01	*2.66 2.35	1.964 <b>*</b> .05
2	44	Step in and try to stop studetns who are doing something <u>illegal</u> away from school (drinking, driving without a license, vandalism, smoking, etc.)?	ი ა ა	18 16	33 34	14 18	13 10	L C	- 0	1.372 .963	1.42 ns	2.45 2.32	0.767 .50
m	2	Help and advise students with their personal problems?	ი ი	12 9	41 32	25 33	Ω <b>4</b>	0 1	0 4	.699 .583	1.20 ns	2.31 2.41	.793 .50
4	65	Assist with and en- courage extra- curricular activities?	აი	С <b>4</b>	44 41	30 32	н н	ЧО	0 0	.412 .451	1.09 ns	2.31 2.42	1.091 .30
ŝ	Q	Accept the responsibility for decisions made by students whom they have appointed to an office?	ი ი	15 8	34 42	22 20	ωm	4 0	4 1	1.100 .680	1.62* .05	2.42 2.32	.675 .50

PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued. II 10 3-1.

;

	Q No.	Sa S Item	mple (84) (79)	AM	¢ PS	MMN	PSN	AMN	NA	ω	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.
9	28	Supervise student trips to businesses, museums, industries, etc., out- side school hours?	ი ი	0 0	21 16	49 49	10 1	г 7		.540 .483	1.12 ns	2.86 2.90	.371 ns
7	74	Sit with students if they eat in a school cafeteria?	იი	00	4 M	54 54	25 21	п 0	ч о	.289 .295	1.02 ns	3.25 3.25	o. su
ω	29	Invite students to their home?	ር እ	00	Р 6	55 44	19 23	0 0		.377 .465	1.23 ns	3.19 3.23	.78 .50
<b>6</b>	30	Help an occasional needy student financially?	ሪ ወ	- 0	44	59 48	17 16	2 10		.370.608	1.64* .05	3.18 3.41	2.265* .05
0	72	Have a sense of humor?	იი	38 36	41 42	нм	0	00	0 ח	.389 .276	1.41 ns	1.60 1.56	.495 ns
r-4	45	An average high school teacher has about 150 students in his classes. Should they be expected to know every one of them by name?	ი თ	18 10	5 48	14 14	4 v	л <sup>0</sup>	0 ר	.512	1.48* .05	1.98 2.25	2.697** .01
2	22	Solicit student contri- butions to charity drives?	ი ი	00	രഗ	35 27	33 34	6 12	н 5 *	.596 .661	1.11 ns	3.45 3.68	1.819 .10
т	127	Ever smoke in front of students?	ი ი			36 39	30 25	16 12	о ч	.693 .660	1.05 ns	3.70 3.59	.866 .40

able 3-1. II PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

	t &
	2 F &
	4 5 6
ontinued.	1 2 3
DECTATIONS <u>C</u> C	Sample S(84)
PERIPHERAL EXF	
<b>JIE D-1</b> .	0

			1										
	o. No.	Sa S Item G	mple (84) ;(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	ي م	F & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
		(B.	oth	er T	each	er Se	ctor)						
Ч	13	Belong to profes- sional teacher organizations?	ი ი	8 12	36 32	36 33	ч	ч 0	0 1	.587 .548	1.07 ns	2.44 2.30	1.223 .30
2	75	Attend most professional meetings and conventions in their area?	ი ი	0 0	18 23	58 51	ΝN	н н	0 0	.36 <b>4</b> .388	1.07 ns	2.79 2.71	.869 .40
m	7	Eat lunch with other teachers apart from students?	ი ი	യഗ	31 34	36 36	4 0	н	1 0	.755	1.47* .05	2.56 2.49	.585 n <b>s</b>
4	73	Should or should not their friends consist mainly of other teachers?	ი ი	00	ЧЧ	53	24 14	7 2	- 0	.389	1.11 ns	3.40 3.34	.556 ns
ц	88	Should they or should they not report another teacher who is violating a school rule?	იი	7 19	20 22	39 30	19 16	04	0 0	.679 1.028	1.51* .05	2.99 2.85	.953 .40
9	131	Belong to a union such as the American Federation of Teachers?	ი ი	4 0	11 9	61 56	5 10	7 7	0 0	.423	1.21 ns	2.85 3.07	2.133* .05

able D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

Ś Ļ Ś ы 2 Ś ſ 7 ſ ¢ Sample

1 -

ble D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

	. OZ	Sar Sar Item G	nple (84) (79)	AM	PS PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	<b>N</b> 6	8 7	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.
		°)	Adn	inia	strat	ive	Secto	г)					
Ч	6	Usually attend school board meetings?	ი ი	15 9	31 35	25 25	<b>1</b> 3	0 0	0 1	.923 .823	1.12 ns	2.43 2.46	.224 ns
2	85	Should they speak up for the election of particular school board candidates?	ა ი	S O	13 23	32 28	23	6 9	0 0	1.088 .865	1.26 ns	3.22 3.14	.519 ns
3 I'	46	Speak up against the election of particular school board candidates?	აი	4 4	13 11	39 45	22 17	なな	Р 7	.815 .599	1.36 ns	3.11 3.15	.331 ns
4	70	Accept the criticism with- out protest if unjustly reprimanded or bawled out by their superintendent or principal?	ი ი		13 5	21 14	27 44	20 15	0 0	1.123 .721	1.55 <b>*</b> .05	3.63 3.85	1.416 .20
		If typical men classroom teachers spent extra time on the following activities do you feel that they shoul not receive additional pay for them?	s, Id or	shou	uld								
5 1,	49	Coach ing?	იი	16 17	43 46	10 8	12 4	0 1	ოო	.888 .665	1.34 ns	2.22 2.03	1.39 .20

Table D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--<u>Continued</u>.

t & гл Сv 2 S ſ 7 ç ble D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued. ¢ , Sample 1

, ) -

No.	San San S( Item G(	iple 84) 79)	L AM	PS PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	s 2	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.
6 150	Teaching in night-school?	იი	30 31	47 43	40	00	00	ო ო	.320	1.10 ns	1.68 1.62	.690
7 152	Working at athletic events?	აი	10 9	32 27	19 30	18 7	N N	ოო	1.086 .913	1.19 ns	2.63 2.58	.319 ns
8 153	Working at evening programs, concerts, plays, etc.?	ი ი	8	21 24	25 34	23 8	4 M	ოო	1.145 .859	1.33 ns	2.93 2.68	1.307 .20
9 151	Directing school plays?	ი ი	ထထ	20 23	26 29	25 14	N N	ოო	1.055 .949	l.ll ns	2.91 2.72	1.187 .30
10 154	Directing the yearbook or school papers?	ი ი	99	11 17	23 30	3 <b>4</b> 20	3 7	ოო	1.116 .972	1.15 ns	3.31 2.96	2.130* .05
LI 155	Supervising trips to museums, industries, businesses, libraries, etc.?	აი	て 4	13	21 36	33 22	C 4	ო ო	1.213 .828	1.46 ns	3.25 3.16	.553 ns
157	Chaperoning school dances?	ი ი	бо	იფ	13 21	40 33	14 8	ოო	1.191 1.056	1.13 ns	3.61 3.40	1.239 .30
13 156	Attending P.T.A. meetings?	ი ი	4 1	0 N	9 11	41 41	25 20	ოო	.975 .693	1.41 ns	<b>4.00</b> <b>4.00</b>	0 ns
	Should they or should they not receive expenses for:											
14 158	Attending professional conferences?	იი	9 10	35 35	17 15	19 10	0 17	м <b>м</b>	1.074 1.263	1.18 ns	<b>2</b> .63 2.57	.396 ns

Table D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

			لد لا
			دى 1.
			2
ş -			9
			Ś
			4
			3
		ntinu	1 2
		s <u>Co</u> p1e	( <i>T</i> د
		ATION	3/5
		EXPECT	
		ERAL	
		PERIPH	
		able L	c

Table I	D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIC	0 SNG	onti	nued								
No.	S Item	sample S(84) G(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMM	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	8 <sup>(7)</sup>	F & Prob.	×	t & Prob.
15 159	Continued Study in evening classes?	აი	6 ம	16 26	16 11	35 25	96	2 3	1.344 1.417	1.05 ns	3.16 3.09	.358 ns
16 160	Continued study during the summer?	ი ი	5 7	15 23	18 11	35 30	~ ~	2 M	1.248 1.325	1.06 ns	3.24 3.15	.548 ns
		(D.	Pare	nt S	ector	~						
1 21	Be required to attend and actively partici- pate in P.T.A.?	ი ი	21 14	34 47	18 11	0 0	- 0	н 2	.949 .622	1.53* .05	2.20 2.12	.572 ns
2 138	If a student has social problem - dating, getting along with other students running around with the "wrong" group, etc., - should his teachers call this to the parents'	ນ ແ	ب 11	36	22	12		~ ~	.894 381	2.35 <del>*</del> 01	*2.46	1.949 10
3 50	Make suggestions to parents if they do not apprear to be dealing with their child properly	6 S	8 2	38 37	<b>58</b> <b>58</b>	1 27	0 M O	0 10	. 796	1.31 ns	2.48 2.44	.249 ns

\$ · + 4 ( ) RXPECTATIONS DERTPHERAT. 5 2

Ĺ	ð
	μ
	ð
1	G.
	<i>a</i>
	ſ
	N
	3
	c
	-
le	;
ġ	è
Sa	C
-	

PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued. ble D-l.

, i 1-

	a No.	Sa S Item	umple (84) ;(79)	AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 N <b>A</b>	ື້	F & Prob.	×	t & Prob.
4	77	Contact the parents of students whom they have seen behaving <u>improperly</u> away from school (rowdy- ism, necking in public, fighting, swearing, etc.)?	ບັນ	18 9	0 0 8 8	21 20	12 9	7 F	0 0	1.049 .865	1.21 ns	2.37 2.44	.499 n <b>s</b>
Ś	78	Contact the parents of students whom they have seen doing something <u>illegal</u> away from school (drinking, driving with- out a license, vandalism, smoking, etc.)?	ບັນ	18 15	33 45	17 11	12 5	0 M	0 0	1.094 .900	1.22 ns	2.35 2.19	1.041 .30
Q	18	If a youngster's parents did not want him to go to college, and teachers knew that he was extremely able should they try to win ove the parents?	S S L	<b>5</b> <b>5</b> <b>5</b>	55 47	ט ט	0 0	00	ч о	.398	1.14 ns	1.85 1.83	.117 ns
7	81	If parents wanted their child to go to college, and teachers knew that the student was likely to fail, should they try to dissuade the parents?	ი ი	4 4	36 30	25 31	1 <b>3</b> 15	א ט	- 0	1.034 .704	1.47* .05	2.51 2.84	2.257* .05

Table D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

		s C
		고대
		1 X
		a do
		P L
		~ _
1.	ľ	~
		9 4
		ž
		z
		AM 5
		_
		4 NS
		-
		м М
	÷	¥
	on	2 5
	T	Ч
	uo	T W
	Ŭ	~
	-	9 () 9 ()
	SNC	1 (8)
	Ĭ	3 0 0
	TA:	
	EC	
	XP	
	EI	
	<b>ZA</b> I	
	IEI	
	Π	
	'ER	
	4	
	. 1	
	9	N.
	Q.	
	ldr	0

ľat	le I	⊢1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS	<u>,</u>	ontir	nued.									
	an No.	Sam S( Item G(	nple 84) 79)	AM AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 N <b>A</b>	s 2	F & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.	
ω	40	Be expected to contact pare personally if a student over-emphasizes clubs, spor or other extra class activities?	ents its, G	11 6	45 41	25 24	6 Н	00	N N	.456	1.22 ns	2.20 2.39	1.73 .10	
		(E. In	Idetei	mina	ate C	ther	Secto	r)						
н	49	Attend most of the public e performances, such as the s band and orchestra concerts senior plays, graduation exercises, and other special programs?	school school s s G	۲.۵ ۲.۵	34 30	44 44	m 4	00	- 0	.368 .360	1.02 ns	2.58 2.65	.706	
2	ω	Be expected to chaperon cla dances, sell tickets, usher and otherwise work at athle and special evening programs?	G G G G G	10	29 24	36 36	14 11	0 0	<b>ч</b> н	.832	1.10 ns	2.58 2.76	1.265 .30	
m	76	Ever refuse to chaperon cla sell tickets, usher or othe work at athletic and other evening programs if they do not wish to work at them?	ISS da Prwise Speci G	ances 2 4	s, 12 16	43 38	25 19	2 H	- 0	.580	1.36 ns	3.13 2.99	1.138 .30	
4	47	Be expected to help organiz and work on school fund drives?	e S S S	г и	26 25	36 30	16 17	2 10	ч л	.701 .857	1.22 ns	2.88 3.00	.875 .40	

ple D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

, ·

			21			•_								
	ano.	San S( S( Item	mple (84) (79)	AM	2 PS	e MMM	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	° v	F. & Prob.	×ı	t & Prob.	11
5 ]	44	Spend summers at further study to keep up to date and to improve their education?	აი	40	44 45	34 31	0 רי	00	н н	.362 .288	1.26 ns	2.39 2.37	.155 ns	1
6 ]	.03	Be tactful?	ი ი	32 22	<b>4</b> 3 51	04	00	00	M 01	.370 .287	1.29 ns	1.68 1.77	.952 .40	
7 ]	.07	Be easygoing?	ი ი	00	10	31 35	36 31	4 M	ოო	.596	1.17 ns	3.42 3.40	.210 ns	
ω	12	Have their work week restricted to 40 hours?	ი ი	<b>м 4</b> .	24 22	29 29	20 20	3	н н	1.022 .906	1.13 ns	3.05 2.95	.639 ns	
ი	83	Should they or should they not be expected to remain at work until 5 o'clock?	ი ი	00	രഗ	40 50	27 19	C 7	ч о	.630 .342	1.84*" .01	*3.39 3.30	.751 .50	
0	38	Have coffee breaks?	ი ი	ч ч	15 16	44 48	14 9	5 M	н н	.829 .570	1.45 ns	2.89 2.89	0 <b>s</b> u	
н.	16	Be allowed to smoke in a teachers' lounge?	ი ი	13 10	34 29	28 33	5 7	04	ч о	.872 .877	1.01 ns	2.42	.565 ns	
2	52	Be permitted to smoke in a classroom after class hours?	ი ი	n n	11 14	19 23	32 2 <b>4</b>	18 15	0 1	1.167 1.223	1.05 ns	3.61 3.43	1.071 .30	
'n	79	Carry their lunch to work?	ი ი	о ч	- 0	73 75	ωm	0 1	- 0	.146 .090	1.62* .05	3.11 3.01	1.75 <b>4</b> .10	

Pable D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.
•

le D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

т. т. 1 -

•

	a n No.	Sa Item	ample 5(84) 5(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 N <b>A</b>	8 N	F. & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
4	56	Wear a political campaign button in school?	აი	00	00	21 26	35 27	27 26	10	.580 .66 <b>7</b>	1.15 ns	4.07 4.00	.581 ns
ъ	46	Should they ever strike for higher salaries?	თ ი	нω	99	39 21	26 35	9 16	10	.826 .833	1.01 ns	3.39 3.75	2.519* .02
		III. (A.	. SEC Commu	ONDA Inity	RY E Par	KPECT. ticip	ATION: ation	ດ ເ					
ч	26	Take an active part in a veterans' organization if they are veterans?	ი ი		10 1 <b>4</b>	67 61	ΜN	00	n u	.200	1.14 ns	2.89 2.82	.928 .40
2	32	Be expected to take an active part in local service clubs such as the Kiwanis, Rotary, Exchange, Lions, etc.?	ט ט	00	13 14	5 8 5	8 4	υω	г л	.407	1.23 ns	3.01 2.92	.925 .40
m	60	Take an active part in social fraternal organi- zations such as the Elks, Moose, Eagles?	n n	00	9 m	70	4 6	0 0	0 0	.148	1.49* .05	3.00 3.10	1.489 .20
4	114	Take an active part in secret fraternal organi- zations such as the Masons Knights of Columbus,	~										
		Knights of Pythias, Odd- fellows, etc.?	ი ი	00	г ч	70 65	ഗയ	ч л	ч о	.195 .326	1.67* .05	3.00 3.22	2.672** .01

able D-1. PERIPHERAL EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

2 54 / 255

ble D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

) – ( ) –

~

a	~	Sam S(	ple 84)	н	2	ო	4	ப	و	5	म् उ		ل لا
2	0	Item G(	79)	AM	PS	NWW	PSN	AMN	NA	S	Prob.	×	Prob.
5 8	6	Belong to a Country Club if they can afford it?	ა ი	00	12 8	65 68	Ъб	00	ч о	.215 .217	1.01 ns	2.93 2.96	.466 ns
6 13	4	Be expected to take an active part in various charitable drives and organizations outside the school?	ი თ	0 0	12 6	61 55	15 15	0 0	ч и	.258 .348	1.35 ns	2.96 3.17	2.347* .02
7 14	5	Be expected to help with Boy Scouts, YMCA, or similar youth organiza- tions?	ი ი	00	26 19	49 48	<b>г</b> б	0 0	ч и	.353	1.31 ns	2.77 2.92	1.539 .20
8	ъ	Take the lead in initiat- ing neighborhood improve- ments?	იი	ч о	26 16	50 55	ы С	7 7	РО	.424 .703	1.66 <b>*</b> .05	2.76 2.91	1.248 .30
9 13	6	Should they be selected to take part in neighborhood improvement activities (rezoning, curbs, paving, sidewalks, etc.)?	ი ი	пз	28 22	48 47	7 10	н 2	н н	.495 .443	1.12 ns	2.66 2.81	1.341 .20
10 5	5	Should or should not our men teachers go to church regularly?	იი	С 6	<b>4</b> 1 44	35 25	Р О	00	ч о	.398 .435	1.09 ns	2.34 2.23	1.076 .30
11 9	е С	Be expected to take an active part in church social groups?	იი	μw	24 21	54 49	υυ	Р О	0 0	.304 .473	1.56* .05	<b>2.7</b> 2 2.75	.274 ns

Table D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

ble D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

,

, -, -

۰.

Tab	le D	-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.	00	ntin	ued.									
	a no.	San S( S( Item G(	nple (84) (79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMM	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	ດ ທ	F. & Prob	×	t & Prob.	
12	94	Be expected to teach a Sunday school class?	აი	- 0	<b>4</b> W	69 62	12 12	0 0	0 0	.198	1.35 ns	3.02 3.17	1.856 .10	1
13	132	Be selected for the lay administration of their churches; committees, vestry, elders, service groups, etc.?	ი ი	00	19 14	61 63	н и	00	н и	.216 .166	1.30 ns	2.79 2.83	.577 ns	
14	14	Wear a political campaign button outside of school?	ი ი	00	ωO	52 55	21 15	ထထ	ч о	.508 .449	1.13 ns	3.41 3.40	.074 ns	
15	57	Informally endorse one of their friends if he were running for a political office?	აი	- 0	3 10	<b>4</b> 9 36	2 <b>4</b> 15	5 18	0 0	.573 .971	1.69* .05	3.52	1.281 .30	
16	06	Help a friend running for political office by passing out campaign lit- erature for him?	ი ი	Р О	Ч 2	48 50	31 17	10	ч о	.340 .608	1.79* .01	*3.40 3.43	.295 ns	
17	16	Help this friend by making a public speech endorsing him if they were asked to do so?	ი ი	<b></b>	40	37 46	37 18	4 0	- 0	.521	1.27 ns	3.47 3.33	1.169 .30	
18	166	If they were offered a nomination for a part-time political office, should they or should they not accept?	ა ი	чч	10 9	35 35	35 26	பல	0 M	.717 .677	106 ns	3.43 3.33	.737	

11

) - + ) -

•

SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

Table L	)-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS		ntin	ued.								
Q	Sa Sa T tem	umple 5(84)	MA L	N 0	e MMM	4 DSN	A MN	9 <b>4</b> 2	u 7	н г. С. С.	×۱	۲ t مرکا
	(C. Extra-	schoo	L WO	rk,	"Nigh	tliah	ting"		n		<	E 1 000 -
1 115	If teachers' incomes are not enough to meet their basic family expenses and they wished to work at other jobs evenings or Saturday, do you think they should or should not do so?	ს თ	0 4	3 7 3 5	о Э Э Э Э	<u>ט רי</u>	00	00	.437 .483	1.11 ns	2.32 2.52	.1.86
2 116	What about taking other jobs during the summer if they need the money and wish to work?	ሆ מ	10 6	51 49	22		00	00	.406 .364	1.12 ns	2.17 2.24	. 760
	Even if you perhaps do not agree with teachers' taking extra jobs, if they did so, how would you feel about their taking the following types of jobs? Should they or should they not accept a job as a	N										
3 122	Counselor at a boys' camp?	ი ი	Р	41 41	33 36	ΜO	00		.462	1.67 <b>*</b> .05	2.40 2.45	.534 ns
4 121	Office worker?	ന വ	50	29 28	<b>45</b> 50	0 0	0 0		.232	2.41*	*2.60 2.64	.396 ns

SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued. ble D-l.

I

, , -۰.

Q No.	Item	Sample S(84) G(79)	AM	P 2	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	o ک	F. & Prob. <del>z</del>	t & Prob.
5 120	Real estate, insurance or car salesman?	აი	40	28 22	48 54	7 7	0 0		.505 .244	2.07**2.63 .01 2.74	1.219 .30
6 118	Department store clerk?	აი	40	22 16	52 59	ოო	0 0	н н	.520 .218	2.39**2.72 .01 2.83	1.156 .30
7 124	Magazine, book or encyclopedia salesman?	აი	μũ	16 20	<b>4</b> 9 53	12 4	00	ч ч	.563	1.82**2.83 .01 2.77	.576 ns
8 123	Nightwatchman or plant protection?	აი	ωO	18 16	51 56	0 0	0 0	г 7	.547 .269	2.03**2.85 .01 2.87	.179 ns
9 117	Factory worker?	აი	мО	12 13	54 53	11	Ч И	ч 2	.530 .364	1.46* 2.96 .05 3.00	.351 ns
10 125	Gasoline station attenda	nt? S G	мО	14 12	47 51	15 12	ოო	г л	.654 .461	1.42 3.01 ns 3.08	.549 ns
11 119	<b>Bartender?</b>	აი	0 0	ч ч	8 15	36 36	34 25	20 20	.801 .568	1.41 4.20 ns 4.10	.716 .50
	(B.	Person	al P	erfo	rmance	ss and	Attr	ibut	(se		
1 101	Be Jewish?	0 0	00	00	72	ы 8	ч 0	чч	.134 .013	10.3** 3.12 .01 3.01	2.086* .05
2 105	Be Protestant?	იი	ŝ	ы С	70 73	00	<b>00</b>	ч	.285	4.67**2.80 .01 2.94	2.043* .05
3 110	Be Catholic?	ი ი	00	о ч	71 76	64	ч 0	с Ч	.144 .026	5.54**3.14 .01 3.00	2.960** .01

Table D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

: 1-۰.

	) lo. Item	sample S(84) G(79)	1 AM	2 PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 N <b>A</b>	s 2	E & Prob.	١×	t & Prob.
4 10	0 Be single?	აი	00		63 69	15 8	0 5	мч	.250	2.31* .01	*3.22 3.09	1.974* .05
5 10	06 Be married (no children)?	ა ი ა	ч о	чч	70 72	4 7	00	6 M	.174 .064	2.72* .01	*3.03 3.04	.257 ns
9	)7 Be married (with children)	n n	0 1	35 26	44 52	ч о	00	п а	.300	1.33 ns	2.56 2.67	1.364 .20
5 2	3 Continue as teachers if divorced?	აი	സഗ	29 21	49 49	ທຸທ	00	н н	.365 .440	1.21 ns	2.60 2.64	.390 ns
8	<b>99 Personally ambitious?</b>	აი	17	46 51	18 20	00	00	чч	.438 .322	1.36 ns	2.01 2.17	1.583 .20
თ თ	<b>18 Be practical</b>	აი	16 15	55 55	6 ۲	<b></b>	00	нм	.359 .331	1.08 ns	1.94 1.92	.161 ns
0 10	<pre>08 Be skilled in public relations?</pre>	აი	10 5	53 53	17 19	ч о	00	ΜN	.375 .283	1.33 ns	2.11 2.18	.776 .50
5	)6 Be a good public speaker?	ი ი	12 9	<b>4</b> 5 49	23 20	0 ח	00	чч	.461 .356	1.29 ns	2.16 2.14	.187 ns
2 14	<pre>17 Should men teachers smoke in public?</pre>	იი	0 0	8 14	66 56	ഗഗ	9 N		.352.401	1.14 ns	2.96 2.96	.000 ns
e S	<pre>i2 Use language colored with occasional swear words, outside school?</pre>	ი ი ი	00	7 7	20 13	53 48	9 16	0 ח	.378 .474	1.25 ns	3.84 3.99	1.405 .20

able D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

,

) - <sup>1</sup> ,

۰.

SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued.

le D-1.

a	Sar	mple (84)		2 0	e e	4	2	9	7	ب می ا	1	۲ د د	l.
- ON	5 Trem	(6/)	AM	rs S	NIMM	NSA	AMIN	NA	ß	Prop.	×	Prob.	1
4 136	Wear shorts when others do - golfing, gardening, on picnics, etc.?	ი ი	нз	21 17	58 57	0 m	00	н 2	.298 .269	1.11 ns	2.67 2.80	1.472 .20	
5 161	Drink an occasional bottle of beer in their homes?	იი	ч 0	യഗ	68 65	5 0	04	ΝM	.206 .303	1.47* .05	2.94 3.07	1.575 .20	
6 162	What about (an occasional bottle of beer) at a bar or nightclub?	ი ი	ч о	m 4	<b>44</b> 50	28 12	6 10	ыр	.544 .609	1.12 ns	3.43 3.37	.488 ns	
7 163	Drink an occasional cocktail or highball in their homes?	ი ი	ч о	0 3	69 64	ΜN	Ч 4	M 2	.231	1.37 ns	2.94 3.05	1.37 .20	
8 164	What about (an occasional cocktail or highball) at a bar or nightclub?	n N	- 0	m 4	44 49	28 13	6 10	N N	.544 .612	1.13 ns	3.43 3.38	.371 ns	
9 143	Have charge accounts in local stores, if they wished to do so?	ი ი	7 N	35 28	43 47	ч о	00		.373 .321	1.16 ns	2.46 2.60	1.559 .20	
34	If men teachers had to borrow money to meet current expenses, should they apply for a signature loan from a credit company	ര	0	7	36	8 3	ە	7	.444	1.09	3.59 .5	. 948	•
	rather than a bank?	сл С	0	Ч	43	29	ഗ്	r I	.409	ns	3.49	.40	

SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS: -- Continued. able D-l. 261

. .

.

, ,- ,

۰.

0 No.	Siltem	ample 5(84) 3(79)	1 AM	P 2 P S	3 MMN	4 PSN	S MN	NS NS	a n	F. & Prob.	×ı	t & Prob.	
1 129	Should they buy house- hold appliances on easy-payment plans if they wish to?	ით	0 F	18 28	61 47	Р 2	00	-	.248 .321	1.29 ns	2.78 2.60	2.102* .05	
2 111	Buy a new Chevrolet, Ford, Plymouth or other low- priced car every year if they could afford it and wanted to do so?	ით	4	24 18	56 54	2 Г	00	Ч 2	.264	1.41 ns	2.70 2.69	.034 ns	
3 112	What about a new Cadillac Lincoln, Imperial, etc., every year if they could afford it and wanted to buy one? (remember we're not talking about whether they can or can't afford but how you would feel about it if they could.)	it so	ч п	16 17	51 44	13 12	0 H	F 7	.456	1.38 ns	2.96 2.91	.456 ns	
4 137	Should or should not thei friends consist mainly of people outside the teach- ing profession?	ט מ ע	00	8	62 67	12 4	00	н и	.244 .142	1.72* .01	3.05 2.96	1.256	

able D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

e D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS. -- Continued

. ∳- ,

[de	D	-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.	Cor	tinı	<u>led</u> .									1
1	o No.	Sam Sam S( S(	ple 84) 79)	AM	2 PS	3 MMN	PSN	A MN	9 NA	a 2	Рт. С.	, ix	t & Prob	u
												<		ı
- 1	[33	Work with and help their own children educationally	S	Ч	32	44	Cullipa 5		ר 10 ד	.379	1.31	2.65	.172	
		more than other people do?	Ċ	m	30	38	7	0	Ч	.496	ns	2.63	ns	
8	53	Should or should not teachers' children be ex- pected to do better work												
		in school than most other	S	0	10	42	19	12	Ч	.779	1.07	3.40	1.706	
		youngsters?	ი	Ч	12	47	11	ω	0	.730	ns	3.17	.10	
m	54	Should their children be better-behaved than most	<b>ა</b> თ	0 0	18	46	11	ω.	Ч (	.732	1.01	3.11	1.469 	
		orner youngsters;	ש	N	77	4 2	ω	ი	С	. 723	ns	7.91	.20	
4	84	Do you expect them to try to do a better job in bringing up their young- sters than other folks?	იი	4 1	28 31	33 33 33	11 6	ഗഗ	10	.756	1.12 ns	2.89 2.71	1.300 .20	
Б	32	Be any more strict with their children than other people are with theirs?	ი ი	0 0	~ ~	30 33	38 29	8		.615 .764	1.24 ns	3.57 3.41	1.194 .30	
9	130	Be any more intelligent than the average citizen?	აი	90	58 50	15 19	ωO	00	п 7	.37 <b>4</b> .347	1.08 ns	2.18 2.13	.579 ns	
7	61	Be any more widely informed On many subjects than the average person?	ი ი	8 2	56 53	21 18	ч 0	00	ч о	.318 .317	1.00 ns	2.22 2.13	1.016 .40	

SECONDAPV 4 e

4 -

	a		ample 5(84)	Ч	2	m	4	Ŋ	9	7	ىكى • 1-1	I	t &	
	No.	Item	3(79)	AM	ΡS	NWW	PSN	AMN	NA	S	Prob.	×	Prob.	
ω	41	Have a better education	S	51	32	0	0	0	Г	.240	1.08	1.39	.753	
		than the average person?	U	23	26	0	0	0	0	.223	ns	1.33	.50	
6	95	Have more reading material	_											
		in their homes than most	თ	m	30	45	4	0	7	.414	1.16	2.61	.626	
		other people do?	ტ	4	32	40	7	Ч	0	.482	ns	2.54	มร	
0	145	Use language that is	S	10	62	6	2	0	٦	.374	1.32	2.01	.565	
		"better" than average?	Ⴊ	6	56	13	0	0	Ч	.283	ns	2.05	ns	
Ч	141	Be any more courteous to												
		people than other folks	თ	ഹ	34	34	6	0	7	.594	1.16	2.57	1.054	
		are?	ტ	m	43	27	4	Ч	Ч	.510	su	2.45	.30	
2	86	Know more people on their												
		block than their	ა	0	12	60	6	Ч	2	.309	1.42	2.99	.321	
		neighbors do?	ს	0	8	68	-1	7	0	.217	su	2.96	ns	
'n	58	Live in a house that is												
		somewhat "better than	თ	0	10	66	Ŋ	Ч	7	.233	1.07	2.96	1.807	
		average"?	ტ	0	18	57	4	0	0	.250	ns	2.82	.10	
4	135	Try to keep their home and grounds in any better repair and condition than												
		other in their neighbor-	თ	Г	22	56	Υ	0	7	.291	1.15	2.74	.283	
		hood?	ი	-1	21	51	S	0	Ч	.335	su	2.77	ns	
15	140	Be any more conscientious about paying their debts												
		on time than other people	თ	ო	34	37	ω	0	7	.512	1.27	2.61	.644	
		are?	Ⴊ	0	32	39	7	0	Ч	.403	มร	2.68	ns	

able D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATIONS.--Continued.

## }- <sup>1</sup>

.

•

able I	D-1. SECONDARY EXPECTATION	s <u>C</u> c	ntin	ued.								
ON.	S Item	ample S(84) G(79)	1 AM	PS PS	3 MMN	4 PSN	5 AMN	6 NA	s S	F. & Prob.	×۱	t & Prob.
6 59	Be expected to be somewhat more active in community affairs than the average?	ა თ	0 F	3 3 3 3 3 3 3	43 39	o u	00	0 /7	. 383	1.16 ns	2.63 2.62	.138 ns
7 165	Be any more conscientious about their civic respon- sibilities than other good citizens?	ლ თ ლ	n n	3 2 3 2	30 35	13 4	7 F	N M	.689 .589	1.17 ns	2.68 2.61	.588 ns
8 87	Should their personal standards of conduct outside the school be any different from those of other good citizens?	ი ი	с <b>4</b>	16 22	32 27	25	r 4	- 0	.945 .974	1.03 ns	3.21 3.00	1.331 .20
9 23	Should their personal standards of conduct in a classroom be any dif- ferent from those of other good citizens?	ი თ	9	29 24	10	2 9 2 5	8 10	Р 2	1.405 1.510	1.07 ns	3.05 3.09	.215 ns

Τa Sp or Ro j. i Nu Pr Ex tı ha Va Le G1 t .

					Role	Sector						
	Stud	lent	Ot! Tead	her cher	Admi	nistr.	Par	ent	Inde	term.	Tot	als
Specific or General Role	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G
Numbers of Primary Expecta- tions having Variance	-											
Less than .774	9	6	2	2	1	l	3	3	4	5	19	17
Greater than .774	1	4	3	3	6	6	1	1	6	5	17	19

Table D-2. Frimary expectations divided by their pooled median variance, .774.

## Hypothesis Under Test:

When the variances are pooled and ranked for all primary expectations defining the specific and general roles, there is no significant difference between the numbers of primary specific role items and primary general role items observed above and below their overall median variance. Using Yate's correction for a single degree of freedom  $\chi^2$  on totals = .056 .80  $\rangle$  p  $\rangle$  .70

The null hypothesis may not be rejected.

y = 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>

.

Role Sector												
	Student		Other Teacher		Administr.		Parent		Indeterm.		Total <b>s</b>	
Specific or General Role	- S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	s	G
Numbers of Periphera Expecta- tions Having Variance	E 1											
Le <b>ss</b> than .6935	9	11	5	5	1	4	2	5	8	8	25	33
Greater than .6935	4	2	1	1	15	12	6	3	7	7	33	25

Table D-3. Peripheral expectations divided by their pooled median variance, .6935.

## Hypothesis Under Test:

When the variances are pooled and ranked for all peripheral expectations defining the specific and general roles, there is no significant difference between the numbers of peripheral specific role items and peripheral general role items observed above and below their overall median variance. Using Yate's correction for a single degree of freedom  $\chi^2$  on totals = 1.735 .20 > p > .10

The null hypothesis may not be rejected.

	Commun. Partic.		Personal Perf. and Attrib.		<b>M</b> oon Lighting		Compara. Items		Totals	
Specific or General Role	s	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G
Number of Secondary Expectations Having Variance										
Le <b>ss</b> than .3745 Greater than	10	8	16	17	0	8	7	7	33	40
.3745	8	10	8	7	11	3	12	12	39	32

Table D-4. Secondary expectations divided by their pooled median variance, .3745.

## Hypothesis Under Test:

When the variances are pooled and ranked for all secondary expectations defining the specific and general roles, there is no significant difference between the numbers of secondary specific role items and secondary general role items observed alone and below their overall median variance.

Using Yate's correction for a single degree of freedom,  $X^2$  on totals = .865 .50 > p > .30

The null hypothesis may not be rejected.

•

•

