

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-20,908

YANCEY, Booker Talmadge, 1928-
A STUDY OF THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF
PARAPROFESSIONALS AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS,
TEACHERS, AND PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THREE
MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1975
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A STUDY OF THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF PARAPROFESSIONALS AS
PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND PARAPROFESSIONALS
IN THREE MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By

Booker T. Yancey

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1975

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF PARAPROFESSIONALS AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THREE MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By

Booker T. Yancey

Today teachers are confronted with increasingly difficult responsibilities of meeting the educational needs of children. Utilization of paraprofessionals as an integral part of the instructional program could become one of the most significant advances in education.

The purpose of this study was to compare the role perceptions as perceived by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. In addition, the position of the paraprofessional was examined to determine the criteria for selection and the actual role of the paraprofessional in the Michigan school districts to be known as district A, district B, and district C.

Fifteen null hypotheses were developed to determine if there is a relationship between the role perceptions of paraprofessionals when compared with principals', teachers', and paraprofessionals' role perceptions:

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the distribution of responses to specific questions reflecting the role perception of paraprofessionals as measured by the Definition of the Paraprofessional Survey Instrument.

- Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences of responses to item two (prepares and previews film) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences of responses to item five (supervises various auxiliary school services) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences of responses to item seven (assist students on difficult information or make-up work) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences of responses to item eight (setting up materials to create an environment for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (preparation of materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (confers with teacher regarding appropriate strategies for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences of responses to item sixteen (records data on cumulative records) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences of responses to item twenty (arranges for field trips) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences of responses to item nine (liking of children) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

- Null Hypothesis 11: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (ability to work with school personnel) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 12: There are no significant differences of responses to item six (average intelligence) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 13: There are no significant differences of responses to item thirteen (artistic ability) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.
- Null Hypothesis 14: There are no significant differences of responses to item fourteen (willing to accept responsibility) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.
- Null Hypothesis 15: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (sensitivity to needs of youth) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Three questionnaires were sent to forty randomly selected experts for purposes of validating the instruments. Eighty percent of those panelists returned their questionnaires.

Selected school districts were contacted by mail requesting their cooperation in this study. Each of the selected schools responded affirmatively. Subsequently, 270 questionnaires were sent to principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in participating Michigan schools. Respondents returned 80 percent of the forms. The chi square test was the statistical treatment used to test the data. The .05 level of confidence was established as the minimum level for accepting significant differences.

To my wife, Dorothy, whose love, encouragement,
and tolerance made this occasion a reality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to the many people who contributed to the finalization of this study. Without their assistance this study would not have become a reality.

I am particularly grateful to Dr. Louis Romano, major professor and chairman of the doctoral guidance committee. His understanding and guidance during the course of the research were encouraging and invaluable.

Additionally, the writer wishes to thank Dr. Alexander Kloster, Dr. James McKee, and Dr. Donald Nickerson for the scholarly advice and assistance they extended to me as committee members. Their encouragement and constructive criticism proved quite valuable prior to the completion of this study.

The writer wishes to acknowledge gratitude to all respondents who participated in this study.

Much credit is due the writer's son, Brian, for his patience and cooperation during the writing of this document.

A special dedication is due my parents, who first encouraged me to achieve the greatest heights possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	5
Design and Methodology	5
Assumptions Underlying the Study	6
Delimitation of the Study	6
Hypotheses	7
Problem	7
Theoretical Foundation	9
Data Analysis	10
Review of Related Literature	11
Overview	11
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	12
The Paraprofessional Movement--How It Began	12
Recent Forerunners of the Paraprofessional Movement	14
National Youth Administration	15
Bay City, Michigan, Experiment	15
Connecticut and New Jersey Programs	16
Berkeley, California, Program	16
The Yale-Fairfield Study	17
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965	17
The Scheuer Amendment	18
Education Profession Development Act--1968	18
Why Paraprofessionals?	19
Effect of Paraprofessional Assistance on Teachers and the Teaching Profession	21
Employment of Paraprofessionals and the Involved Expense	22
Training the Paraprofessional	23
Exploitation--How It Can Be Avoided	23
Role of Institutions of Higher Learning	23

Chapter	Page
Role of Local Boards of Education, State Boards of Education, and Local Education Associations . .	24
Profile of Current National Paraprofessional Programs	24
Minneapolis, Minnesota	26
New York City	27
Dade County, Florida	28
Profile of Selected Paraprofessional Programs in the State of Michigan	29
Saginaw	29
Recruitment and Selection	30
Trainee Profile	30
Preservice Programs	31
Duties Performed by Paraprofessionals	31
Trainee Evaluation	32
Evaluation of Supervising Teachers	32
Wayne Intermediate School District	33
Recruitment and Selection	34
Trainee Profile	35
Pre- and Inservice Training	35
Evaluation	36
Flint Community Schools	37
Recruitment and Selection	37
Trainee Profile	37
Pre- and Inservice Education	38
Evaluation by Trainees	38
Evaluation by Teachers and Administrators	39
Evaluation by Project Directors	39
Review of Related Studies	39
Summary	44
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	46
Introduction	46
Demographic Structure of Selected School Districts . .	46
Grand Rapids	46
Lansing	47
Pontiac	48
Selection of the Sample	49
Procedures	52
Instrumentation	53
Hypotheses	54
Problem	54
Data Analysis	56
Summary	57

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	58
Analysis of Definition Statements	59
Definition One	59
Definition Two	60
Definition Three	60
Actual Role Questionnaire Findings	61
Items Pertaining to Criteria for Selection of Paraprofessionals	64
Analysis of Data From Principals, Teachers, and Paraprofessionals to Definition of Role of Para- professional, Criteria for Selection, and Actual Role Instruments	66
Distribution of Responses to Definition of Role Instrument	66
Role Definition Instrument	67
Criteria for Selection Instrument	67
Actual Role Instrument	69
Test of Hypotheses	69
Data for Actual Role Instrument by Position	72
Data for Criteria for Selecting Paraprofessionals by Position	80
Data for Criteria for Selecting Paraprofessionals by District	82
Summary	87
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	90
Summary	90
Findings	92
Null Hypothesis 1	92
Null Hypothesis 2	93
Null Hypothesis 3	93
Null Hypothesis 4	94
Null Hypothesis 5	94
Null Hypothesis 6	95
Null Hypothesis 7	95
Null Hypothesis 8	96
Null Hypothesis 9	96
Null Hypothesis 10	97
Null Hypothesis 11	97
Null Hypothesis 12	97
Null Hypothesis 13	98
Null Hypothesis 14	98
Null Hypothesis 15	99
Conclusions	99
Recommendations for Further Study	101

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	102
A. LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENT .	103
B. LETTER RECEIVED GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENT	105
C. LETTER SENT TO PANELISTS REQUESTING THEIR ASSISTANCE IN FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRE	107
D. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	109
E. LIST OF PANELISTS	117
F. LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS IN THREE MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS	121
G. LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THREE MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS	123
H. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	125
BIBLIOGRAPHY	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Responses by Panelists on Role Definition of Paraprofessionals	59
2. Summary of Responses by Panelists on Actual Role of Paraprofessionals	62
3. Summary of Responses by Panelists to Criteria for Selecting Paraprofessionals	65
4. Total Percentage of Respondents to Definition of Role Instrument	67
5. Total Number and Percentage Breakdown of Responses to Criteria for Selection of Paraprofessionals	68
6. Total Number and Percentage of Responses to Actual Role of Paraprofessionals	70
7. Observed and Chi Square Contribution for Each Cell as Tabulated From the Role Definition Instrument by Position	71
8. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Role Definition Instrument by School District	72
9. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 2	73
10. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 5	74
11. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 7	75
12. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 8	76
13. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 12	77
14. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 15	78

Table	Page
15. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 16	79
16. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Actual Role Instrument by Position, Item 20	80
17. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by Position, Item 9	81
18. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by Position, Item 12	82
19. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by District, Item 6	83
20. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by District, Item 13	84
21. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by District, Item 14	85
22. Contingency Table With Frequencies From the Criteria for Selection Instrument by District, Item 15	86

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Little has been heard of in the area of teacher aides or para-professionals prior to 1960, and there were no references to teacher aides in any educational index until 1956.¹ The use of volunteer laymen in our schools has been used for many years as lay readers, tutors, and in other roles, but the use of the paid nonprofessional is a relatively new phenomenon.

An examination of teacher duties shows that there are many nonprofessional activities such as helping children with coats, making inventories, helping children with materials of instruction, grading papers, cleaning blackboards, operating audio-visual machines, etc. constantly plaguing teachers when this time and energy could be used for more valuable teaching activities. ". . . We have long operated on the assumption that one teacher can do all that needs to be done in a good classroom. This is our tradition; it is a bad tradition."²

¹William Bennett, Jr., and R. Frank Falk, New Careers and Urban Schools--A Sociological Study of Teachers and Teacher Aide Roles (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1957), p. 13.

²Association for Childhood Education International, Aides to Teachers and Children (Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1968), p. 43.

In recent years teachers have insisted on being freed from the burdens of nonprofessional duties. Furthermore, teachers have claimed that many of these duties can be assumed by individuals who have had no professional training in the field of education. The presumption is greater flexibility in activities involving their professional competence.

Currently educators are welcoming the assistance of paraprofessionals in unprecedented numbers. This situation reflects a substantial change in their attitude from the years when paraprofessionals were regarded with suspicion and irresolution.

The teaching profession reacted negatively on the whole, to an employment device which would assign available educational funds to the employment of untrained personnel rather than the employment of more teachers. Some observers believe that the resistance created among teachers retarded progress in the development of auxiliary personnel in school systems for at least a decade.¹

Impetus to the creation of the role of the paraprofessional was through the provision of funds in various governmental programs. The National Youth Administration (N.Y.A.) was one of the first programs in government to introduce this role.² Then in 1952 the first major experiment in the use of teacher aides was undertaken in Bay City, Michigan, with funds provided by the Ford Foundation.³ Today there is a general acceptance of the idea of paraprofessionals, but there is a

¹Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopff, New Careers and Roles in the American School: Of Auxiliary Personnel in Education (New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1968), p. 6.

²Bennett, op. cit., p. 16.

³Ibid.

lack of agreement about what the job functions are for this particular position.

The effective use of paraprofessionals could be one of the most significant recent advances in education.

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards see the addition of auxiliary personnel in the schools as one of the most challenging and hopeful advances in modern education. The needs of society require significant changes in our present school organization. The teacher is a skilled professional and must be permitted to do a professional level of work.¹

Statement of the Problem

This study examines the role perceptions of paraprofessionals as perceived by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. In addition, this study investigates specific activities delegated to paraprofessionals in selected school districts.

Not enough evidence about paraprofessionals existed for state and federal agencies to establish criteria for selection, quality-control guidelines, and licensure specifications. To this extent, this study should disclose some conclusions which might affect increased efficiency in the use of paraprofessionals.

Significance of the Problem

Paraprofessional personnel are a potential resource to be used by educators in teaching children. How this resource can best be utilized to its maximum efficiency is not yet entirely clear. The paraprofessional movement, though thriving, is still a fledgling in the

¹"Auxiliary School Personnel," The National Elementary Principal 46 (March 1967): 6.

educational family. New concepts are now emerging about the most appropriate role for paraprofessionals, and an increasing number of carefully planned programs are now in operation.

In Pontiac, Michigan, the present funded paraprofessional project entitled Pontiac Career Opportunities Program has four main objectives:

1. Effect better ways of utilizing school staffs through the specific career lattice feature in existence for paraprofessional personnel.
2. Create better ways of training personnel through college-level education concurrent with work-study assignments.
3. Provide ways of attracting personnel from low income areas to careers within schools serving children from low income families.
4. Encourage greater understanding and participation between the community and the educational system through the development of an advisory council.

Implicit with each of the above four statements is the inference that schools simply cannot operate effectively without community interest, understanding, and support. Therefore, it is necessary for schools to be looked upon as an institution which is a part of the community rather than an entity standing apart from the community.

Thus the significance of this study becomes quite apparent. Investors in any business enterprise desire tangible proof that the products of that enterprise are satisfactory. Americans have underwritten one of the world's most complex educational enterprises.

American people are presently concerned that students are equipped with skills which, in turn, will enable them to become contributing, functional citizens in this highly complex technological society of ours.

In summary, the need for establishing criteria for determining the contributions paraprofessionals can make on instructional teams as well as determining the criteria for their selection are the bases for this study.

Definition of Terms

Professional--A teacher who is certificated to analyze the instructional needs of students and to initiate educational activities to meet those needs.

Paraprofessional--The role of the paraprofessional is to function as an equal member of a differentiated instructional team; he is responsible to the teacher, yet involved in a process of planning and performance in an atmosphere of trust, flexibility, and communication.

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

Design and Methodology

The design of the study was based upon a questionnaire which was developed by Bryce Perkins.¹ Recipients of the questionnaire were a panel of selected experts, elementary principals, elementary teachers, and paraprofessionals. These recipients are all located in the state

¹Bryce Perkins, "Factors Which Have Influenced the Development of the Role of the Paraprofessional in the Elementary Schools of Norwalk, Connecticut" (Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961).

of Michigan except for the panel of experts. Panelists were distributed nationally.

This study is a replication of Perkins' dissertation, which was completed in the city of Norwalk, Connecticut. Because of the limited scope of Perkins' study, it was decided to expand this study to include three large metropolitan communities in the state of Michigan.

Assumptions Underlying the Study

Research survey methods normally used in questionnaire and checklist techniques were employed in this study. The delimiting factors characteristic of such methods were considered. However, the study assumed these techniques to be the most appropriate data-gathering instruments for this specific situation. It was further assumed that respondents would express their reactions explicitly and with candor.

Delimitation of the Study

This study was limited to principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals from three selected school districts in the state of Michigan. The collection of data was limited to questionnaires and a study of state and national documents important to this study. Questionnaires used in this thesis were used in a previous study of paraprofessionals and were considered acceptable for the purpose for which they were to be used.

The validity of this study was affected by the degree of sincerity and frankness of responses to the instruments administered.

Hypotheses

The problem which has been outlined can better be understood with the following hypotheses in this study.

Problem

The purpose of this research was to study the role perceptions of paraprofessionals as perceived by certain principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, and to determine if there is a relationship between the role perception of paraprofessionals when compared with principals', teachers', and paraprofessionals' role perceptions.

- Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the distribution of responses to specific questions reflecting the role perception of paraprofessionals as measured by the Definition of the Paraprofessional Survey Instrument.
- Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences of responses to item two (prepares and previews film) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences of responses to item five (supervises various auxiliary school services) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences of responses to item seven (assist students on difficult information or make-up work) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences of responses to item eight (setting up materials to create an environment for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (preparation of materials following teacher/paraprofessional planning session) reflecting

the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

- Null Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (confers with teacher regarding appropriate strategies for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences of responses to item sixteen (records data on cumulative records) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences of responses to item twenty (arranges for field trips) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences of responses to item nine (liking of children) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 11: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (ability to work with school personnel) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 12: There are no significant differences of responses to item six (average intelligence) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 13: There are no significant differences of responses to item thirteen (artistic ability) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.
- Null Hypothesis 14: There are no significant differences of responses to item fourteen (willing to accept responsibility) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Null Hypothesis 15: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (sensitivity to needs of youth) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Theoretical Foundation

The employment of paraprofessionals for the last five years has steadily increased. During the 1967-1968 year, 743 school systems reported 29,938 paraprofessional employees. This number increased to 40,295 paraprofessionals for the 1969-1969 school year in districts that had enrollments of 6,000 or more pupils.¹

Currently, 200,000 to 300,000 paraprofessionals are employed in and around public schools.² By 1977 the National Congress of Parents and Teachers reports that the number may swell to 1.5 million. Leon H. Keyserling, an economist, predicted that the ratio will eventually become one aide to every two teachers.³

In spite of the rapidity with which paraprofessionals are now being employed, there is still a vagueness in the line that separates professional from nonprofessional tasks. While some school systems have apparently been able to establish conditions that allow satisfying and rewarding experiences in the use of paraprofessionals, many have found it difficult to use paraprofessionals effectively. Among the apparent problems are specific role definition, proper supervision, teacher-time

¹N.E.A., Research Division, "Use of Teacher Aides," Research Memo No. 1969-11 (Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1969), p. 1.

²Paraprofessionals in the Schools (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972), p. 1.

³Ibid.

utilization, in-service training, opportunity for upward mobility, and recruitment. These difficult situations are sources of concern to administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals. The resulting dilemma is that certain states are attempting to clarify and legalize the status of paraprofessionals.

In Florida, after four years of study involving educators throughout Florida, the state board of education recommended to the legislature a bill providing a legal definition of paraprofessionals, and legal protection for paraprofessionals. The law defined a paraprofessional as any person assigned by a school board to assist a teacher in carrying out his professional duties and instructional responsibilities.

Georgia has an entirely different approach. It has very specific guidelines relative to the qualifications of paraprofessionals, training program content, and classification of duties that may be performed. Local school districts are restricted in disbursing any funds until such persons hold a valid license issued through teacher certification services in the Georgia State Department of Education.

As paraprofessional programs become more deeply entrenched within school districts, knowledgeable educational authorities have come to realize a great deal should be done to define more explicitly the role of the paraprofessional and appropriate criteria for their selection.

Data Analysis

A chi square computational procedure was used in this study. This procedure allows for nonindependence between groups and was

therefore deemed appropriate for this study. A complete description of this research technique is included in Chapter III of this dissertation. Data were programmed and processed by the Control Data Corporation (CDC) 6500 computer at Michigan State University.

Review of Related Literature

Development of the concept of paraprofessional programs can better be understood when the factors combining to produce such a concept are stated. Therefore, a review of the literature includes documentation of data establishing the role of paraprofessionals in public school systems nationally followed by an evaluation of experimental programs being conducted in selected Michigan school districts.

Overview

In this initial chapter, the problem was defined, the purpose of the research given, the theoretical framework discussed, and an analysis of data presented. A review of the research studies pertinent to this study is presented in Chapter II.

The design of the study is described in Chapter III. In addition, a description of the population and the nature of the sample used is presented. Methods of administration of the instruments is followed by a statement of the statistical methodology employed.

Chapter IV is largely concerned with an analysis of the data gathered in the study. Data are charted, tabulated, and analyzed. In addition, the hypotheses are tested as presented in Chapter III.

The final chapter, Chapter V, consists of summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations drawn from the entire study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter is presented a review of the literature concerned with: (1) the paraprofessional movement--how it began, (2) practical considerations related to the role of paraprofessionals, (3) profile of current paraprofessional programs, and (4) review of related studies.

Part one of the review is addressed to interest in and increased use of paraprofessionals in a historical perspective, while the second part contains a review of a number of concerns relative to the implementation of a consistent, meaningful paraprofessional program.

In part three of the review a number of outstanding paraprofessional programs nationally and in school districts in the state of Michigan are identified. The principal issue pursued in this dissertation mandates such a review in order to document the concept of paraprofessionals.

Reviewed in the fourth part are studies that relate to an attempt to interpret the concept of the role of the paraprofessional in public school education.

The Paraprofessional Movement--How It Began

Acceptance of paraprofessional assistance by the educator is a recent development but by no means universal.

Little was heard of teacher aides before 1960. There were no references to teacher aides in any educational index until 1956. There are early references to various kinds of volunteers: lay readers, tutors and unpaid housewives helping out in various capacities. There are references to homeroom mothers and unpaid fathers filling in as coaches. But one looks in vain for any use of paid non-professional help in the classroom before the 1940's or any discussion by educators until about a decade later.¹

Prior to the 1960's, lay assistance in schools was strictly on a volunteer basis and was generally characterized by the most menial tasks. "The use of paraprofessionals in capacities higher than the traditional volunteer started several years ago in the field of mental health."² Even then, the presence of paraprofessionals was challenged by the professional teacher. Lawson, in her book Role of the Auxiliary: Teaching in the Truest Sense, presented an effective argument in defense of the paraprofessional by presenting a number of suggestions relative to the tasks of that position. She contended that since teaching is a continuous process and is not confined to formal instruction in the classroom, everyone in the school is engaged in informal education of significant value to students. "Ancillary helpers, nevertheless must be ancillary. The qualified teacher will always have to be in charge of the class guiding and directing the activities of both children and auxiliary into fruitful fields of experience and learning."³

Thompson initiated a discussion of the role of the paraprofessional by declaring the paraprofessional to be ". . . neither clerk nor

¹Bennett and Falk, New Careers, p. 13.

²Margaret J. Rioch, "NIMK Study in Training Mental Health Counselors," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 55 (June 1963): 16-31.

³E. M. Lawson, "Role of the Auxiliary: Teaching in the Truest Sense," Times Educational Supplement 2585 (December 18, 1964): 1137.

certified teacher, though she will do considerable typing and some teaching."¹ He continued to point out that the specific talents of the aide will be a determinant in whatever tasks are assigned:

. . . Teachers assisted by the alleviation of the suggested teacher aide can then concentrate on the unquestionable professional aspects of the job: planning and preparing the lesson, leading classroom learning, evaluating progress, and guiding the individual student in matters of subject and self.¹

Gayle Janowitz contended,

Volunteers have an enormous advantage to support and help a child without the pressure of a fixed curriculum. They do not have to teach any specific skill in any specific way. They do, however, have a responsibility to support the child's need to achieve academically and to gain self respect.²

Thus, innovative new plans to help correct inequalities of opportunity include the use of paraprofessionals and other human resources with many skills and talents from all walks of life. Betty Atwell Wright indicated, "In these combinations [professional-paraprofessional] skillful teachers can use their specialized know-how and the diverse professions and accomplishments of non-certified people to revitalize classrooms."³

Recent Forerunners of the Paraprofessional Movement

In spite of the current rapid development of the paraprofessional movement, initial efforts began in the 1940's and 1950's. The

¹S. D. Thompson, "The Emerging Role of the Teacher Aide," The Clearing House 37 (February 1963): 326.

²Ibid., p. 327.

³Gayle Janowitz, Helping Hands (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 43.

⁴Betty Atwell Wright, Teacher Aides to the Rescue (New York: The John Day Company, 1969).

training the utilization of relatively unskilled low income workers is not a new phenomenon. "In the United States, an organized program based on this concept was begun under the National Youth Administration."¹

National Youth Administration

This program emphasized the employment of out-of-school youth as well as potential dropouts. These youngsters were trained and placed as nonprofessionals in the human services. "Unfortunately, the NYA was plainly a white collar worker program administration and had no programmatic follow-up in terms of long run use of auxiliary personnel, nor did it include provisions allowing young people to obtain credentials while in the program."²

Bay City, Michigan, Experiment

"The first major experiment in the utilization of teacher aides was undertaken in Bay City, Michigan, with funds provided by the Ford Foundation."³ "After a preliminary report revealed that teachers were spending between 21% and 69% of their time in non-teaching tasks, the school system employed nine housewives, and other women in the community as teacher aides to perform some chores that do not require professional training."⁴ The Bay City project was the first conscious attempt to improve classroom performance by releasing teachers from clerical and monitorial tasks performed by them. "It was the intent to free the

¹Bennett and Falk, New Careers, p. 16. ²Ibid. ³Ibid.

⁴Bryce Perkins, Getting Better Results from Substitutes, Teacher Aides, and Volunteers (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Successful School Management Series, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 33.

teacher to teach so that the pupils would derive benefits from greater use of his professional competencies."¹

Connecticut and New Jersey Programs

The Connecticut and New Jersey programs were designed to assist administrators in preserving quality education while facing severe shortages. "These two programs were funded by the Ford Foundation and closely resembled the Bay City experiment."² Teaching personnel in these states objected to this concept on the grounds that resources for educational expenditures were scarce; therefore, available funds should be spent for teachers.

Berkeley, California, Program

Another recent forerunner of the paraprofessional concept was the use of college students as aides and tutors to school children in educationally deprived areas. In 1961, the Berkeley, California, school system, in cooperation with the University of California, requested university students to join their teaching staff as volunteer teaching assistants. The success of the program was never documented, but teachers and college volunteers attested to the effectiveness of the program.

¹"A Cooperative Study for the Better Utilization of Teacher Competencies," Second Printed Report (Mount Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan University, 1955).

²Decade of Experiment: 1951-1961 (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, The Ford Foundation, 1961), pp. 431-67.

The Yale-Fairfield Study

In 1954, Yale University and the school district of the city of Fairfield, Connecticut, engaged in a cooperative two-year experiment to use paraprofessionals in a variety of ways. This project was financed by a grant from a fund known as the Advancement of Education. The director of the Yale-Fairfield study made the following observations:

1. There is considerable evidence to support the claim that teacher assistants relieve teachers of routine, non-professional duties thereby providing more time for teaching. This, in turn, spreads the competencies of the master teacher for the benefit of more pupils.
2. The study showed there is validity to the assertion that teaching assistants contribute to the solution of the teacher shortages problem. Working conditions are improved when teacher assistants are used and teacher assistants themselves become interested in professional teacher preparation.¹

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965

In 1965, Congress passed the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which earmarked large amounts of money for direct assistance to schools. The act was passed in part to improve education in disadvantaged neighborhoods. A seldom-referred-to provision of this act was that of \$75,000,000 for the use of paraprofessionals. "Passage of this act clearly demonstrated that obstacles to federal aid to education can be overcome and that the improvement and equalization of American elementary and secondary education is a legitimate, indeed mandatory task for the federal government."²

¹Perkins, "Factors," p. 39.

²"Education," Collier's Yearbook (1966), p. 201.

The Scheuer Amendment

In 1966-1967 the Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act was passed providing \$40,000,000 for the development of demonstration programs for the poor. This program may be considered as an anti-poverty strategy and more specifically as a manpower program. Thus job opportunities for paraprofessionals who were indigenous to the community were made available.

Education Profession Development Act--1968

"EPDA authorized the most comprehensive training program ever launched in any human service area."¹ This act authorized \$240,000,000 for colleges, state and local agencies, and nonprofit private agencies to identify and assist capable youth who were interested in careers in education. It also attempted to utilize local community people in part-time or temporary teaching activities and provided training for teachers, teacher aides, and administration. "Under the impetus of this legislation the use of teacher aides and the development of new careers programs have grown rapidly."²

In spite of the aforementioned programs which were supportive of the paraprofessional concept, teachers questioned the use of paraprofessionals.

In the mid-1960's they feared the introduction of aides was an opening wedge to increase class size or to infringe on their own professional prerogatives. Some felt awkward supervising their new helpers and others worried that pupils would respond more readily to aides because the latter would "always be on the child's

¹Bennett and Falk, op. cit., p. 18.

²Ibid., p. 20.

side," and "against the teacher." Many felt that paraprofessionals would need so much direction and follow-up it would be easier for the classroom teacher to do the job himself."¹

Why Paraprofessionals?

Every teacher, no matter what the grade level, should have an aide, a helper, a co-worker [a paraprofessional] with her in the classroom. It makes no difference whether the helper is a paid aide or an unpaid volunteer. . . . We have long operated on the assumption that one teacher can do all that needs to be done in a good classroom. This is our tradition; it is a bad tradition.²

U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson explicitly stated another important factor in the issue of why paraprofessionals when he said, "Teachers are alone among professional people in volume of nonprofessional work they are required to do."³ Supervising cafeterias during the lunch hour, hall duty between periods, playground supervision at recess time, and the distribution and collection of materials, monies, and reports are but a few of the nonteaching responsibilities confronting today's teacher.

Esbensen contended in an editorial the distinguishing characteristics of a qualified teacher are his ability to analyze the instructional needs of his students, and to prescribe the elements of formal schooling that best meet those needs. He continued to editorialize, "Can we reasonably maintain that the regular teacher is the only

¹Paraprofessionals in Schools: How New Careerists Bolster Education (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972), p. 50.

²Association for Childhood Education International, Aides to Teachers and Children, p. 43.

³Gaylord Nelson, "S-721--Teacher Aide Program Support Act of 1967," The National Elementary Principal 46 (1967): 40.

qualified teacher to (1) hear a child read Dolch's ninety-five most common nouns, (2) read to children, (3) help students locate materials, (4) repeat directions concerning assignments."¹ "Anyone who has taught knows that a teacher--to do everything expected--would need the eyes of Argus, the arms of Shiva, the speed of Mercury and the Strength of Galahad."² These contentions are not new. Recent literature on this subject consistently substantiates the idea that teachers may do a better job of teaching with paraprofessional assistance.

Thus, new educational roles are being created in school systems in this country as the need for increased human services emerges. Hadden felt that actions of the federal government have had a significant impact on revising the schools' educational programs. She wrote, "To some extent, the impetus for change stems from federal programs designed to benefit children from low income families."³ Kvaraceus continued, "It will be necessary to make some wholesale changes--to establish new policies, seek new legislation, secure new monies, arrange time and organization of school, day and night differently; to deploy the professional staff more effectively, to add new types of school

¹T. Esbensen, "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks," Phi Delta Kappan 47 (January 1960): 237.

²Aides for Better Schools, Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (Raleigh, North Carolina: State Department of Public Instruction, July, 1962).

³Marise Alvena Tabor Bell Hadden, "An Analysis of the Emerging Roles of the Paraprofessional School Community Aide With Implications for Strategies for Social Change in Disadvantaged Areas" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 44.

workers such as coordinators and paraprofessional assistants."¹ We must give more attention to identifying differentiated staffing responsibilities as they relate to specific tasks.

In this view, it is quite proper for the paraprofessional to be more than a clerical assistant. "The usefulness of the teacher aide should be restricted only by his own personal limitation in whatever duties that may be assigned to him by the regular classroom teacher."²

"There is a need at most levels of education for determining those activities, responsibilities, tasks and behaviors necessary for successful participation of teacher aides in the school setting."³

Bryce Perkins indicated,

Grade level has a decided bearing on the tasks that paraprofessionals may perform as do also special competencies of the paraprofessional and her interest and ability to work with children and adults, variations in the legal requirements regarding the use of non certified personnel in the classroom, and views and convictions of educators concerning the role of professionally trained teachers.⁴

Effect of Paraprofessional Assistance on Teachers and the Teaching Profession

On the basis of a study dealing with the impact of paraprofessionals on teachers in New York City, the following findings were listed:

¹William Kvaraceus, "Poverty, Education, and Race Relations," in Poverty, Education and Race Relations, ed. William Kvaraceus (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967).

²Esbensen, loc. cit.

³Garland W. McNutt, "An Analysis of the Role Expectations of Professional Teachers and Non Professional Teacher Aides" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969), p. 37.

⁴Perkins, Getting Better Results, p. 34.

1. The results of interviews with teachers showed strong support for paraprofessionals.
2. About half of the teachers reported a better relationship with children in their classes and half indicated a better understanding of the surrounding community and of minority groups.
3. Most teachers said that their own work had changed as a result, in that they were assuming additional jobs and using new skills.
4. Teachers reported giving increased responsibility to paraprofessionals.¹

The use of paraprofessional services will also affect teacher educational programs. Under the career lattice plan, the paraprofessional classification may become a regular part of teacher training programs. Students will receive valuable classroom experience. Colleges of education can work closely with schools so that various programs of work and study will complement one another.

Employment of Paraprofessionals and the Involved Expense

Implicit with increased employment of paraprofessionals is the concomitant increased expenditure of funds. Though costs may be minimized to a significant degree by federal funds, improvement in any field costs money. Probably the most important question is whether the advantages gained from paraprofessional services warrant additional costs. "Allocating funds for paraprofessionals can help to prevent the waste of time, money, and resources which occur when professional people who are prepared to teach are prevented from developing their potential."²

¹"Paraprofessional Influence on Student Achievement and Attitudes," A Study for the Board of Education of the City of New York, Institute for Educational Development (New York: September, 1971, Executive Summary), p. 5.

²"Auxiliary School Personnel," The National School Principal 46 (1967): 11.

When teachers have the time to develop expertise in more professional activities this is an important step toward ensuring that the education students receive is the best available.

Training the Paraprofessional

No definite guidelines can be found relative to desirable educational levels of paraprofessionals. Prior to reporting on the job, paraprofessionals are the recipients of little or no training--except for brief orientation sessions. Once the paraprofessional begins to work, he is generally taught by the teacher. Inservice workshop classes are usually held and it is in these classes that paraprofessionals learn how to make instructional materials, operate audio-visual equipment, and engage in a variety of additional educational experiences.¹

Exploitation--How It Can Be Avoided

Professionals fear that increased use of paraprofessional assistance could very easily become a cost-cutting scheme. To prevent such exploitation, it is incumbent upon teachers, administrators, parents, and members of boards of education to negate the possibility of this situation ever developing by being aware of the issue involved. One safeguard against this type of exploitation is to have the function of paraprofessionals specified by certified teachers.²

Role of Institutions of Higher Learning

Probably the most important service to be rendered by institutions of higher learning is to provide internships and student teaching

¹Ibid., p. 11.

²Ibid.

in schools employing paraprofessional personnel. Universities, colleges, and junior colleges may also consider programs providing direct training for paraprofessionals.¹

Role of Local Boards of Education, State Boards of Education, and Local Education Associations

Board members and citizens of the local constituency should become knowledgeable about the issues, problems, and advantages involved in employing paraprofessional personnel.

Most state departments of education are charged with specific responsibilities because certain federally funded programs such as ESEA Title I encourage the employment of paraprofessionals. Therefore, guidelines should be devised for school districts to implement reasonable proficiency requirements. Methods of protecting all parties affected by employment of paraprofessionals should be devised and, in addition, experimentation should be encouraged.

Members of professional organizations can become informed about the issues concerning the selecting, training, and assigning of paraprofessional personnel. In addition, local association officers should be prepared to be of assistance to local administrators and board members, when needed.

Profile of Current National Paraprofessional Programs

"The centrality of creating jobs for the unemployed in the NYA approach, and the emphasis upon budgetary considerations which prevailed

¹Ibid., p. 12.

in the Bay City experiment had not produced lasting results. Planners of the current new careers movement sought a rationale and a focus having a more lasting impact."¹ Innovative characteristics of the new approach were as follows:

1. The emphasis of the right of all people to essential human services.
2. The shift from the creation of entry level jobs leading nowhere, to the concept of a career ladder, with training available at each step for those who seek and merit upward mobility.
3. The emphasis upon the involvement of low-income workers as participants in the process of problem-solving, rather than as recipients of the wisdom and beneficence of those far removed from the realities of poverty.
4. A more systematic approach to the program, including role development, training and institutionalization of auxiliary personnel as a stable and integral part of public service.²

The human values inherent in the new careers movement include not only self-fulfillment, but also give to individuals an opportunity to make significant contributions to the education of youth.

If we are going to make the learning experience meaningful and rewarding for our students, then we must avoid using paraprofessionals primarily as disciplinarians, housekeepers, or monitors of student activity. We must begin to involve them in experiences relevant to their own skills and talents and to the learning growth of students.³

The following examples of contemporary national and statewide programs will exemplify new career priorities as cited above.

¹Bowman and Klopff, New Careers, p. 7.

²Ibid., p. 8.

³Dwight W. Allen and Gary L. Morrison, "Differentiated Staffing and the Non-Professional: A Need for Educational Personnel Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education 5 (Winter 1972): 53.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

Paraprofessional programs in Minneapolis are regarded as among the nation's most outstanding. Beginning in 1965 under Title I, ESEA, the Minneapolis school district presently employs approximately 650 elementary aides and 350 secondary aides in more than 100 schools. The \$1.5 million program is financed by federal, state, and local funds.

Prospective employees must take oral and written tests and are hired according to civil service procedures. The main condition for employment is the desire to work with children and an ability to relate meaningfully to students. Residents of the school community are given preference.

Innumerable training opportunities exist for each type of aide. Training includes preservice and inservice programs, course work at the local vocational high school, school-initiated workshops, adult education, day or extension courses at Minnesota University, and specialized course work taught by KTCA-TV.

A very appealing feature of the Minneapolis program is career ladder provisions consisting of three progressively responsible categories and six steps within each category. For each type paraprofessional training procedures and selection criteria are carefully worked out.

Minneapolis program directors claim that by investing \$5,400 per trainee, they get a return of from \$1.04 to \$1.59 for each dollar invested. New careerists also do well in college, performing better than most junior college students. . . . The Minneapolis findings on how aides do in colleges were echoed by a survey by the New Careers Development Center, NYU, which focused on programs designed for full time employees in human service agencies (including schools) who were given time off with pay to attend college. The paraprofessionals-in-training did as well as or better than

other students in similar courses; some 60% matched the performance of others, and 20% surpassed that level. In one-half of the programs, the dropout rates were lower than for other students and Ohio University found that the dropout rate for paraprofessionals was 11% compared to 40% for the average freshman.¹

New York City

In 1957, the position of "school aide" was created and funded by the New York State Urban Education Program. Employees designated as "school aides" were directly responsible to the principal and were assigned no instructional tasks. Assignments were quite menial and tasks included relieving teachers of playground duties, taking stock inventories, and assisting in the lunchroom.

With the implementation of the ESEA in 1965 and the New York State Urban Education Programs, additional positions were created by the local school board of New York City. "Unlike the city funded school aides, persons employed under federal and state auspices were regarded as 'paraprofessionals' rather than 'aides.'"² Under this classification, paraprofessionals were expected to perform semi-professional tasks in assigned classrooms. In addition, paraprofessionals were expected to affect the attitudes and achievement of students by working directly with them in semi-instructional capacities.

Heightened awareness for what paraprofessionals could effect was accompanied by an expansion of job titles and job descriptions for paraprofessionals. The Board of Education created four kinds of paraprofessional positions for the classroom:

¹Paraprofessionals in Schools, p. 58.

²Ibid., p. 59.

1. Educational assistants were employed to help classroom teachers plan and conduct lessons.
2. Educational associates were given duties with greater responsibilities than educational assistants.
3. Student aides were employed to help younger children with homework.
4. Teacher aides were appointed to assist classroom teachers in routine non-professional tasks.¹

Dade County, Florida

Dade County employs in excess of 1,200 paraprofessionals of all races. Quick identification of the potential employee is helpful to planning and implementing a substantial program. Thus, the Dade County director of training programs for lay assistance emphasized two selective criteria:

1. the desire to work and help children learn.²
2. to commit themselves to a training program.²

In view of the foregoing information, the pay schedule is as follows:

1. The starting salary is \$16.59 per day; after five years the salary is \$21.17 per day.
2. Paraprofessionals who have received at least two years (60 hours) of college training start at \$21.17 daily and reach a maximum of \$27.02 per day after five years of service.³

A majority of paraprofessionals work toward associate degrees-- something that is made possible through the coordinated efforts of the Miami-Dade Junior College. Two courses are set up especially for paraprofessionals and such courses are offered to them during regular school hours and credit is earned for taking one or all ten individualized teacher aide training courses, which cover a wide range of topics including recognizing how children develop, demonstrating map and globe

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 62.

skills, promoting human relations through team teaching, and clarifying paraprofessional roles and responsibilities.

Available funds determine the number of paraprofessionals the system may employ. Most schools are enthusiastic about the potential of paraprofessionals. The director indicated, "Aides are here to stay. The results are obvious. Most teachers are delighted to have them. In fact, the demand exceeds the supply."¹

Profile of Selected Paraprofessional Programs
in the State of Michigan

Saginaw

Saginaw is located in the eastern section of central Michigan. In 1970, it had a population of 90,603. The total number of students enrolled in the public schools in the spring of 1969 was approximately 23,000 with 3,740 Title I eligible students inclusive. The school district of the city of Saginaw had a per capita evaluation for each child of \$18,055 and its operational millage was 23.8. School enrollments were reported as 47 percent black. "Composite test scores of basic skills in the elementary grades uniformly turned out to be below national averages. Teacher turnover in the inner city was reported as 25%."²

¹Ibid., p. 63.

²Final Technical Report on 1969 Fiscal Year E.P.D.A. B-2 Programs (Lansing: State of Michigan, 1969), p. 4.

Recruitment and Selection

Trainees for this program were recruited by elementary principals who contacted former aides and also by checking federal files for previous applicants. In addition the program director interviewed applicants. However, final employment and placement was effected by principals.

Selective criteria were as follows:

1. Ability to communicate
2. Personality and attitude
3. Appearance
4. Completion of an application form
5. Evidence of some previous experience in working with children, i.e., Sunday school teacher, summer camp counselor, etc.

Thirty-five potential paraprofessionals were recruited by the project director, principals, and teachers. Thirty-one recruits completed the program; twenty-eight were assigned to the language master program, and three to librarians. Teachers and principals were participants in an orientation program instructing trainees in their responsibilities as paraprofessionals.

Trainee Profile

Of those paraprofessionals reporting:

1. Twenty-five were female.
2. Sixteen were previously employed in Title I programs.
3. Twenty-one were married, one was single, and one was a divorcee.

4. Family income was as follows:

<u>Less than \$1,000</u>	<u>\$2,000-\$2,999</u>	<u>\$3,000-\$3,999</u>		
1	1	1		
			<u>\$4,000-\$4,999</u>	<u>\$5,000-\$5,999</u>
			2	4
				<u>\$7,000+</u>
				15
				<u>No Response</u>
				1

5. Educational Training:

- a. Five trainees had less than a high school diploma.
- b. Sixteen trainees were high school graduates.
- c. Four trainees had one year of college.

6. Race:

<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Spanish-American</u>
15	7	3

Preservice Programs

A four-week noncredit preservice program was offered paraprofessional trainees. Communication skills relevant to paraprofessional needs were featured. It was intended that applicants would understand their roles as a complement to teaching efforts. Therefore, the following skills were taught:

1. Instruction in reading and telling stories.
2. Proper use of the instructional materials center.
3. Maintaining good human relations practices.
3. Use of acceptable speech patterns.
5. Legible handwriting.

Duties Performed by Paraprofessionals

All twenty-five paraprofessionals offered tutorial services to individual students. Nineteen paraprofessionals assisted students in

improving special skills, sixteen helped chaperone field trips, seventeen worked with small groups, and sixteen took small groups to the library. Areas of infrequent involvement included counseling pupils and directing program learning experiences.

Noninstructional tasks included changing bulletin boards, duplicating instructional materials, duties for the general appearance of the classroom, and hall and lunchroom supervision. Infrequent activities included operation of audio-visual equipment, filing, and cataloging instructional aids.

Trainee Evaluation

Paraprofessionals highly regarded information received in the preservice program. They felt too little, if any, guidance was given regarding the use of office machines, techniques in administering first-aid, and filing and cataloging skills. Paraprofessionals were involved, to some extent, in staff meetings and some contacts with specialized personnel were experienced. Nevertheless, they indicated a desire to receive more instruction in test administration and increased assistance from specialized personnel.

Evaluation of Supervising Teachers

Teacher reactions to quality of services rendered by paraprofessionals indicated improved discipline, improved pupil performance, moderate increase in use of innovative techniques, significant increase in instructional time with pupils as well as individualization of instruction.

Principals rated their behavior as alert and confident. This was particularly true where enthusiasm and interest in pupils, patience, and a sense of humor were concerned. The pervading view was supportive of a refinement of study skills.

The director agreed there was increased teacher effectiveness, contribution to quality education, increased pupil-adult interaction, increased student achievement, and increased staff awareness of ethnic groups and disadvantaged children.

Evidence indicated the Saginaw Paraprofessional Program was approved by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals themselves. Indicative of the program's success was a school district report of employment for the school year 1970-1971. Twenty-seven paraprofessionals were reemployed in varying positions during 1970-1971.

Wayne Intermediate School District

The Wayne County Intermediate School District is an area of 622 square miles. Approximately 695,508 students in 37 local school districts attend 1,037 schools. Detroit, the largest city in the Wayne Intermediate School District, is located on the southeastern border of Michigan and has a population of 1,492,914. The educational problems existing in this metropolitan complex are like those in similar metropolitan areas throughout the United States. The educational and physical drain on teachers in this intermediate district is overwhelming. These demands hamper efforts to prevent reading failures during the important years of elementary education. "Improved learning of students will come only when the position of the teacher is more manageable. Paraprofessionals in schools promise increased student learning,

otherwise large numbers of minority group students from low income families in Wayne County are destined to reading failure."¹

Recruitment and Selection

Local school districts conducted their own recruiting. Officers within those districts, usually federal and state program coordinators, assumed this responsibility. Ninety-eight residents of the Wayne Intermediate School District were selected and trained as paraprofessionals to teachers with the reading program. Although immediate employment of paraprofessionals in the school setting solved basic needs of the employed persons for new careers, personnel in the various school districts recognized that such employment "mitigates against desirable outcomes without continued training of both paraprofessionals and professionals."² A plan of upward mobility was an integral part of this specific training program. Such training is essential if paraprofessionals are to become an integral part of the educational enterprise. According to Bowman and Klopff, the need is to "shift from the creation of entry level jobs leading nowhere to the concept of a career ladder with training available at each step for those who seek and merit upward mobility."³

¹State of Michigan Final Evaluation Report of Fiscal Year 1971, E.P.D.A. B-2 Programs (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1971), p. 45.

²Wayne County Intermediate School District, "Application for Approved Local Education Proposal for Paraprofessional Training" (Detroit: Wayne County Intermediate School District, March 4, 1971), p. 2.

³Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopff, Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training, and Institutionalization (New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1967), p. 3.

Trainee Profile

Twenty-five prospective paraprofessionals were American-Indian, the rest Caucasian. Fifteen persons were residents of inner-city Detroit, twelve persons being selected from the Detroit Archdiocesan Elementary Schools. Ninety-three of the ninety-six trainees who completed the program were female and three were male. High school diplomas were held by thirty-six individuals, ten persons had some college training, forty-eight held college degrees but were unemployed. One trainee earned less than \$4,000 per year, while forty-two individuals had an annual income of \$10,000+. The remaining fifty-three persons were unemployed.

Pre- and Inservice Training

Four hours of intensive training were offered students at Wayne State University. The program focused on emerging educational roles and was aimed at developing paraprofessional proficiency to provide direct service to pupils during the school day. The most innovative experiences provided students were:

1. Paraprofessionals learned how to use a variety of reading instructional techniques.
2. Paraprofessionals were exposed to various cultural enrichment components such as theaters, concerts, museums, and library tours.
3. Paraprofessionals developed skills in using the Wayne County Pre-Reading Kit Materials effectively.
4. Paraprofessionals developed skills for administering and using diagnostic reading tests.¹

¹Final Evaluation Report, 1971, p. 46.

Evaluation

Responses from trainees were in general positive. Most felt that inservice training was beneficial. Sixty-four students indicated satisfaction in program organization and content relevancy as pertaining to inservice workshop participants. Nevertheless, forty-two persons did not concur with the majority opinion. These individuals felt their training was not relevant to the tasks expected of them--tasks such as clerical skills, first-aid, and record-keeping techniques.

Most cooperating teachers indicated satisfaction with the program and expressed a desire to be similarly involved in the future.

Teacher reaction revealed the following facts:

1. Students were the recipients of increased instructional time on an individual basis.
2. The acquisition of reading skills by paraprofessionals was indicative of the success of the instructional program offered at Wayne State University.
3. Paraprofessional confidence in themselves was enhanced by their experiences at Wayne State University.
4. Mixed feelings relative to increased attendance and pupil discipline.

As reflected by the attitudes of supervising teachers, members of the project staff were convinced of the program's success. They felt program objectives had been reached. In addition, staff members were now confident that paraprofessionals could acquire the skills necessary to work effectively with students who had reading disabilities.

Flint Community Schools

The school district of the city of Flint, Michigan, is the second largest in the state of Michigan. During the 1971-1972 school year, 10,578 students were involved in Title I programs and 7,100 ADC children resided in the district. Flint had a wide variety of federal, state, and locally funded programs prior to the beginning of its paraprofessional pretraining project. Hence, approximately 350 paraprofessionals were already employed in programs such as Headstart, Follow-Through, Model Cities Pre-School, Middle Cities, and Action Now. Personnel who were closely associated with paraprofessional employees felt that newly hired paraprofessionals had little or no understanding of the skills needed to work effectively with students.

Recruitment and Selection

The Flint Community School District recruited twenty-five community persons and provided them with training to assist teachers in working with disadvantaged children. Twenty-three recruits completed the program and were employed by the Flint school district for the 1972-1973 school year. Three trainees did not continue in the program due to illness or inability to meet the daily tasks required in the classroom.

Trainee Profile

All trainees were females. Nineteen persons were Black and five were Caucasian. Twenty-two persons of twenty-five had a high school education but no college. Three persons had some college training but were not graduates. Prior to entering the program, only two

persons earned over \$10,000. Income of the remaining twenty-three was below \$4,000 per year. Trainees were either inner-city or model city residents. In addition, all trainees except two were unemployed persons and on ADC.

Pre- and Inservice Education

Preservice training consisted of a planned, systematic series of courses necessary for outstanding performance as paraprofessionals in an educational setting.

Inservice activities consisted of four two-hour sessions during the trainee's practicum experience. These activities were based upon the expressed needs of professionals and paraprofessionals and actually enlarged upon the scope of preservice sessions. Four two-hour concurrent sessions enabled teachers and paraprofessionals to work together clarifying job descriptions. Specific techniques were used at the workshops including role-playing, sensitivity training, and practice sessions using instructional hardware.

Evaluation by Trainees

Most trainees regarded highly the opportunity to observe and participate in classroom activities on a limited basis. They felt the opportunity for consistent dialogue between themselves and an evaluator enhanced their effectiveness as assistants to teachers in the instructional program. All trainees felt a need for more techniques in behavior modification prior to any classroom assignments.

Evaluation by Teachers and Administrators

Most teachers and administrators indicated great satisfaction with assigned paraprofessionals. Staff members reported noticeable proficiency on the part of paraprofessionals who had been the recipients of inservice training programs as opposed to those paraprofessionals who had had no training. The major problem encountered was in communicating to administrators performance and personality problems which arose during workshop participation. Teachers felt some of the major problems they dealt with might have been avoided had assignments been different.

Evaluation by Project Directors

The major objective of the Flint program was to adequately train competent personnel for assignment as paraprofessionals. The project director felt program objectives were realized and she believed they were relevant. Pupil learning had increased, community relations had improved, and teachers had more time to devote to students.

Review of Related Studies

In 1961, Bryce Perkins conducted a study which was concerned with defining the role of the paraprofessional and with identifying criteria for their selection. In addition, Perkins was interested in the contributions paraprofessionals could make for the purpose of appraising the development of the role of paraprofessionals in the elementary schools of Norwalk, Connecticut.

Most of the educational programs using paraprofessional personnel were surveyed and the selection of a panel of jurors who assisted in the

study was made from lists obtained from forty-seven school superintendents or members of their supervisory staffs.

From related research, Perkins formulated three definitions of the role of paraprofessionals, twelve criteria for their selection, and eighteen criteria for the actual role paraprofessionals may assume within the educational process. These definitions and criteria were submitted for validation to sixty-nine jurors who had been associated with programs featuring paraprofessional personnel. Jurors were asked to accept, reject, change, or suggest new definitions or criteria. Sixty-one respondents were submitted in time to be included in the validation of the instrument.

On the basis of information submitted by jurors, a definition of the role of the paraprofessional was formulated which served as the basis for this study. From the responses of the jurors to the criteria for their selection and criteria for the actual role of paraprofessionals, an evaluative opinionnaire was developed. The final instrument contained twenty actual tasks and fourteen criteria for selection. In order to determine the extent that the criteria had been realized in the Norwalk School System, a three-point scale was used which the respondents checked to indicate judgments. In addition, a special column for comments on each criterion was provided. Six principals, eleven team teachers, and six teacher aides constituted the population in this study.

It was contended that through an integration of opinions and ideas of educators, a definition of the role of the paraprofessional could be formulated which might be useful in establishing criteria for

the use of paraprofessional personnel. Furthermore, the study attempted to identify the personal characteristics, practices, competencies which contribute to the development and success of the paraprofessional worker in the public schools.

A definition agreed upon by the panel of experts was as follows:

The role of the paraprofessional is to assist the classroom teacher with routine procedures and under his direction to perform special assignments. The assignments will vary according to the nature of the special competencies and to the degree of interest and ability to work with children and adults that the paraprofessional may have.¹

A further conclusion included ten criteria for selection of paraprofessionals and twenty criteria for the actual role of paraprofessionals. The ten criteria for selection were as follows:

1. Good moral character
2. Evidence of good physical and mental health
3. Good grooming
4. Good English usage
5. Pleasing personality
6. Average intelligence
7. Successful experience working with children
8. Some formal education beyond high school desirable
9. Liking for children and youth
10. Ability to work under the supervision of the classroom teacher

Perkins also enumerated the criteria which may be desired for specific positions. They are ability to play the piano, artistic

¹Perkins, "Factors," p. 138.

ability, and subject matter background or specialization if the para-professional is to correct English themes.

Some specific role assignments outlined in Perkins' study were as follows:

1. Serves as a resource person in subject matter content depending upon training and experience
2. Prepares visual materials for instruction as determined by the teacher
3. Operates audio-visual devices
4. Supervises certain work-study periods when standards are set by the teacher
5. Serves as a library assistant
6. Reads stories to children when the purposes have been clearly established by the teacher
7. Supervises the playground under certain conditions
8. Supervises the school lunchroom
9. Provides tutorial assistance under the direction of the teacher
10. Corrects certain English themes according to criteria established by the teacher
11. Corrects objective tests under teacher supervision
12. Prepares certain records and reports as directed by the teacher and reproduces others prepared by the teacher
13. Gives certain drills related to lessons when the material is planned by the teacher and prepared under her direction
14. Supervises money collection
15. Handles routine interruptions
16. Provides clerical assistance
17. Serves as a piano accompanist for music and games
18. Assists with housekeeping chores and bulletin board arrangements

19. Assists with bus duty and related tasks
20. Assists the teacher with opening exercises, large group lessons, and demonstrations

In 1970, G. W. McNutt completed a study devoted to examining the role expectations of professional teachers and nonprofessional teacher aides as perceived by role incumbents. Additionally, the non-professional teacher aide position was examined to determine if dissension was indicated by selected variables. The population included all teacher aides and one supervising teacher for each aide. Four selected school systems were used in the study.

Responses concerning role relationships were elicited by means of two instruments: a division-of-labor instrument developed to assess expectations for tasks and functions performed, and an on-the-job expectations instrument developed to assess expectations for attributes and behaviors of the incumbents of both positions. The division-of-labor instrument included three submeasures, one for "the most technical" tasks, one for "the less technical" tasks. These tasks were classified by the judges according to the degree of professional competence required for each group.

Analysis of the data collected for the study resulted in the findings enumerated below:

1. Incumbents of both the professional and nonprofessional position specified a division such that there was a statistically significant difference between task functions assigned to their own position and to the counter position.
2. There was no statistically significant difference between the assignments of "least technical" functions to the professionals by incumbents of the non-professional position and incumbents of the professional position.

3. There was statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "most technical" functions to the professionals by incumbents of the non-professional position and incumbents of the professional position.
4. There was statistically significant difference between the assignments of the "less technical" functions to professionals by incumbents of the non-professional position.
5. There were no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professionals and non-professionals for the non-professional position.
6. There were no statistically significant different on-the-job expectations between the professionals and non-professionals for the professional position.
7. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to race.
8. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to previous training.
9. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to age.
10. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to educational level.
11. There was no statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to previous experience.
12. There was statistically significant difference between role expectations of non-professionals according to economic status.¹

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter has provided a theoretical framework for a comparison of the role concept of paraprofessionals by their peers. A review of the literature has focused attention on ideas of central importance to this study. One of these

¹McNutt, "An Analysis."

is that if paraprofessionals are to make their fullest contribution to school programs, their tasks must be clearly defined so they can be trained to provide maximum service. Teachers and principals must also understand the paraprofessional's role.

Second, questions concerning the limitations of the school paraprofessional are frequently raised in the literature. What should the paraprofessional be permitted to do? What should the paraprofessional not be permitted to do? Such questions are central to the issue of role definition and procedures to be established as related to credentialing or licensing.

A third idea of central importance is that the ultimate objectives of career development include both differentiated staffing and differentiated education so that improved educational services might be provided students.

Fourth, communities are insisting that school personnel expect more from youngsters. There is a new demand for accountability which is likely to manifest itself in new methods for evaluation and quality control. Schools have to concentrate on cognitive development in a variety of approaches that will be of educational value to students. It is noteworthy that the use of paraprofessionals has some added hope for success. They may serve as models and generally assist in the development of self-concept of the youngsters or may be able to establish contact with students in a more informal way.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The principal aim of this study was to compare the role perceptions of paraprofessionals as perceived by certain principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. In addition, this study investigated the actual role delegated to paraprofessionals in the school districts of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Pontiac, Michigan. This chapter is primarily concerned with a description of the locales in which this study took place, composition of the sample, data collection procedures utilized, and methods used for treatment of the data. In addition, the research hypotheses to be tested are listed.

Demographic Structure of Selected School Districts

Grand Rapids

Grand Rapids¹ is a city of approximately 255,000 residents within a metropolitan area of 550,000 people. It is the seat of county government that includes eleven surrounding metropolitan areas. The Grand Rapids city commission governs the Grand Rapids School District.

The Black population of Grand Rapids comprises approximately 20 percent of the total population. Most of these residents live near

¹All data on Grand Rapids, Michigan, were taken from Paraprofessional Aide Pre-Service and In-Service (Abstract, Grand Rapids Special Programs Office, March 4, 1971), p. 2.

the southeast section of the city. Latinos make up 2 percent of the total population, the majority of whom live in the southeast-southwest section of Grand Rapids.

The school district of Grand Rapids, Michigan, consists of the following schools:

55 elementary schools	7 special education schools
4 middle schools	1 educational park
5 junior high schools	1 junior college
4 senior high schools	

Parochial schools are attended by some 16,000 students, the majority of whom are white.

Grand Rapids is presently operating under a board-approved desegregation plan pending a decision by the courts on this issue.

Lansing

The Lansing School District¹ includes an area of approximately fifty square miles. The school district of Lansing is larger than the city of Lansing, and its boundary extends beyond the city in every direction. Thirty-three thousand students attend school in the Lansing school district. The number of educational facilities available to students is as follows:

48 elementary schools (K-6)
5 junior high schools (7-9)
4 senior high schools (10-12)

Racial distribution of students is:

25,010 or 77 percent Caucasian
4,600 or 13 percent Black
2,400 or 7 percent Spanish-American
990 or .3 percent American Indian

¹All data on Lansing, Michigan, were taken from Desegregation Plan Proposal (Lansing: Lansing Board of Education, 1972), introd., p. 5.

The total professional staff numbers approximately 1,750 members with 13.5 percent or 236 being minority members.

The Lansing School District has implemented a non-court-ordered desegregation plan of its own to eliminate, reduce, and prevent minority group isolation in Lansing schools. The intent is to eliminate minority group segregation, to eliminate discrimination among students and faculty, and to overcome the educational disadvantages of minorities.

Pontiac

The city of Pontiac¹ is an industrial city of 85,000 people located in the northern section of Oakland County. It is twenty-five miles northwest of downtown Detroit. Pontiac operates under a commission and city manager form of government. Three large General Motors plants are located within the city and offer employment, directly or indirectly, to a large majority of the population. The three plants contribute about 50 percent of the local tax revenue. The working force is about half blue collar and half white collar. According to the 1970 census, the school district of the city of Pontiac includes 120,000 people as compared to almost 700,000 in Oakland County. The 30 percent Negro population exceeds the Black percentage of both the state and county level. The percentage of economically deprived persons also exceeds the state and county level, as evidenced by the distribution of ESEA Title I and OEO programs. Of the eight Michigan cities having the

¹Data on Pontiac, Michigan, were taken from Demonstration City Proposal (Pontiac, Michigan: Comprehensive Career Education, Office of Community Action Programs, 1973).

largest number of Blacks, Pontiac ranks fifth. There are 8,500 Mexican-Americans and 1,500 Puerto Rican residents in Pontiac.

The number of schools available to students in Pontiac is as follows:

23 elementary schools
6 junior high schools
2 senior high schools

Academically, Pontiac has the same problems that face all major urban cities. A significant portion of heads of households in Pontiac are seriously lacking in education. The average number of years completed in school by males in Pontiac is 10.5 as compared to 10.8 for females. In comparison, the average years of schooling completed in Oakland County is 12.4 for males as compared with 12.3 for females.

Prior to the 1971-1972 school year, the school district of the city of Pontiac was ordered to desegregate its schools.¹ To comply with this court order, the school district developed and implemented a plan to achieve racial balance through the busing of students and reassignment of professional staff.

Selection of the Sample

The population for this study included a random sampling of forty experts selected from a listing of local, state, and national Career Opportunity Directors and cooperating college and university representatives. These names were obtained from the Career Opportunities

¹ Application for Assistance Under the Emergency School Aid Act, School District of the City of Pontiac, February 1, 1973. Appendix A, p. 1. Summary and Final Report of the Research-Evaluation.

Program Directory for 1972.¹ Panelists were classified by occupation as follows:

1. College and university faculty members
2. Employees of state and local administrative units
3. Specialists within the United States Office of Education

The panel of experts was randomly selected using the following formula:²

$$\frac{N_i}{N} \times 40$$

where: N_i = Number of panelists in group

State and local = 181

College and university = 60

Federal specialists = 40

N = Total number of panelists listed in the Career Opportunity Program Directory = 281

Therefore, the total number of panelists within a specific occupational track is indicated below.

College and university faculty members -- 8 or 20 percent

State and local administrative units -- 26 or 70 percent

Specialists--U.S. Office of Education -- 6 or 10 percent

The panel of experts was a nationally representative sample of forty experts from twenty-three states within the United States of America and Washington, D.C. Panelists in this study were closely

¹"Career Opportunities Program Directory for 1972" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Career Opportunities Program, 1972).

²Research assistance provided by the Department of Research Consultative Services, College of Education, Michigan State University.

associated with programs making use of paraprofessionals and were chosen because of research they have conducted in the area of paraprofessional utilization.

Directors of paraprofessional programs in the Michigan school districts of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Pontiac submitted reports indicating the number of elementary schools utilizing paraprofessional services. One principal, one teacher, and one paraprofessional were selected from certain schools in three school districts. Ninety participants were used. For purposes of this research, ninety was regarded as high enough proportionally to be representative of a randomly sampled population.

The number of principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals selected was determined by the following formula:

$$\frac{N_i}{N} \times 90$$

Where:

N_i = Number of elementary schools in each school district

N = Total number of elementary schools = 126

$$\text{Grand Rapids: } \frac{55}{126} \times 90 = 40$$

$$\text{Lansing: } \frac{48}{126} \times 90 = 34$$

$$\text{Pontiac: } \frac{23}{126} \times 90 = 16$$

Using a table of random numbers, forty principals, forty teachers, and forty paraprofessionals were selected from Grand Rapids; thirty-four principals, thirty-four teachers, and thirty-four

paraprofessionals were selected from Lansing; and sixteen principals, sixteen teachers, and sixteen paraprofessionals were selected from Pontiac.

These school districts were selected because of similarities in multi-racial composition and also because of the multiplicity of federal programs permitting use of paraprofessionals in classrooms.

Procedures

Selected school districts were contacted by mail requesting their cooperation in the study. Each of the selected schools responded affirmatively. A letter of procedure was first sent to administrators in charge of paraprofessional programs. Thereafter, 270 questionnaires were sent to principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in participating schools. Each packet was coded for each school district involved and sent to principals of the respective schools. Packets contained a letter of explanation to each participant, a questionnaire, and a stamped, addressed envelope. Participants were requested to complete the inventories according to directions, place them in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelopes, and return to principals, who, in turn, were requested to mail them.

The data of this research project were programmed for computer analysis. Data were analyzed to ascertain perceptions of respondents regarding the degree to which programs in District A, District B, and District C were in harmony with criteria established by selected authorities.

Instrumentation

Since this study was done subsequent to a previous study conducted by Bryce Perkins in 1961 at New York University, questionnaires used by the author were replicated for this study. All items were validated as a result of personal conferences by Bryce Perkins with university officials, school superintendents, teachers, and principals in Michigan, Colorado, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. Further validation was obtained from the literature, studies conducted at Central Michigan University, and studies conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Three identical questionnaires were sent to a panel of forty experts inviting their responses. Part one focused on the definition of the role of the paraprofessional and consisted of three definitions. The respondents selected one of the definitions or included a new definition. Part two was related to the role of the paraprofessional and contained twenty role functions. Part three was concerned with criteria for selection and contained twelve items. The panel of experts was asked to accept, accept in part, or reject the items included in parts two and three of the questionnaire. The purpose of distributing questionnaires to the forty members of the panel of experts was to validate the definition, the role function, and criteria for selecting paraprofessionals. Responses to the questionnaires were tabulated and reported in percentages; items accepted by a three-fourths majority of the panel of experts were retained and recommended changes in phraseology were made. Once these changes were made, the questionnaire was distributed to principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in Michigan school

districts to respond to statements regarding the actual role of paraprofessionals. These data were expected to provide insights into the perceptions each occupational group held about the emerging role of the paraprofessional.

Hypotheses

Problem

The purpose of this research was to study role perceptions of paraprofessionals as perceived by certain principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, and to determine if there is a relationship between the role perception of paraprofessionals when compared with principals', teachers', and paraprofessionals' role perceptions.

- Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the distribution of responses to specific questions reflecting the role concept of paraprofessionals as measured by the Definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional Survey Instrument.
- Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences of responses to item two (prepares and previews film) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences of responses to item five (supervises various auxiliary school services) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences of responses to item seven (assist students on difficult information or make-up work) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences of responses to item eight (setting up materials to create an environment for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

- Null Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (preparation of materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (confers with teacher regarding appropriate strategies for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences of responses to item sixteen (records data on cumulative records) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences of responses to item twenty (arranges for field trips) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences of responses to item nine (liking of children) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 11: There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (ability to work with school personnel) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 12: There are no significant differences of responses to item six (average intelligence) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
- Null Hypothesis 13: There are no significant differences of responses to item thirteen (artistic ability) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Null Hypothesis 14: There are no significant differences of responses to item fourteen (willing to accept responsibility) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Null Hypothesis 15: There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (sensitivity to needs of youth) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence.

Data Analysis

The chi square test was used to determine the significant differences existing among principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position and by district.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where:

O = Observed frequency

E = Predicted frequency

(r - 1) (c - 1)

Where:

r = number of rows in a particular contingency table

c = number of columns in a particular contingency table

Observations were classified into discrete categories and recorded into contingency tables as observed responses and the corresponding chi-square contributions. Where applicable, data were selected from computer print-outs to determine if the null should be rejected.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Principals					
Teachers					
Paraprofessionals					

The preceding is an example of application of chi square method of testing significant differences among the three groups.

Summary

This study was designed to compare the role concept of paraprofessionals as perceived by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Selected elementary schools in the school districts of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Pontiac were used in this study. The population included forty panelists, ninety principals, ninety teachers, and ninety paraprofessionals from three selected school districts.

Questionnaires designed to ascertain respondent perceptions were mailed to certain authorities throughout the United States and to administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals in the Michigan districts of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Pontiac. Research hypotheses were developed regarding role definitions of paraprofessionals, actual role of paraprofessionals, and criteria for selection. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The statistical instruments identified as appropriate were a three-dimensional chi square analysis technique.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter are presented the results of comparing and analyzing data. The major problem of this research was to study the role perception of paraprofessionals as perceived by certain principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. In addition, the position of the paraprofessional was examined to determine the criteria for selection and the actual role of the paraprofessional in the Michigan school districts to be known as District A, District B, and District C.

In this study a nationally representative sampling of forty panelists from twenty-three states was used to validate the questionnaire instrument. This panel included educators who were considered experts in the area of paraprofessional management. Additionally, ninety principals, ninety teachers, and ninety paraprofessionals chosen proportionally from District A, District B, and District C were included in this study. These data were gathered from responses by selected principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals to thirty-nine items contained on three questionnaires distributed for this purpose. Questions were designed to elicit the perception of respondents as related to the role definition, criteria for selection, and actual role of the paraprofessional.

Data from the questionnaires were tabulated by the Control Data Corporation (CDC) 6500 computer at Michigan State University. A

chi square test was used to determine whether variations in responses were associated with certain characteristics of respondents by school district or by position.

Analysis of Definition Statements

Definition One

Thirty-two panelists responded to a questionnaire concerning the role definition of paraprofessionals. Responses to definition one were categorized and summarized, and the results are presented in Table 1.

The role of the paraprofessional is to free the teacher from certain clerical and routine chores in order to enable him to spend more time in planning, evaluating, and instructing.

Table 1.--Summary of responses by panelists on role definition of paraprofessionals.

Respondents	Definition 1	Definition 2	Definition 3
College	0%	60%	40%
Local-state	14%	38%	48%
Federal-specialists	17%	50%	33%

Findings

Table 1 indicates that no college respondents supported the first definition. Seventeen percent of the federal specialists and 14 percent of the local and state employee group accepted the first definition. Thus, panelists rejected definition one, whether considered collectively or on the basis of specific groups.

Definition Two

Responses to definition two by thirty-two panelists were categorized and summarized, and the results are presented in Table 1.

The role of the paraprofessional is to free the teacher from certain clerical and routine chores; to assist the teacher with the preparation of instructional materials; to assist with objective evaluation when specialized knowledge is not required; and to assist in the supervision of certain independent work-play activities.

Findings

According to Table 1, 60 percent of college staff members, 50 percent of federal specialists, and 38 percent of the local respondents supported definition two. Thus, definition two was accepted by the panelists.

Definition Three

Below are the results of thirty-two panelists' responses to definition three. Elicited responses were categorized and summarized, and are presented in Table 1.

The role of the paraprofessional is to supervise certain independent work activities of pupils; to provide routine tutorial service; and to provide research assistance to the classroom teacher when none of the activities require professional teacher preparation.

Findings

Table 1 indicates that 48 percent of the responses elicited from local and state agencies supported definition three. In addition, 40 percent of those categorized as college employees supported definition three, as was true of 33 percent who responded from the specialist

category. Further tabulation of data revealed that twenty-eight panelists, or 88 percent, accepted either definition two or three.

Response patterns by college, state, and federal respondents indicated acceptance of the role concept of paraprofessionals in theory and in practice. Disagreement on a specific definition can be attributed to the difficult task of writing a single, all-inclusive job description of the paraprofessional.

Actual Role Questionnaire Findings

A list of twenty items relating to the actual role of the paraprofessional was included in a three-part questionnaire to panelists. A summary of responses is presented in Table 2.

Findings

A condition for retaining any of the twenty items for the revised questionnaire was by 75 percent agreement by panelists.

Percentages given in the accept column in Table 2 were used to retain items where there was 75 percent or more agreement. In addition, recommended changes in phraseology were considered. On this basis, six items were retained, seven items were deleted, and seven new items were added as recommended by the panelists. Deleted items from the original questionnaire are listed below:

5. Serves as a library assistant
7. Supervises the playground under certain conditions
8. Supervises the school lunchroom
14. Supervises money collections
15. Handles routine interruptions

Table 2.--Summary of responses by panelists on actual role of para-professionals.

Item Number	Accept		Accept in Part		Reject	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	24	75	6	19	2	6
2	29	91	3	9	..	..
3	30	94	2	6	..	..
4	27	84	4	13	1	3
5	22	69	10	31	..	..
6	27	84	5	16	..	..
7	23	72	7	22	2	6
8	12	38	16	50	4	12
9	23	72	7	22	2	6
10	16	50	12	37	4	12
11	25	78	8	22	..	..
12	25	78	6	19	1	3
13	26	81	6	19	..	..
14	19	60	10	31	3	9
15	16	50	13	41	3	9
16	15	47	14	44	3	9
17	18	56	13	41	1	3
18	29	91	3	9	..	..
19	27	84	4	13	1	3
20	26	81	6	19	..	..

16. Provides clerical assistance

17. Serves as a piano accompanist for music and games

Retained items were:

1. Serves as a resource person in subject matter content according to training and experience
2. Prepares visual materials for instruction after consultation with the teacher
3. Operates audio visual devices
11. Corrects objective tests
18. Assists with housekeeping chores and bulletin board arrangements
20. Assists the teacher with opening exercises, large group lessons, and demonstrations

Suggested changes were submitted by the panelists. The revised items are listed below:

4. Performs a variety of instructional tasks after mutually agreed upon standards are set by teacher and paraprofessional
6. Reads stories to children or listens to children read stories
9. Assists students with basic writing skills
10. Provides tutorial assistance for individuals or small groups of children on well-defined subjects
12. Prepares and reproduces materials following teacher/paraprofessional planning sessions
13. Leads the class or small groups in simple comprehensive, skill, or drill exercises following pre-planning discussions by teacher and paraprofessional
19. Arranges for field trips and assists with related tasks

Items Pertaining to Criteria for
Selection of Paraprofessionals

A list of fourteen items pertaining to the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals was sent to forty nationally located panelists. Thirty-two responded and their answers are summarized in Table 3.

Findings

Upon the recommendation of responding panelists, three items were deleted and replaced by five new items. Thus, the questionnaire was increased to a sixteen-item questionnaire.

Deleted items from the original questionnaire are listed below:

- 11. Clerical skills
- 12. Ability to play piano
- 14. Subject matter background or specialization if to correct English theme or to serve as instruction assistant

Retained items in original questionnaire were:

- 2. Evidence of good physical and mental health
- 3. Good grooming
- 5. Pleasing personality
- 6. Average intelligence
- 7. Successful experience working with children
- 8. Some formal education beyond high school desirable for most positions
- 9. Liking for children and youth
- 13. Artistic ability

Table 3.--Summary of responses by panelists to criteria for selecting paraprofessionals.

Item Number	Accept		Accept in Part		Reject	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	26	81	4	13	2	6
2	29	91	3	9	..	..
3	24	75	8	25	..	..
4	18	56	13	41	1	3
5	24	75	7	22	1	3
6	27	84	4	13	1	3
7	25	78	6	19	1	3
8	24	75	9	28	8	25
9	30	94	1	3	1	3
10	27	84	5	16	..	..
11	11	34	14	44	7	22
12	5	16	9	28	18	56
13	24	75	16	50	9	28
14	16	50	8	25	8	25

New items in the revised questionnaire are listed below:

1. Dedication, sincerity, perceptiveness
4. Restrained use of crude or abusive language
10. Ability to work with a teacher in an atmosphere of mutual trust and flexibility
15. Demonstrated sensitivity to the needs of youth
16. Restraint of personal bias and prejudice

Analysis of Data From Principals, Teachers, and
Paraprofessionals to Definition of Role of
Paraprofessional, Criteria for Selection,
and Actual Role Instruments

The second part of this chapter includes the results of 216 questionnaires returned by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals from the Michigan school districts designated District A, District B, and District C. Of 270 questionnaires sent, 216 were returned, representing an 80 percent response.

Distribution of Responses to Definition
of Role Instrument

Respondents apparently were supportive of the role concept of paraprofessionals because there was general agreement that more effective use of paraprofessionals' time is an educational imperative. One respondent commented he preferred a definition placing the paraprofessional in an instructional assistant's role, sharing in planning, and making tentative suggestions to provide meaningful learning experiences for the students.

Role Definition Instrument

Table 4 reveals the strong support given definition one of the Definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional instrument by respondents. As a consequence of the expressed opinions of a majority of the panelists, two definitions were modified and submitted to Michigan participants with an option to write a definition of their own.

Table 4.--Total percentage of respondents to Definition of Role instrument.

<u>Definition 1</u>		<u>Definition 2</u>		<u>Definition 3</u>	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
135	62.5	76	35.2	5	2.3

Criteria for Selection Instrument

Table 5 indicates the general support of items included in the Criteria for Selection instrument. However, differences in the range of answers existed along the strongly agree/strongly disagree response continuum. Certain items were therefore selected on the basis of significant variation in extent of agreement between response categories.

These items are as follows:

- 6. Average intelligence
- 13. Artistic ability
- 14. Willingness to accept responsibility
- 15. Demonstrated sensitivity to the needs of youth

Additional analysis was made of these items.

Table 5.--Total number and percentage breakdown of responses to criteria for selection of paraprofessionals.

Item	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	153	61.57	74	34.25	9	4.16	..	..	..	..
2	126	58.33	87	40.27	3	1.38	..	..	..	..
3	66	30.55	135	62.50	14	6.48	1	0.463	..	..
4	162	75.00	52	24.07	2	0.925	2	0.463	..	..
5	100	46.29	109	50.46	7	3.24	..	..	..	..
6	85	39.35	125	57.87	6	2.77	..	..	..	..
7	93	43.05	90	41.66	24	11.11	8	3.70	1	0.463
8	18	8.33	61	28.24	47	21.75	73	33.79	17	7.87
9	162	75.00	51	23.61	3	1.38	..	..	..	..
10	155	71.75	57	26.38	4	1.38	..	..	..	..
11	143	66.20	67	31.01	5	2.31	1	0.463	..	..
12	1	0.463	90	41.66	114	52.77	8	3.70	3	1.38
13	5	2.31	53	24.53	64	29.63	73	33.79	21	9.72
14	118	54.63	87	40.27	8	3.70	3	1.38	..	..
15	122	56.48	70	32.40	12	5.55	10	4.63	2	0.926
16	140	64.81	69	31.94	7	3.24	..	..	..	..

Actual Role Instrument

Table 6 indicates significant differences in the range of answers along the agree-disagree continuum. Certain items were selected due to variation in extent of agreement between response categories. Selected items are as follows:

2. Prepares and previews film and visual materials for instruction after consultation with the teachers
5. Supervises various auxiliary school activities
7. Assists students with difficult information on missed assignments or make-up work
8. Assists in setting up materials to create an environment for learning
12. Prepares and reproduces materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions
15. Confers with teacher regarding appropriate corrective strategies for learning and/or behavior
16. Records data on cumulative records
20. Arranges for field trips and assists with related tasks

These selected items were analyzed using a chi square test. Data were recorded in contingency tables, and observations classified in discrete categories.

Test of Hypotheses

In order to test the general hypothesis of no significant difference in the role concept of paraprofessionals as perceived by selected principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, fifteen null

Table 6.--Total number and percentage of responses to actual role of paraprofessionals.

Item	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	35	16.20	91	42.13	32	14.81	54	25.00	4	1.85
2	18	8.33	90	41.66	37	17.13	58	26.85	13	6.01
3	44	20.37	121	56.01	26	12.03	22	10.18	3	1.38
4	103	47.68	97	44.90	8	3.70	5	2.31	3	1.38
5	22	10.18	88	40.74	28	12.96	59	27.31	19	8.79
6	67	31.01	128	59.25	8	3.70	11	5.09	1	0.463
7	81	37.05	115	53.24	9	4.16	8	3.70	3	1.38
8	77	35.64	121	56.01	5	2.31	12	5.55	1	0.463
9	44	20.37	126	58.33	21	9.72	18	8.33	7	3.24
10	119	55.09	89	41.20	3	1.38	5	2.31	..	..
11	54	25.00	115	53.24	21	9.72	22	10.18	4	1.85
12	90	41.66	115	53.24	5	2.31	4	1.85	2	0.926
13	92	42.59	102	47.22	8	3.70	10	4.63	4	1.85
14	24	11.11	89	41.20	43	19.90	51	23.61	9	4.16
15	73	33.79	115	53.24	13	6.01	13	6.01	2	0.926
16	53	24.53	81	37.50	23	10.64	42	19.44	17	7.87
17	24	11.11	92	42.59	39	18.05	46	21.29	15	6.94
18	76	35.18	117	54.16	10	4.63	10	4.63	3	1.38
19	53	24.53	96	44.44	21	9.72	36	16.66	10	4.63
20	36	16.66	92	42.59	29	13.42	49	22.28	10	4.63

Findings

According to the data presented in Table 7, the computed chi square statistic was 2.182. In reference to the chi square distribution table, a value of 6.0 was found for the .05 level of significance with 2 degrees of freedom. Since the computed value was below the tabled value, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 8.--Contingency table with frequencies from the role definition instrument by school district.

	1	2
District A	55 .44	39 .78
District B	53 1.04	19 1.85
District C	27 .11	18 .20

Findings

Table 8 indicates the computed chi square statistic was 4.428. The chi square table revealed a value of 6.0 at the .05 level with 2 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was not rejected since the computed value was less than the tabled value.

Data for Actual Role Instrument by Position

Since there was overall consensus regarding the actual role instrument, it was decided to analyze only those items where significant

variations in responses were found. In the actual role category, items 2, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, and 20 indicated variations and were analyzed separately. Observations were classified into discrete categories and recorded into 5 x 3 contingency tables as observed responses and the corresponding contributions. Appropriate data from computer print-outs were selected as needed to determine whether or not the null should be rejected. The data are presented below by position.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences of responses to item two reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 2: Prepares and previews film and visual materials for instruction after consultation with the teachers.

The results of the data for item 2 are reported in Table 9.

Table 9.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 2.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	9 1.20	29 .03	9 .90	19 .01	6 .64
Teachers	4 .67	31 .03	10 .44	23 .70	4 .03
Paraprofessionals	5 .17	30 .03	18 2.60	16 .57	3 .41

Findings

Information from Table 9 indicates the computed chi square statistic was 8.690. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi square was less than the table value, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences of responses to item 5 reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 5: Supervises various auxiliary school activities.

The results of the data for item 3 are reported in Table 10.

Table 10.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 5.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	10 .97	35 1.09	5 2.01	15 1.11	7 .07
Teachers	6 .24	28 .06	6 1.09	27 2.73	5 .28
Paraprofessionals	6 .24	25 .64	17 6.30	17 .36	7 .07

Findings

It was determined from Table 10 that the computed chi square was 17.374. A value of 15.5 was indicated on the chi square table at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi square was more than the table value, the null was rejected.

An examination of Table 10 indicates that paraprofessionals tend to be more undecided than either principals or teachers about whether or not they should supervise various auxiliary activities.

Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences of responses to item 7 reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 7: Assist students with difficult information on missed assignments or make-up work.

Data as related to item 7 are reported in Table 11.

Table 11.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by positions, item 7.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	26 .04	40 .07	3 .00	3 .00	0 1.00
Teachers	33 1.33	33 .74	0 3.00	3 .04	3 4.00
Paraprofessionals	22 .93	42 .35	6 3.00	2 .17	0 1.00

Findings

It was determined from Table 11 that the computed chi square was 15.712. The chi square table indicated a 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected since the computed chi square was more than the table value.

According to the data presented in Table 11, significantly more teachers were strongly disagreed with item 7 than either the principal or paraprofessional groups.

Null Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences of responses to item 8 reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 8: Assists in setting up materials to create an environment for learning.

Data as related to item 8 are reported in Table 12.

Table 12.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 8.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	28 . 21	42 . 07	0 . 1.67	2 . 1.00	0 . .33
Teachers	27 . 07	37 . 28	3 . 1.07	4 . .00	1 . 1.33
Paraprofessionals	22 . .52	42 . 07	2 . .07	6 . 1.00	0 . .33

Findings

Information from Table 12 indicated the computed chi square value was 8.0. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Since the

computed chi square was less than the table value, the null was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences of responses to item 12 reflecting the actual role of the para-professional by principals, teachers, and para-professionals.

Item 12: Prepares and reproduces materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions.

The results of data for item 12 are reported in Table 13.

Table 13. Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 12.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	24 1.20	44 .84	3 1.07	0 1.33	1 .17
Teachers	39 2.70	31 1.40	0 1.67	1 .08	1 .17
Paraprofessionals	27 .00	40 .30	2 .07	3 .08	0 .67

Findings

Information from Table 13 indicated the computed chi square value was 13.813. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi square was less than the table value, the null was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7: There was no significant difference of responses to item 15 reflecting the actual role of the para-professional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 15: Confers with teacher regarding appropriate corrective strategies for learning and/or behavior.

Data as related to item 15 are reported in Table 14.

Table 14.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 15.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	22 .<22	41 .19	3 .41	5 .10	1 .17
Teachers	21 .46	41 .19	4 .03	5 .10	1 .17
Paraprofessionals	30 1.32	33 .74	6 .64	3 .41	0 .67

Findings

Table 14 reveals the computed chi square was 5.805 with 8 degrees of freedom. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Since the computed value was not larger than the table value, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences of responses to item 16 reflecting the actual role of the para-professional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 16: Records data on cumulative records.

Data as related to item 16 are reported in Table 15.

Table 15.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by positions, item 16.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	12 1.82	25 .15	6 .36	21 3.50	8 .96
Teachers	22 1.06	22 .93	7 .06	14 .00	7 .31
Paraprofessionals	19 .10	34 1.81	10 .71	7 3.50	2 2.37

Findings

Information from Table 15 reveals the computed chi square value was 17.7. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 with 8 degrees of freedom. The conclusion was to reject the null hypothesis. As indicated in Table 15, principals and paraprofessionals tended to disagree that paraprofessionals should record data on cumulative records. Teachers were generally agreed that paraprofessionals should record data on cumulative records.

Null Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences of responses to item 20 reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by teachers, principals and paraprofessionals.

Item 20: Arranges for field trips and assists with related tasks.

Data as related to item 20 are reported in Table 16.

Table 16.--Contingency table with frequencies from the actual role instrument by position, item 20.

	1	2	3	4	5
Principals	6 3.00	45 6.70	5 2.25	12 1.15	4 .13
Teachers	13 .08	23 1.92	11 .18	21 1.35	4 .13
Paraprofessionals	17 2.08	24 1.45	13 1.15	16 .01	2 .53

Findings

Table 16 contains information indicating the computed chi square was 22.108. The chi square table indicated a value of 15.5 with 8 degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis was rejected since the computed chi square was larger than the table value.

Table 16 shows general support for item 20 by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Teachers were, in general, indecisive in their opinions as related to item 20.

Data for Criteria for Selecting Paraprofessionals by Position

Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals showed a high level of agreement regarding the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals. Of sixteen items listed in the criteria for selection instrument, Table 5 revealed significant differences of opinions on two items--9 and 12. Elicited opinions were analyzed separately.

Null Hypothesis 10: There are no significant differences of responses to item nine reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by teachers, principals and paraprofessionals.

Item 9: Liking for children and youth.

The results of the data for item 9 are reported in Table 17.

Table 17.--Contingency table with frequencies from the criteria for selection instrument by position, item 9.

	1	2	3
Principals	57 17	14 53	1 .00
Teachers	45 1.50	26 4.76	2 .00
Paraprofessionals	60 .67	11 2.12	1 .00

Findings

Information from Table 17 indicates the computed chi square statistic was 9.745. Information from the chi square table indicated a value of 9.5 at .05 with 4 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi square was more than the table value, the null was rejected.

Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals agreed with item 9 but there was a difference in the degree of agreement. Principals and paraprofessionals strongly agreed with item 9, while teachers generally agreed.

Null Hypothesis 11: There are no significant differences of responses to item 12 reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Item 12: Ability to work with various school personnel.

The results of the data for item 12 are reported in Table 18.

Table 18.--Contingency table with frequencies from the criteria for selection instrument by position, item 12.

	1	2	3	4
Principals	42 4.80	28 2.63	1 1.04	0 1.00
Teachers	27 .30	41 .24	3 .04	1 .00
Paraprofessionals	21 2.70	45 1.29	4 .67	2 1.00

Findings

Table 18 indicates the computed chi square was 17.708. The chi square table indicates a statistic of 15.5 at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Because the computed chi square was larger than the table value, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 18 reveals that principals and paraprofessionals were more supportive of item 12 than the teacher group.

Data for Criteria for Selecting Paraprofessionals by District

Data from the criteria for selection instrument, by district, indicated significant variation of responses in four of sixteen items.

Specifically, those items were 6, 13, 14, and 15. Such items were separately considered and variations of responses were analyzed. Observations were classified into discrete categories and recorded in contingency tables as observed responses and the corresponding contributions. The data are presented below:

Null Hypothesis 12: There are no significant differences of responses to item 6 reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Item 6: Average intelligence.

The results of the data for item 9 are reported in Table 19.

Table 19.--Contingency table with frequencies from the criteria for selection instrument by district, item 6.

	1	2	3
Principals	43 .72	47 1.32	6 4.17
Teachers	27 .21	48 .49	0 2.08
Parapro- fessionals	15 .41	30 .60	0 1.25

Findings

Information from Table 19 reveals that the computed chi square was 11.256. The chi square table statistic at the .05 level was 9.5 with 4 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi square was larger than the table value, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Item 14: Willing to accept responsibilities.

Table 21.--Contingency table with frequencies from the criteria for selection instrument by district, item 14.

	1	2	3	4
District A	53 0.01	35 0.35	6 1.68	2 0.33
District B	34 1.19	40 3.17	1 1.14	0 1.04
District C	31 1.67	12 2.07	1 0.27	1 0.23

It was determined from Table 21 that the computed chi square was 13.144. A value of 12.6 was indicated on the chi square table at the .05 level with 6 degrees of freedom. Since the computed chi

square was larger than the table value the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 21 indicates general agreement with item 14 by Districts A, B, and C. Significant differences as related to an analysis of the chi square were due to the degree of agreement. Where Districts A and B strongly agreed, District B agreed.

Null Hypothesis 15: There are no significant differences of responses to item 15 reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Item 15: Demonstrated sensitivity to the needs of youth.

The results of the data for item 15 are reported in Table 22.

Table 22.--Contingency table with frequencies from the criteria for selection instrument by district, item 15.

	1	2	3	4	5
District A	57 .<14	27 .<54	7 .<52	4 .<04	1 .<01
District B	41 .<04	32 2.44	1 2.41	1 1.76	0 .69
District C	24 .<08	11 .88	4 .90	5 4.08	1 .82

Findings

It was determined from Table 22 that the computed chi square was 15.365. A value of 15.5 was indicated on the chi square table

at the .05 level with 8 degrees of freedom. Thus the null was not rejected.

Table 22 indicates that responses from principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals from District B tended toward ambivalency while respondents from District were in general agreement, though there was indication of some indecision. District C respondents indicated disagreement with item 15 as a criterion for selecting paraprofessionals.

Summary

Following is a summary of the null hypotheses which showed no significant differences:

1. There was no significant difference in the response patterns to specific questions reflecting the role concept of paraprofessionals as measured by the Definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional Survey Instrument.
2. There was no significant of responses to item two reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.
3. There were no significant differences of responses to item eight reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.
4. There were no significant differences of responses to item twelve reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.
5. There were no significant differences of responses to item fifteen reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

6. There were no significant differences of responses to item fifteen reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

In summary, the following null hypotheses were rejected:

1. There were significant differences of responses to item five reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
2. There were significant differences of responses to item seven reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
3. There were significant differences of responses to item sixteen reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
4. There were significant differences of responses to item twenty reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.
5. There were significant differences of responses to item nine reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals by position.
6. There were significant differences of responses to item twelve reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

7. There were significant differences of responses to item six reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by district.
8. There were significant differences of responses to item thirteen reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by district.
9. There were significant differences of responses to item fourteen reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by district.

Based on these data certain conclusions and recommendations were formulated, and are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding chapter, the findings of this study were presented. In this chapter may be found a summary of the study conducted, the major findings, conclusions based upon the findings, discussion, and recommendations for further study.

Summary

Acceptance of paraprofessional assistance by professionals is virtually a recent development but by no means universal. Use of paid paraprofessional help prior to the 1940's was practically non-existent. Until 1956, no references were made about paraprofessional services in any educational index.

Extensive use of paraprofessional assistance developed in the 1940's. This practice is attributable to the depression of the 1930's and a serious shortage of teachers. By the early 1970's, use of paraprofessional services had increased to approximately 200,000 nationally. An estimated 2,000,000 paraprofessionals will be employed in school districts throughout the United States by 1975.

Meanwhile, the leadership role of the contemporary teacher is gradually becoming a managerial function. Through planning and the proper use of paraprofessionals, teachers will be able to analyze the

students' instructional needs more quickly and a course of study based on those needs could be realistically developed.

It was the purpose of this study to compare the role perceptions of principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Additionally, the position of paraprofessionals was investigated to determine the criteria for selection and the actual role of the paraprofessional in the school districts of Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Pontiac.

The literature reviewed in Chapter II focused attention on ideas of central importance to this study: that the role of the classroom teacher is gradually being redefined in an era where the demand for accountability is resulting in new methods of quality control. Accompanying this process of redefinition of the teacher's role is the planned use of paraprofessionals by teachers as an integral part of the educational team.

Forty panelists were randomly selected from a listing of local, state, and national career opportunity employees. Panelists represented a national sample and were closely associated with programs using paraprofessionals. In addition, ninety principals, ninety teachers, and ninety paraprofessionals chosen proportionally from District A, District B, and District C were a part of this study. Data were gathered from replies by selected participants to thirty-nine items contained on three questionnaires distributed for this purpose. Questionnaires were designed to elicit the perceptions of respondents as related to the role definition, criteria for selection, and actual role of the paraprofessional.

A chi square test was used to determine if differences in responses could be related to respondents by school district or by position.

Findings

Null Hypothesis 1

There are no significant differences in the distribution of response patterns to specific questions reflecting the role perception of paraprofessionals as measured by the Definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional Instrument by position.

Table 1 shows acceptance of the role concept of paraprofessionals by forty selected panelists. Perhaps the consensus of the panelists may be summarized in the words of a respondent who felt the role of the paraprofessional to be a partnership arrangement. The ability of the teacher to establish rapport with her assigned paraprofessional can produce a work relationship of inestimable value to children.

Close examination of Table 4 reveals strong support of the role perception of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Perhaps teachers now realize that involvement of paraprofessionals in activities as related to their personal skills and talents is an imperative which cannot be indefinitely delayed.

According to the data presented in Table 7, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals supported the role perception of paraprofessionals, by position, though almost twice as many respondents indicated a preference for definition one than two.

Similarly, Table 8 discloses the null hypothesis was not rejected. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, by school district, supported the role perception of paraprofessionals, though almost twice as many respondents indicated a preference for definition one than two.

Null Hypothesis 2

There are no significant differences of responses to item two (prepare and preview film) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Table 9 supports the assumption that principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, by position, did not reject the null hypothesis. Since the table value of 9.5 at the .05 level was more than the computed value of 8.6, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Upon closer examination of the contingency table, teachers appeared to be somewhat more in disagreement with this item than either principals or paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals tended toward indecision in this case. Principals seemed inclined toward more agreement than either teachers or paraprofessionals, though this tendency was insignificant.

Null Hypothesis 3

There are no significant differences of responses to item five (supervises various auxiliary school services) reflecting the actual role of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals, by position.

Table 10 reveals the rejection of this hypothesis. Since the computed chi square value of 17.4 was more than the table value of 15.5, the null was rejected. Paraprofessionals appeared more

undecided than either principals or teachers concerning the supervision of auxiliary school services. It may appear that paraprofessionals felt unqualified to assume this responsibility.

Teacher response indicated more disagreement with this item than was true of either principals or paraprofessionals. If we assume that the primary purpose of paraprofessionals is to increase teacher effectiveness in the classroom, then it may follow teachers felt this was a prerogative they preferred to keep. Principals indicated a greater tendency toward affirming this hypothesis than either teachers or paraprofessionals. In addition, they had fewer responses in the disagree category than either of these two groups.

Null Hypothesis 4

There are no significant differences of responses to item seven (assisting students with difficult information or missed assignment) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Since the computed chi square of 15.7 was more than the table value of 15.5, as shown in table 11, the null hypothesis was rejected. Teacher responses ran the gamut from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed. Principals appeared to be more committed to the strongly agree/agree end of the continuum, while paraprofessionals generally indicated agreement with this specific item.

Null Hypothesis 5

There are no significant differences of responses to item eight (assists in setting up materials to create an environment for learning) reflecting the actual role of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Table 12 indicates the null hypothesis was not rejected because the computed chi square of 8.0 was less than the table value of 15.5. Close examination of Table 12 will reveal that principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals were in general agreement in their support of item eight.

Null Hypothesis 6

There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (preparation of materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions) by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Data contained in Table 13 indicated the null hypothesis was not rejected. The computed chi square was 13.8 but the table value was 15.5 at the .05 level. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals were in general agreement on item twelve and responses in the undecided or disagree categories did exist but did not have significance as related to the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 7

There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (confers with teacher regarding appropriate strategies for learning) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Table 14 reveals the table value of 15.5 at the .05 level was more than the computed chi square of 5.8. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Responses of principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals generally agreed on item fifteen.

Null Hypothesis 8

There are no significant differences of responses to item sixteen (records data on cumulative records) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

This hypothesis was rejected. Table 15 reveals the computed chi square of 17.7 exceeded the table value of 15.5 at the .05 level. While principals supported this particular item, a significant number either disagreed or strongly disagreed that paraprofessionals should record data on cumulative records. In comparison, Table 15 reveals that twenty-one teachers disagreed with item sixteen. Nine of seventy-two paraprofessionals disagreed with item sixteen. However, ten paraprofessionals were undecided concerning this issue.

Null Hypothesis 9

There are no significant differences of responses to item twenty (arranges for field trips) reflecting the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals by position.

Table 16 indicates a rejection of this hypothesis because the computed value of 22.1 exceeded the table chi square of 15.5 at the .05 level. Further inspection of Table 16 reveals that principals, while supportive of item twenty, did tend to disagree. The data as pertaining to teachers revealed general agreement by teachers on this item as well as some disagreement. A smaller number of teachers affirmed this item than either principals or paraprofessionals. In addition, teachers reflected some indecision on this issue. Paraprofessionals were also supportive of item twenty. They also had a larger number of respondents undecided than either the principal or teacher groups.

Null Hypothesis 10

There are no significant differences of responses to item nine (liking for children and youth) reflecting the criteria for selection of paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Information from Table 17 shows that the null hypothesis was rejected. The computed chi square statistic was 9.7; the table value was 9.5--a condition for rejecting the null. Even though the difference seems slight, it was large enough to be statistically significant. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals overwhelmingly agreed with item nine. Table 17 clearly indicates the unanimity of respondents on this matter.

Null Hypothesis 11

There are no significant differences of responses to item twelve (ability to work with school personnel) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Table 18 indicates the computed chi square is 17.8. The chi square table value is 15.5 at the .05 level of confidence--a reason statistically for rejecting the null. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals supported the ability to work with various school personnel to a significant degree.

Null Hypothesis 12

There are no significant differences of responses to item six (average intelligence) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Information from Table 19 reveals the rejection of the null hypothesis because the computed chi square statistic of 11.3 exceeded

the table value of 9.5 at the .05 significance level. Although respondents from District A, District B, and District C were relatively undecided on average intelligence as a factor, principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals from District A more strongly agreed on this item than those in the same positions from the school districts of District B and District C.

Null Hypothesis 13

There are no significant differences of responses to item thirteen (artistic ability) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Since the computed chi square of 26.0 was more than the table statistic of 15.5 at the .05 level of confidence, the null hypothesis was rejected. Principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals from District A failed to indicate a clear consensus from elicited responses while their counterparts from District B elicited responses which were either in agreement or disagreement. District C principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals were generally undecided on this specific item. Most respondents conceded that artistic ability was desirable but should not be of prime consideration as a criterion for selection.

Null Hypothesis 14

There are no significant differences of responses to item fourteen (willing to accept responsibility) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C, by district.

Analysis of the data from Table 21 reveals that the hypothesis was rejected since the computed chi square of 13.2 was more than the table value of 12.6 at the .05 level. Although the null hypothesis was rejected, Table 21 does reveal that respondents from District B and District C tended to support this item more than respondents from District A, who were somewhat undecided.

Null Hypothesis 15

There are no significant differences of responses to item fifteen (demonstrated sensitivity to the needs of youth) reflecting the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in District A, District B, and District C.

Since the computed chi square of 15.3 was more than the table value of 15.5, the null was not rejected. District B teachers did not indicate a clear consensus from elicited responses. Respondents from District A and District C were generally agreed, though tendency toward disagreement was evident.

Conclusions

1. The panelists agreed on the role definition of paraprofessionals in two of the three definitions. The agreed-upon definitions are as follows:

The role of the paraprofessional is to free the teacher from certain clerical and routine chores; to assist the teacher with the preparation of instructional materials; to assist with objective evaluation when specialized knowledge is not required; and to assist in the supervision of certain independent work-play activities.

The role of the paraprofessional is to supervise certain independent work activities of pupils; to provide routine tutorial service; and to provide research assistance to the classroom teacher when none of the activities require professional teacher preparation.

2. Teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals generally agreed that the following criteria should be used in the selection of paraprofessionals:

- a. Dedication, sincerity and perceptiveness
- b. Good physical and mental health
- c. Good grooming
- d. Restraint from abusive language
- e. Pleasing personality
- f. Successful experiences with children
- g. Some formal education beyond high school
- h. Working with a teacher in atmosphere of mutual trust
- i. Respect for individual differences
- j. Sensitivity for needs of youth
- k. Restraint of personal bias

There was no general agreement on the following criteria for selection of paraprofessionals:

- a. Average intelligence
- b. Liking for children and youth
- c. Ability to work with various school personnel
- d. Artistic ability
- e. Willingness to accept responsibility

3. There was general agreement by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in Districts A, B, and C on the actual role of the paraprofessional as follows:

- a. Serves as a resource person
- b. Operates audio-visual devices
- c. Performs a variety of instructional tasks
- d. Reads stories to children
- e. Assists in setting up materials to create a learning environment
- f. Assists students with basic writing skills
- g. Provides tutorial assistance for individuals
- h. Corrects objective tests
- i. Prepares and reproduces materials
- j. Leads the class in simple comprehensive skills
- k. Assists in direction of plays
- l. Confers with teacher on corrective strategies for learning
- m. Assists teacher with basic research problems
- n. Assists teacher with housekeeping duties
- o. Assists teacher with opening exercises, large group lessons

There was no general agreement on the actual role of the paraprofessional by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in Districts A, B, and C:

- a. Supervises various auxiliary school activities
- b. Assists student with difficult information
- c. Records data on cumulative records
- d. Arranges for field trips

Recommendations for Further Study

An analysis of the role perception of the paraprofessional, the criteria for selection, and the actual role have revealed a multiplicity of successes, problems, and needs. The recommendations that follow are made in the hope they might give more authenticity and understanding to activities involving the role perception of paraprofessionals.

1. A comprehensive study needs to be done on the statutory provisions as related to paraprofessionals. Indications are that most states do not have specific statutes. Frequently, state boards of education have released statements on the use of paraprofessionals but these statements do not give direction and guidance in the employment and use of paraprofessionals.

2. As use of paraprofessionals increases throughout the United States, the question of role expectation, teacher acceptance, and administrative support must be considered.

3. Additional research addressed to understanding the paraprofessional's role in affecting professional practice and performance is needed. The teacher-paraprofessional team approach is alleged to be an exception rather than the rule in educational circles.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

April 19, 1973

Dr. Bryce Perkins
109 McIver Street
Greensboro, N.C. 27403

Dear Sir:

As a doctoral student at Michigan State University, my dissertation topic is "A Comparison of the Role Perceptions of Paraprofessionals by Principals, Teachers and Paraprofessionals in Three Michigan Elementary Schools." In order to give credibility to the study, I would like permission to use your survey instruments in my endeavor.

I am working with the research consulting department at Michigan State University. They recommend that your instruments be used in securing data for my research concerning paraprofessionals.

Your assistance in this effort will be appreciated very much.

Cordially,

Booker T. Yancey

BTY/mw

CC: 1

APPENDIX B

LETTER RECEIVED GRANTING PERMISSION
TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX B

LETTER RECEIVED GRANTING PERMISSION
TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENT



COLLEGE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
ST. CROIX CAMPUS

May 2, 1974

Mr. Booker T. Yancey
Benjamin Franklin Elementary School
661 Franklin Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48053

Dear Mr. Yancey:

This is in reply to your letter of April 29 in which you asked permission to use my survey instruments in connection with your dissertation on "The Role Concept of Para-professionals."

I am glad to share them with you and am quite interested in your results. I would appreciate your sharing them with me.

Best wishes in your study.

Sincerely yours,

Bryce Perkins, Ed. D.
Director

BP/mcb

KINGSHILL P. O. BOX 84 / ST. CROIX / VIRGIN ISLANDS / 00850

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO PANELISTS REQUESTING THEIR
ASSISTANCE IN FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO PANELISTS REQUESTING THEIR ASSISTANCE IN FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRE

Franklin Elementary School
661 Franklin Road
Pontiac, Michigan

Dear _____,

I am desirous of your assistance in a project that is of significant personal and professional importance to me. As a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University my topic is "A Comparison of the Role Perception of Paraprofessionals by Principals, Teachers and Praprofessionals."

The principal aim of this study is to compare the role perceptions of paraprofessionals as well as the actual role and criteria for selection as perceived by authorities, principals, teachers and paraprofessionals.

In order to obtain the necessary data, a panel of experts from various leadership roles was selected to assist in this study. Your educational experience and interest in paraprofessional programs were factors that led to selecting you as a participant in this study.

Your immediate response to the three enclosed questionnaires will be greatly appreciated. A stamped self-addressed envelope is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Booker T. Yancey

APPENDIX D

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: Definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional

Name	Position	Date
------	----------	------

To the Panelist:

Listed below are three definitions of the role of the paraprofessional in public school education. Please select one definition. If none are acceptable, additional space is provided at the end of part one of this opinionnaire for you to write your definition of the role of the paraprofessional.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| () Accept | 1. The role of the paraprofessional is to free the teacher from certain clerical and routine chores in order to enable him to spend more time in planning, evaluating, and instructing. |
|------------|---|

Panelist comment:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| () Accept | 2. The role of the paraprofessional is to free the teacher from certain clerical and routine chores; to assist the teacher with the preparation of instructional materials; to assist with objective evaluation when specialized knowledge is not required; and to assist in the supervision of certain independent work-play activities. |
|------------|---|

Panelist comment:

- () Accept 3. The role of the paraprofessional is to supervise certain independent work activities of pupils; to provide routine tutorial assistance; and to provide research assistance to the classroom teacher, when none of these activities require professional teacher preparation.

Panelist comment:

Panelist's definition of the Role of the Paraprofessional:

Part II

Actual Role of the Paraprofessional

Listed below are contributions made by the paraprofessional based upon research in this area. Please accept or reject each item with a check mark in the appropriate column. Space is left after each statement for comments and at the end of this section of the opinionnaire for any additional statements you may care to make.

<u>Accept</u>	<u>Accept in Part</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Contributions</u>
()	()	()	1. Serves as a resource person in subject matter content depending upon training and experience.
Comments:			
()	()	()	2. Prepares visual materials for instruction as determined by the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	3. Operates audio visual devices.
Comments:			
()	()	()	4. Supervises certain work-study periods when the standards are set by the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	5. Serves as a library assistant.
Comments:			
()	()	()	6. Reads stories to children when the purposes have been clearly established by the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	7. Supervises the playground under certain conditions.
Comments:			

<u>Accept</u>	<u>Accept in Part</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Contributions</u>
()	()	()	8. Supervises the school lunchroom.
Comments:			
()	()	()	9. Provides tutorial assistance of a limited routine nature under the direction of the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	10. Corrects certain English themes according to criteria established by the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	11. Corrects objective tests under the supervision of the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	12. Prepares certain records and reports under the supervision of the teacher and reproduces others prepared by the teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	13. Gives certain drills related to lessons when the material is planned by the teacher and prepared under her direction.
Comments:			
()	()	()	14. Supervises money collections.
Comments:			
()	()	()	15. Handles routine interruptions.
Comments:			

<u>Accept</u>	<u>Accept in Part</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Contributions</u>
()	()	()	16. Provides clerical assistance.
Comments:			
()	()	()	17. Serves as a piano accompanist for music and games.
Comments:			
()	()	()	18. Assists with housekeeping chores and bulletin board arrangements.
Comments:			
()	()	()	19. Assists with bus duty and related tasks.
Comments:			
()	()	()	20. Assists the teacher with opening exercises, large group lessons, demonstrations.

Part III

Criteria for the Selection of Paraprofessionals

Listed below are fourteen criteria for the selection of paraprofessionals. Please evaluate with a check mark in the appropriate description. Space is left at the end of each statement for any comments and at the end of this section of the opinionnaire for your suggestions for additions.

<u>Accept</u>	<u>Accept in Part</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Contributions</u>
()	()	()	1. Good moral character.
Comments:			
()	()	()	2. Evidence of good physical and mental health.
Comments:			
()	()	()	3. Good grooming.
Comments:			
()	()	()	4. Good English usage.
Comments:			
()	()	()	5. Pleasing personality.
Comments:			
()	()	()	6. Average intelligence.
Comments:			
()	()	()	7. Successful experience working with children.
Comments:			

<u>Accept</u>	<u>Accept in Part</u>	<u>Reject</u>	<u>Contributions</u>
()	()	()	8. Some formal education beyond high school desirable for most positions.
Comments:			
()	()	()	9. Liking for children and youth.
Comments:			
()	()	()	10. Ability to work under the supervision of the classroom teacher.
Comments:			
()	()	()	11. Clerical skills.
Comments:			
()	()	()	12. Ability to play the piano.
Comments:			
()	()	()	13. Artistic ability.
Comments:			
()	()	()	14. Subject-matter background or specialization if to correct English themes or to serve as instruction-assistant.
Comments:			

APPENDIX E

LIST OF PANELISTS

APPENDIX E

LIST OF PANELISTS

United States Specialists

Dr. Eric N. Dennard
Office of Education
1114 Commerce Street
Dallas, Texas 75222
214-749-2634

Mr. Dexter Tilroe
Office of Education
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007
212-264-1098

Mr. P. Max Gabbert
Office of Education
300 South Wacker Drive Bldg.
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-353-7330

Dr. Fred Wilkinson
Office of Education
JFK Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203
617-223-6891

Mr. James Roberts
Office of Education
P.O. Box 12900
Philadelphia, Penn. 19108
215-597-9248

Dr. Cecil Yarbrough
Office of Education
50 Seventh Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30323
404-526-5996

College and University Faculty Members

Mr. Armando Barboza, Asst. Dir.
Higher Education Program
Model Cities Administration
2414 Washington Street, NW
Roxbury, Massachusetts 02119
617-442-8624

Mr. Frederick V. Hayen
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
612-348-3000

Dr. Garda W. Bowman
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, New York 10025
212-663-7200

Dr. Paul H. Masoner, Dean
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
412-621-3500, Ext. 511 or 512

Mr. James A. Caillier
Director of Special Services--
DeClouet Hall
Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501
318-233-3850, Ext 744 or 745

Dr. Derek Nunney
463 Rolling Rock Drive
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan
313-647-6200, Ext. 205

Local and State Agencies

Dr. Elmer L. Burkhard
 Director of Certification &
 Placement
 State Department of Public Inst.
 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
 307-777-7291

Mr. Archie N. Chiles
 EPLA Coordinator
 State Department of Education
 Trenton, New Jersey 08625
 609-292-2678

Mr. Nathaniel Clay
 COP Director
 School District of the City
 of Pontiac
 86 Parkhurst
 Pontiac, Michigan 48058
 313-338-9151

Mrs. Shirley A. Collier
 COP Director
 Grand Rapids Board of Education
 959 Tumer, NW
 Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504
 616-456-4968

Mrs. Bennie M. Bollins
 COP Director
 Gary Consolidated School Corporation
 620 East 10th Place
 Gary, Indiana 46402
 219-962-2512

Mrs. Nettie Dove
 COP Director
 Dade County Public Schools
 150 NE 19th Street
 Miami, Florida 33132
 305-350-3951

Mr. George Franklin
 COP Director
 D.C. Board of Education
 Hayes Building
 5th and K Streets, NE
 Washington, D.C. 20002
 202-543-2022

Dr. Patricia J. Goralski
 Director, Professions Development
 Department of Education
 610 Capitol Square Bldg.
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
 612-221-3955

Mrs. Mary Harris
 COP Director
 Baltimore City Public Schools
 School 224 Annex
 5545 Kennison Avenue
 Baltimore, Maryland 21215
 301-467-4000, Ext 1317 or 1319

Mr. Ulysses Harvey
 COP Director
 Detroit Public Schools
 5057 Woodward Avenue
 Detroit, Michigan 48202
 313-833-7900, Ext. 2769 or 863-4866

Dr. Jane M. Hornburger
 COP Director
 Public Schools of Wilmington
 625 East 10th Street
 Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Mrs. Clara Jennings
 Acting COP Coordinator
 State Dept. of Public Instruction
 Michigan National Tower
 Lansing, Michigan 48902
 517-373-1924

Mr. Tom McCallen
 COP Director
 Denver Public Schools
 2320 West 4th Avenue
 Denver, Colorado 80202
 303-744-3601 or 399-6710

Mr. C. William Phillips
 EPDA Coordinator
 State Dept. of Public Instruction
 781 Northwest Boulevard
 Columbus, Ohio 43212
 614-469-2979

Local and State Agencies continued

Mrs. Floy Potter
COP Director
Sacramento City Unified School
District
P.O. Box 2271
Sacramento, California 95810
916-444-2464

Mr. Ronald Robinson
COP Director
Board of Educ. City of Chicago
227 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312-641-4598-99

Mr. Ray Sturgis
COP Director
St. Landry Parish School Board
P.O. Box 310
Opelousa, Louisiana 70582
318-948-3657 or 754-5927

Mr. Don Summers
COP Director
Hartford Board of Education
500 Woodlaid Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06112
203-527-4191

Mr. Alan Sweet
COP Director
Minneapolis Special School Dist. #1
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Mr. James Taylor
Acting Director, Staff Development
D.C. School Board of Education
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Lee G. Wells
EPDA Specialist
State Dept. of Public Instruction
942 Lancaster Drive, NE
Salem, Oregon 97310
503-378-4769

Miss Jeanne S. Werschke
EPDA Coordinator
Colorado Dept. of Education
State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203
303-892-3382

Dr. Percy V. Williams
Director of Federal State Programs
State Department of Education
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
301-383-3760

Mr. Amos Wright
COP Director
Jackson Municipal Separate School
District
P.O. Box 2338
Jackson, Mississippi 39203
601-353-3095

Dr. J. Zeb Wright
EPDA Coordinator
Office of the Superintendent
State Department of Education
Charleston, West Virginia 24305
304-348-3744

Mr. David Youngblade
COP Director
School Dist. of the City of Saginaw
550 Millard Street
Saginaw, Michigan 48607
517-752-4130

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS IN THREE
MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS IN THREE MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

May 6, 1974

Dear Principal:

You have been randomly selected to participate in a research project conducted at Michigan State University, College of Education, East Lansing, Michigan.

The purpose of this study is to compare the role concept of paraprofessionals, the actual role of paraprofessionals, and criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in certain school districts.

Enclosed are three sets of identical questionnaires, one each for the principal, a teacher, and a paraprofessional. Upon completing the enclosed questionnaires, please place all three questionnaires in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and mail.

Please refrain from using names, as responses will be kept in strict confidence.

Your contribution to this project is greatly desired and will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Booker T. Yancey

BTY:jgb

APPENDIX G

**LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS
IN THREE MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

APPENDIX G

LETTER SENT TO TEACHERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS
IN THREE MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

May 6, 1974

Dear participant:

You have been selected to participate in a research project conducted at Michigan State University, College of Education, East Lansing, Michigan. The purpose of this study is to compare the role concept of paraprofessionals, the actual role of paraprofessionals, and the criteria for selecting paraprofessionals by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals in certain school districts.

You have received three short questionnaires from your principal. Upon completing the questionnaires, please return them to your principal.

Please refrain from using names, as responses will be kept in strict confidence.

Your contribution to this project is greatly desired and will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Booker T. Yancey

BTY:jgb

APPENDIX H

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX H

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

Definition of the Role of Paraprofessional

Listed below are two definitions of the role of the paraprofessional in public school education. Please select one definition. If none are acceptable, additional space is provided at the end of Part I of this opinionnaire for you to write your definition of the role of the paraprofessional.

() accept

1. The role of the paraprofessional is to give legally certified teachers an opportunity to use their skills more efficiently and effectively; to assist the teacher with preparation of a learning environment; to provide tutorial assistance; to assist with objective evaluation when specialized knowledge is not required; to provide research assistance to the classroom teacher.

() accept

2. The role of the paraprofessional is to operate as an equal member of a differentiated instructional team; who is responsible to the teacher, yet involved in a process of planning and performance in an atmosphere of trust, flexibility, and communication.

Your definition of the role of the paraprofessional:

Part II

Criteria for Selection of Paraprofessionals

Below is a series of statements that give criteria for selecting paraprofessionals. Please circle the response on the right that indicates how closely you agree with each statement. Please answer every item.

	<u>Response Scale</u>				
	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1. Dedication, sincerity, perceptiveness	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Evidence of good physical and mental health	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Good grooming	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Restraint from use of crude or abusive language	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Pleasing personality	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Average intelligence	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Successful experience working with children	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Some formal education beyond high school	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Liking for children and youth	SA	S	U	D	SD
10. Ability to work with a teacher in an atmosphere of mutual trust and flexibility	SA	S	U	D	SD

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. Respect for individual differences and personal worth	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Ability to work with various school personnel	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Artistic ability	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Willingness to accept responsibility	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. Demonstrated sensitivity to needs of youth	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. Restraint of personal bias and prejudice	SA	A	U	D	SD

Part III

Actual Role

Please check each practice to the extent you think it has been realized in your school, according to the following five-point scale. Please circle the response on the right that indicates how closely you agree with each statement.

	<u>Response Scale</u>				
	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
1. Serves as a resource person in subject matter content according to training and experience	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Prepares and previews film and visual materials for instruction after consultation with the teachers	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Operates audio-visual devices	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Performs a variety of instructional tasks after mutually agreed upon standards are set by teacher and paraprofessional	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Supervises various auxiliary school activities	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Reads stories to children or listens to children read stories	SA	A	U	D	SD

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
7. Assists students with difficult information on missed assignments or make-up work	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Assists in setting up materials to create an environment for learning	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Assists student with basic writing skills	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Provides tutorial assistance for individuals or small groups of children on well-defined subjects	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Corrects objective tests	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Prepares and reproduces materials following teacher paraprofessional planning sessions	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Leads the class or small groups in simple comprehensive, skill or drill exercises following pre-planning discussion by teacher and paraprofessional	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Assists in direction of skits and plays	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. Confers with teacher regarding appropriate corrective strategies for learning, and/or behavior	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. Records data on cumulative records	SA	A	U	D	SD

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
17. Assists teacher with basic research problems	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. Assists with house-keeping chores and bulletin board arrangements	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Assists the teacher with opening exercises, large group lessons and demonstrations	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. Arranges for field trips and assists with related tasks	SA	A	U	D	SD

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Anderson, Robert H. Teaching in a World of Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.
- Beach, Richard. Help in School: Establishment of Paraprofessional Programs. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1973.
- Bennett, William S., and Falk, Frank R. New Careers and Urban Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Bowman, Garda W., and Klopff, Gordon J. Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training, and Institutionalization. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1966.
- _____. New Careers and Roles in the American School. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1967.
- Brighton, Howard. Handbook for Teacher Aides. Midland, Michigan: Pendall Publishing Company, 1972.
- _____. Utilizing Teacher Aides in Differentiated Staffing. Midland, Michigan: Pendall Publishing Company, 1972.
- Brotherson, Mary, and Johnson, Mary. Teacher Aide Handbook: A Guide for New Careers in Education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Da Silva, Benjamin, and Lucas, Richard P. Practical School Volunteer and Teacher Aide Programs. New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Getz, Howard. Paraprofessionals in the English Department. Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English Education Resources, Information Center, 1972.
- Janowitz, Gayle. Helping Hands. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Klopff, Gordon; Bowman, Garda W.; and Jay, Adams. A Learning Team: Teacher and Auxiliary. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1969.

- Pear, Arthur, and Riessman, Frank. New Careers for the Poor. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Perkins, Bryce. Getting Better Results From Teacher Aides, Substitutes and Volunteers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Riessman, Frank. Issues in Training the New Non Professional. New York: New Careers Development Center, 1967.
- Wright, Betty Atwell. Teacher Aides to the Rescue. New York: The John Day Company, 1969.

Periodicals

- Aides for Better Schools, Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, July, 1967.
- "Aides to Teachers and Children." Association for Childhood Education International, 1968, p. 43.
- Allen, Dwight, and Morrison, Gary. "Differentiated Staffing and the Non Professional: A Need for Educational Personnel Development." Journal of Educational Research and Development in Education 5 (Winter 1972): 53.
- "Auxiliary School Personnel." The National Elementary Principal 6 (March 1967): 6.
- Brighton, Howard. "Thoughts on Teacher Aide Programs." Adult Leadership 19 (November 1970): 117-119.
- Brummit, H., and Schieren, A. G. "After the Perfect Set Up." Psychology in the Schools 11 (April 1974): 229-238.
- Canady, R. L. "Paraprofessionals: Should Roles Be Differentiated?" Phi Delta Kappan 55 (November 1973): 206.
- A Cooperative Study for Better Utilization of Teacher Competencies. Second Printed Report (Mount Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan University, 1955).
- Dauzat, S. V. "Wise Utilization of Human Resources: The Paraprofessional in the Reading Program." International Reading Association Conference Papers 17 (1972): 91-97.
- Decade of Experiment: 1951-1961, New York (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, The Ford Foundation, 1961).

- Enzmann, A. M. "Developing New Teacher Teams." Childhood Education 47 (December 1970): 131-134.
- Esbensen, T. "Should Teacher Aides Be More Than Clerks?" Phi Delta Kappan 47 (January 1960): 237.
- Fox, R. "Inservice Educational Programs for the Paraprofessional." Child Welfare 52 (May 1973): 313-320.
- Frelow, R. D. "Academic Progress and Behavior Changes in Low Achieving Pupils." Educational Research 67 (February 1974): 263-266.
- Grossman, L. "Misuse of Paraprofessionals." Urban Review 5 (June 1972): 2.
- Gudridge, B. M. "Paraprofessionals in Schools." Education Digest 38 (September 1972): 23-25.
- Hiatt, M. P. "Writing Programs for Paraprofessionals." College Composition and Communication 24 (December 1973): 405-408.
- Jackson, A. M. "Two Teachers in the Classroom." New York State Education 58 (April 1971):
- Johnson, L., and Faunce, R. W. "Teacher Aides: A Developing Role." Elementary School Journal 74 (December 1973): 136-144.
- Lawrence, D. "Counselling of Retarded Readers by Non Professionals." Educational Research 15 (November 1972): 48-51.
- Lawson, E. M. "Role of the Auxiliary: Teaching in the Truest Sense." Times Educational Supplement 2585 (December 18, 1964): 11-37.
- Lefkowitz, L. J. "Paraprofessionals: An Administrative/School Board Conspiracy?" Phi Delta Kappan 54 (April 1973): 546-549.
- Mandelson, A. "Young Men Around the Class." Education Digest 38 (November 1972): 58-59.
- Mayer, T. J., Jr. "Promises and Problems of the Paraprofessional." School and Community 59 (May 1973): 30-31.
- Nelson, Gaylord. "S-721-Teacher Aide Program Support Act of 1967." The National Elementary Principal 46 (1967): 40.
- Nickerson, N. C., Jr. "Comments on Research: Teacher Aides." N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin 56 (November 1972): 105-110.

- Orvis, P. "Slow Learners: New York University's Educational Training and Research Program for Teachers' Aides." Saturday Review 55 (October 14, 1972): 57-62.
- "Paraprofessionals and Reading." Reading Teacher, International Reading Association 27 (December 1973): 1-8.
- "Paraprofessionals in Schools: How New Careerists Bolster Education." National School Public Relations Association (1972): 50.
- "Partners or Rebels?" Instructor 83 (November 1973): 43-49.
- Prioleau, B. "From an Aide in Kindergarten." Instructor 80 (August 1970): 138.
- Rioch, Margaret J. "NIMK Study in Training Mental Health Counselors." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 55 (June 1963): 16-31.
- Rist, R. C. "Black Studies and Paraprofessionals: A Prescription for Ailing Reading Programs in Urban Black Schools." Journal of Reading 14 (May 1971): 525-530.
- Shanker, A. "Paraprofessionals Are Often the Best Public Relations People Teachers Have." Interview edited by L. Landsmann. Instructor 83 (November 1973): 40-42.
- Talbot, V. "Teacher Aides." Grade Teacher 88 (November 1970): 109-111.
- Thompson, S. D. "The Emerging Role of the Teacher Aide." The Clearing House 37 (February 1963): 326.
- "Use of Teacher Aides." NEA Research Bulletin Number 1969-11 (1969), p. 1.
- Walden, J. C. "Paraprofession Personnel and the Law: Some Tentative Answers." National Elementary Principal 51 (February 1972): 100-102.
- Weinstein, G. W. "You Can Upgrade Your Child's School." Parents Magazine 47 (October 1972): 52-53+.
- Willems, A. L., and Sillems, K. D. "What Should Be the Role of Elementary School Classroom Aides?" Education 94 pp. 122-126.

Special Reports

"Application for Approved Local Education Proposal for Paraprofessional Training." Wayne County Intermediate School District, March 4, 1971, p. 2.

"Application for Assistance Under the Emergency School Aid Act." School District of the City of Pontiac, February 1, 1973, Appendix A-P.

"Career Opportunities Research Directory" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Career Opportunities Program, 1972).

"Demonstration City Proposal: Comprehensive Career Education" (Pontiac, Michigan: Office of Community Action Programs, 1973).

"Desegregation Plan Proposal." Lansing Board of Education, 1972.

"Final Evaluation Report of 1971 Fiscal Year EPDA B-2 Programs." State of Michigan, 1971.

"Final Technical Report on 1969 Fiscal Year, EPDA B-2 Programs." State of Michigan, 1969.

"A Look at Teacher Aides and Their Training." Metropolitan Educational Research Association, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1968.

"Paraprofessional Aide Pre-Service and In-Service Abstract." Grand Rapids Special Programs Office, March 4, 1971.

Unpublished Materials

Hadden, Marise, A. T. B. "An Analysis of the Emerging Roles of the Paraprofessional School Community Aide With Implications for Strategies for Social Change in Disadvantaged Areas." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

Janove, Ethan. "Duties Performed by Paraprofessionals and the Relationship of Self-Concept and Dogmatism." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

McNutt, Garland W. "An Analysis of the Role Expectations of Professional Teachers and Non Professional Teacher Aides." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

Perkins, Bryce. "Factors Which Have Influenced the Development of the Role of the Paraprofessional in the Elementary Schools of Norwalk, Connecticut." Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961.