

Summer 1970

## Clarification of the Role of the Teacher of the Elementary Educable Mentally Retarded Child in Tacoma, Washington

Stephen Melseth  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Melseth, Stephen, "Clarification of the Role of the Teacher of the Elementary Educable Mentally Retarded Child in Tacoma, Washington" (1970). *All Master's Theses*. 1575.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1575>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

153

CLARIFICATION OF THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER OF THE ELEMENTARY  
EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILD  
IN TACOMA, WASHINGTON



A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College



In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education



by  
Stephen Melseth  
July, 1970

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

Sam Rust, Jr., COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Dohn Miller

---

Donald G. Goetschius

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer expresses a sincere indebtedness to Dr. Sam Rust, Jr., for his assistance and guidance in making this thesis a reality. The writer also wishes to thank Dr. Dohn Miller and Dr. Donald Goetschius for their willing cooperation as members of the committee. A very special thank you to my boss, Dr. Robert L. Myers for his encouragement and permission to use the questionnaire in the study. To Jeanne, who made all this possible, thank you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
 Chapter	
I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Related Research . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
II. METHOD . . . . .	9
Subject Populations . . . . .	9
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	9
Gathering of Data . . . . .	11
Treatment of Data . . . . .	11
III. RESULTS . . . . .	13
Agreement Within Population: Teachers . . . . .	14
Agreement Within Population: Principals . . . . .	26
Agreement Between Populations . . . . .	36
IV. DISCUSSION . . . . .	56
Discussion of Results . . . . .	56
Population Studied . . . . .	56
Percent of Returns . . . . .	57
Within Group Agreement: Teachers . . . . .	57

Chapter	Page
Within Group Agreement: Principals . . . . .	62
Between Population Comparisons . . . . .	66
Implications for Education . . . . .	68
Implications for Future Research . . . . .	69
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION . . . . .	70
The Problem . . . . .	70
Method . . . . .	70
Results . . . . .	71
Conclusions . . . . .	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	74
APPENDICES	
A. Questionnaire . . . . .	76
B. Letter Mailed to All Respondents in the Study . . . . .	83
C. Follow-Up Post Card . . . . .	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Administration and Organization: Teachers' Responses . . . . .	15
2. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Curriculum and Instruction: Teachers' Responses . . . . .	18
3. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Guidance and Evaluation: Teachers' Responses . . . . .	22
4. Agreement and Percentage Scores for School Community Relations: Teachers' Responses . . . . .	24
5. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Administration and Organization: Principals' Responses . . . . .	27
6. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Curriculum and Instruction: Principals' Responses . . . . .	30
7. Agreement and Percentage Scores for Guidance and Evaluation: Principals' Responses . . . . .	34
8. Agreement and Percentage Scores for School Community Relations: Principals' Responses . . . . .	37
9. Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals in Administration and Organization Role, as Measured by Differences of Percentage Distribution . . . . .	39
10. Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals in Curriculum and Instruction Role, as Measured by Difference of Percentage Distribution . . . . .	44
11. Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals in Guidance and Evaluation Role, as Measured by Difference of Percentage Distribution. . . . .	50
12. Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals in School Community Relations Role, as Measured by Differences of Percentage Distribution . . . . .	53

## CHAPTER I

### BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM AND STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE

#### INTRODUCTION

Since the first classes for the educable mentally retarded child (EMR) in the early 1900's, little has been accomplished to clarify the role of the teacher of the EMR child.

Even with this early beginning the greatest number of EMR children were still found in regular classrooms, in private schools or at home until the late 1940's. (Myers, 1969)

At about this time mounting pressure from parent groups resulted in a rapidly increased number of special classes being organized to meet the needs of these children. Legislative support at the state level was motivated by the same forces and has continued to the present time.

Parental demand for financial aid programs for the retarded reached the federal level during the 1960's, the resultant funds were channeled to meet many needs. Appropriate training for the teacher of the EMR child was one of the greatest needs to be met, others were the need for development of new teaching techniques, curriculum approaches, and a particular set of learning goals and objectives for the EMR child.

To achieve these learning goals and objectives the mutual support, understanding and cooperation of the elementary principal



and the teacher of the elementary (EMR) child is necessary. Lacking this team approach, the value of the special classes is greatly reduced. Clarification of roles is the only way this team approach can be realized. (Myers, 1969)

Even with the beneficial effect of State and Federal support for programs for the (EMR) child, the greater reason for success appears to be an effective teacher. This effectiveness is significantly dissipated if the teacher's role is not clear to all persons involved in the teaching situation. Morphet (1959) stated it this way. "It is demoralizing to the individual and destructive to the productivity of the organization when individuals are uncertain of their responsibilities." (p. 57)

#### RELATED RESEARCH

An organizational position is created to delineate a duty or number of duties. Often a lack of clarification of duties or role creates conflict when the incumbents attempt to perform what they perceive as their respective roles or duties.

The behavior of everyone is influenced to some extent not only by the incumbents expectations but also by the expectations of other participants in the group. (Gross, Mason, and McEachem, 1958)

Dinkmeyer (1964) stated:

Teachers are frequently concerned about their roles. Many entered teaching out of a desire to work with children. However, on the job they are increasingly confronted with conflicting and varied expectations of parents, administrators, colleagues, and children. Each teacher needs to clarify specifically the type of roles which he can perform most effectively for a specific group of children. (p. 11)

Brookover (1955) pointed out that role research is as important in education as it is in many other fields. He found that status position of the incumbent influences role expectations, i.e., expectations that apply to shop teachers would not apply to the home economics teachers position. Brookover goes on to suggest that these specific differences are many times disregarded and generalized role expectations are applied to all teachers. While it is improbable that the multitude of idiosyncratic variation of role expectations and their effect on specific roles can be identified, it is necessary for the success of special class placement that the areas and degrees of difference between teacher and principal on role expectations be identified.

MacNair (1966) in his study on the role of the Assistant Superintendent, stated, "When role expectancies are confused or in conflict, negative influences on the focal position tend to develop." (p. 41)

The effect of conflicting views of role on performance is stressed by Bates (1956) :

In the individual, tension is seen, then, as arising when inconsistent or conflicting expectations exist with respect to his behavior. Suppose, for example, a given position requires that an individual act in the role of "harsh disciplinarian" toward a person occupying another position. Suppose also that it requires him to act as a "good friend" of that same individual. When the norms which are a part of his position are translated into action, conflicting expectations of his behavior will exist and tension will be aroused in him because of the conflicting expectations. (p. 315)

As opposed to the day when the teacher had only the task of imparting knowledge to the student, today a wide variety of expectations must be met. Administrators and the public expect

the teacher's role to be surrogate parent, counselor, coordinator of instruction, and knowledge specialist. Frequently these incompatible tasks are beyond the professional preparation of the teacher and serve only to weaken the instructional effectiveness of the teacher.

Aubrey (1968) stated:

It is time to put an end to the diffusion of the teacher's role. If teachers clearly define their own role and place in the school structure, perhaps institutional goals and objectives will emerge with a clarity and a keenness now obscured by conflict and confusion. (p. 283)

Biddle and Thomas (1966) clearly illustrated that everyone has been in role conflict at some time or other. Agreement and disagreement runs the range from almost perfect agreement to near complete disagreement.

When the effect of role conflict is considered, the importance of being aware of consensus and dissensus is clear. A teacher faced with two sets of role expectations cannot behave consistently with both of them. If, however, there is agreement between the focal and counter positions, the role task can be performed without conflict.

If a person is to perform an organizational role, i.e., teacher in the public school, then that role must be clearly defined. Aubrey (1968) stated ". . . that if teachers clearly define their own role and place in the school structure, perhaps institutional goals and objectives will emerge with clarity and keenness now obscured by conflict and confusion." (p. 283)

If the placement of the EMR child in special classes is to be for the greatest benefit of the child involved, then the

question of role clarification of the teacher of that child must be examined.

Fine (1967) found that while the teacher had a great effect on the child's learning behavior, very few studies had been made on the attitudes and expectations of the teacher of the special class.

#### Rationale: For Purposes of This Investigation

When classes for the EMR child were made a part of the present structure of the school the need for a cooperative effort between the building principal and the teachers of the EMR child became apparent. This was due to new teaching techniques, new goals and objectives and restructuring of the curriculum to meet the needs of the EMR child.

Unless this team approach is utilized the learning process in special classes for EMR children would be jeopardized. The best way to effect this team approach is to define and clarify roles for both the focal position and the counter position.

Getzels (1958) would seem to agree:

A role has certain normative obligations and responsibilities which may be termed "role expectations," and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect, he is said to be performing his role. The expectations define the actor, whoever he may be, what he should or should not do as long as he is an incumbent of that particular role. (p. 155)

The building principal's view of the job of the teacher of the elementary EMR child will have a definite effect on the performance level of the teacher. Conflict on many issues would result in tension that would be inimical to the organization.

This investigation attempted to assess the different role expectations of teachers and their principals, as related to the teachers' roles. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to (1) specify the role of the elementary teachers of the EMR child as held by the incumbents, (2) to specify the expectations of the building principals for teachers of the elementary EMR child, (3) to compare their expectations and perceptions to determine points where differences occurred, and (4) to summarize according to the evidence of consensus and dissensus the role of the teacher of elementary EMR child.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The basic problem is what role expectations does the teacher of elementary EMR children think she has compared to what her principal thinks her role should be?

Role expectation statements from four areas were considered: (1) Curriculum and Instruction; (2) School and Community Relations; (3) Administration and Organization; (4) Guidance and Evaluation.

Three specific questions are cited:

(1) Is there consensus for selected role norm items, among teachers of the elementary EMR child?

(2) Is there consensus for selected role norm items among the building principals?

(3) Is there consensus for selected role norm items between the focal and counter groups?

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

The investigator used the following definitions for the purpose of this study:

1. Educable Mentally Retarded defines the child whose intelligence quotient ranges from 55 to 80 and can be taught certain academic and social skills through special teaching methods, materials and placement.
2. Teacher of the Elementary EMR Child defines the role of the educator who is charged with daily development and implementation of practical knowledge. (Robinson and Robinson, 1965)
3. Building Principal defines the role of the certified administrator who is charged with operation of special education classes within his elementary school structure.
4. Role Expectations are evaluative standards which can be applied to an incumbent of a specific position describing the manner in which he should act his role.
5. Counter Position is a position within the same system of social relationships as the focal position and to which the focal position is related.
6. Consensus is defined as the degree of agreement of individuals on a given topic; sameness of commonly held norms; conceptions; sameness of behavior in general (Biddle and Thomas, 1966)
7. Dissensus is defined as the degree of disagreement of individuals on a given topic.

## LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

This study was limited to twenty-three teachers of the elementary (EMR) child and to the fifteen principals in charge of the buildings in which the teachers worked.

Personnel from Tacoma Public Schools were selected for this investigation for two reasons: (1) ready accessibility to the investigator, thus providing optimum returns; (2) ideal population for the investigation, EMR classes in regular grade school buildings.

The outstanding limitation of the study is that the data does not show if conflict does, in fact, exist. Therefore, clarification of points of conflict was not possible. A more precise analysis could have been made by using interview and observation procedures.

The determination of significant differences, by statistical procedures within groups would have made the study more meaningful.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### SUBJECT POPULATIONS

The main population for this study were teachers of the elementary (EMR) child in the city of Tacoma, Washington. This subject population represented the incumbent position and had an N of 26.

The principals of the buildings in which the incumbents worked represented the counter group and had an N of 15.

These people were selected from a list of personnel provided by H. B. Sowell, Supervisor of Program for Retarded Children. These teachers were listed as teachers of elementary (EMR) children in fifteen elementary schools of the Tacoma Public School System. The principals selected were listed as being in charge of the grade schools in which the focal population worked.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument used in the research was developed by Robert L. Myers for his doctoral dissertation. The initial step was to search the literature for information which would help to determine the goals and objectives frequently held for this position. In addition, the advice of field personnel currently engaged in teaching the elementary (EMR) child, regular class



teachers and university staff associated with teacher training were utilized to form an item pool.

Initial selection of questions were based on the following criteria:

1. The item was stated as a positive form.
2. The item was or could be stated behaviorally.
3. General and ambiguous statements were avoided.

These items were then placed under one of four major headings in the questionnaire. The four divisions of the instrument are: Administration and Organization, Curriculum and Instruction, Guidance and Evaluation and School Community Relations.

Validation of questions used in the instrument was done by the following four groups of people:

1. Doctoral and Masters' students in special education programs at the University of Oregon.
2. Field personnel teaching in special education in Eugene, Oregon Public Schools in 1969.
3. University of Oregon staff involved in special education programs.
4. Bureau of Handicapped children, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin.

Irrelevant and ambiguous items were identified and either revised or removed from the item pool by the above process.

Each item in the questionnaire had four possible answers: Absolutely Should Not (ASN), Preferably Should Not (PSN), Preferably Should (PS), and Absolutely Must (AM). (Myers, 1969)

## GATHERING OF DATA

Initial contact as to feasibility of the project was made with H. B. Sowell, Supervisor of Programs for Retarded Children in Tacoma Public Schools. After an explanation of the criteria for selection of subject population and of the project in general was given, H. B. Sowell granted permission to proceed and supplied the names and school addresses of selected staff members.

Each person selected received the following information:

(1) A letter describing the project and requesting full participation. (2) The role norm inventory and demographic data sheet. This demographic information was used only to describe each subject population. (3) A pre-addressed, stamped envelope for returning his role norm inventory to the investigator.

Five days after the role norm inventory was mailed 29 had been returned. Two weeks after the inventory was mailed a follow-up post card was sent to all subjects soliciting their support in returning the role inventory. Data collection was terminated after two more weeks.

Final returns from the elementary teacher population were 23 for a percentage of return of 88%. Final returns from the principal population were 15 for a percentage of return of 100%.

## TREATMENT OF DATA

A role norm inventory developed by Robert L. Myers (1969) was used to collect the data. This instrument covered four areas, (1) Administration and Organization, (2) Curriculum and Instruction,

(3) Guidance and Evaluation, (4) School Community Relations.

Respondents were asked to answer a total of fifty-two questions, each one a positive behavioral statement. A choice of responses ranging from ASN to AM were available for each statement.

The degree of consensus or dissensus existing within or between the two population groups was the basis for analyzing the data. This was done with a measure of cumulative relative frequency distribution developed by Robert Leik (1966), University of Washington. The theoretical range this score is based on extends from -1.0 where 50% of the responses are at each extreme category to +1.0 with all responses in one category.

An analysis of the teachers and principals differences in percentage of distribution of response scores for all fifty-two items is given.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the research pertaining to the four major role categories investigated: Administration and Organization; Curriculum and Instruction; Guidance and Evaluation; and School Community Relations. Each one has been treated separately and reported in terms of (1) consensus within populations, and (2) agreement between populations.

The within population data have been recorded in agreement and percentage scores with special note made of those items having the highest and lowest agreement scores. As in (Myers, 1969) study, the following agreement categories based on Leik values were utilized:

.900 - .999	very high
.700 - .899	high
.500 - .699	moderately high
.300 - .499	moderately low
.100 - .299	low

For the between population findings, a report in terms of an analysis of the teachers and principals differences in percentage distribution of response scores for all fifty-two items is given.

AGREEMENT WITHIN POPULATIONS:  
TEACHER RESPONSES

Administration and Organization

Any agreement scores below 0.0 result from a bi-modal distribution and may be regarded as a measure of dissensus. A complete lack of consensus is indicated by a score of 0.0; this means there is no clustering of responses in any given response category. An agreement score above 0.0 is regarded as a measure of consensus expressed in a percentage form.

Agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the Administration and Organization category are displayed in Table 1. The range of these scores is from .869 (high) for Item 6, to .543 (moderately high) for Item 12.

Role norm item six (. . . attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child . . .) shows the highest agreement score (.869) for Table 1 with seventy-eight percent of the responses in the PS category.

Role norm item twelve (. . . submit budget recommendations directly to the Director of Special Education. . .) has the lowest agreement score (.543) for Table 1 with thirty-four percent of the responses in the PS category and thirty-four percent of the responses in the PSN category.

Role norm item six (. . . attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child . . .) displays the highest agreement score in Table 1, with ninety-five percent of the responses falling in the combined PS and AM response categories.

TABLE 1

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Administration  
and Organization Teachers Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
2. Determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class	.717	04.3	34.7	52.1	04.3	04.3
4. Use itinerant specialists to teach special class students; i.e., music teacher, physical education.	.739	00.0	04.3	34.7	52.1	08.6
5. Develop and maintain a social case history on each student in his class.	.804	00.0	08.6	69.5	13.0	08.6
6. Attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child.	.869	00.0	00.0	78.2	17.3	04.3
8. Ask permission from the Director of Special Education to attend special education conferences.	.717	04.3	17.3	52.1	21.7	04.3
15. Keep written records updated monthly concerning the program of each student.	.847	00.0	08.6	73.9	13.0	04.3
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
1. Make the final determination on which students will be admitted to his class.	.652	13.0	39.1	43.4	00.0	04.3
3. Attend all building meetings open to the entire staff.	.695	04.3	00.0	47.8	43.4	04.3

Table 1 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
7. Ask permission from building principal to attend special education conferences.	.695	08.6	04.3	52.1	30.4	04.3
9. Secure the approval of the building principal before presenting program changes to the Director of Special Education.	.695	13.0	13.0	56.5	13.0	04.3
10. Send suggestions for program changes directly to the Director of Special Education.	.652	04.3	34.7	43.4	08.6	08.6
11. Submit budget recommendations directly to the building Principal.	.695	04.3	17.3	47.8	26.0	04.3
12. Submit budget recommendations directly to the Director of Special Education.	.543	08.6	34.7	34.7	04.3	17.3
13. Obtain the approval of the building Principal prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	.652	08.6	17.3	43.4	26.0	04.3
14. Obtain the approval of the Director of Special Education prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	.652	08.6	60.8	08.6	13.0	08.6

## Curriculum and Instruction

Teachers agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the Curriculum and Instruction category are tabulated in Table 2.

The range of agreement scores as shown in Table 2 is from .869 for items five, seven, and sixteen to .586 for role norm item one.

Role norm item five (. . . use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills . . .) has one of the high agreement scores in Table 2, with seventy-three percent of the responses falling in the AM category.

Role norm item seven (. . . test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child . . .) also has one of the high agreement scores in Table 2, with seventy-three percent of the responses falling in the AM category.

Role norm item sixteen (. . . utilize non-certified persons as tutors in the instructional program . . .) has one of the high agreement scores in Table 2, with seventy-eight percent of the responses falling in the PS category.

Role norm item one (. . . determine what the curriculum content should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests, i.e., Stanford Achievement Test . . .) shows the lowest agreement score in Table 2, with forty-seven percent in the combined ASN and PSN categories and forty-seven percent in the combined PS and AM categories.



TABLE 2

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Curriculum  
and Instruction Teacher Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
2. Use behavior modification techniques in teaching each individual child.	.739	00.0	00.0	47.8	47.8	04.3
3. Use regular class students as tutors for the EMR child.	.804	00.0	30.4	65.2	00.0	04.3
5. Use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills.	.869	00.0	00.0	21.7	73.9	04.3
6. Make supplementary materials for his classroom.	.847	00.0	00.0	26.0	69.5	04.3
7. Test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child.	.869	00.0	00.0	21.7	73.9	04.3
8. Organize a curriculum which provides for repetition of basic concepts.	.826	00.0	00.0	30.4	65.2	04.3
11. Work with other teachers in assisting at special functions such as parents' night.	.804	00.0	00.0	34.7	60.8	04.3
12. Volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners.	.804	00.0	04.3	65.2	26.0	04.3

Table 2 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
13. Initiate placement of EMR students with regular classroom students whenever they can meet minimum academic standards.	.804	00.0	04.3	26.0	65.2	04.3
14. Place EMR students with regular class students for such activities as art and physical education	.833	00.0	00.0	52.1	43.4	04.3
15. Divide school day activities equally between academic and non-academic tasks.	.717	08.6	17.3	56.5	13.0	04.3
16. Utilize non-certified persons as tutors in the instructional program.	.869	00.0	08.6	78.2	08.6	04.3
18. Record deviant behavior data for the purpose of evaluating pupil adjustment.	.760	00.0	04.3	34.7	56.5	04.3
19. Review current literature to guide his selection of new teaching strategies.	.739	00.0	00.0	52.1	43.4	04.3
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
1. Determine what the curriculum content should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests; i.e., Stanford Achievement Test.	.586	21.7	26.0	43.4	04.3	04.3
4. Teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child.	.608	52.1	30.4	08.6	04.3	04.3

Table 2 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
9. Take full responsibility for the initiation of curriculum development for his classroom.	.695	00.0	34.7	43.4	17.3	04.3
10. Take turns with regular teachers in supervision of lunchroom and playground.	.695	00.0	17.3	21.7	56.5	04.3
17. Test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests.	.695	04.3	39.1	47.8	04.3	04.3

### Guidance and Evaluation

Teachers agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the Guidance and Evaluation section are tabulated in Table 3.

The range of agreement scores is from .717 for role norm item three, to .499 for role norm item eight.

Role norm item three (. . . use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique . . .) shows the highest agreement score (.717) for Table 3. The score indicates that sixty-nine and one-half percent fall in the combined PS and AM categories.

Role norm item eight (. . . administer psychometric tests, i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test . . .) displays the lowest agreement score (.499) in Table 3. Sixty point eight of the responses fall in the combined ASN and PSN categories.

### School Community Relations

Teachers' agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the School Community Relations category are tabulated in Table 4.

The agreement scores range from .782 for role norm item five to .565 for role norm item eight.

Role norm item five (. . . obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program . . .) shows the highest agreement score (.782) for Table 4, with sixty percent of the responses in the AM category.

Role norm item eight (. . . organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children . . .) has the lowest agreement score (.565)

TABLE 3

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Guidance  
and Evaluation Teacher Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High</u>						
3. Use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique.	.717	00.0	17.3	56.5	13.0	13.0
<u>Moderately High</u>						
1. Take all responsibility for counseling the children in his class.	.565	47.8	34.7	04.3	04.3	08.6
2. Counsel regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.	.543	04.3	47.8	21.7	13.0	13.0
4. Grade his students in accordance with standards employed in the regular classroom.	.673	69.5	17.3	00.0	04.3	08.6
5. Use grades as motivational devices.	.565	30.4	34.7	21.7	04.3	08.6
6. Administer educational diagnostic tests, such as Wide Range Achievement Test.	.565	13.0	47.8	17.3	08.6	13.0
7. Administer psychological tests; i.e., Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person.	.543	30.4	34.7	17.3	08.6	08.6
9. Utilize research findings concerning factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students.	.695	00.0	04.3	43.4	43.4	08.6

Table 3 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>Moderately Low</u>						
8. Administer psychometric tests; i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test.	.499	30.4	30.4	17.3	13.0	08.6

TABLE 4

Agreement and Percentage Scores for School  
Community Relations Teachers Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
5. Obtain written per- mission from each child's parents prior to place- ment in the EMR program.	.782	00.0	04.3	26.0	60.8	08.6
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
1. Solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program.	.630	08.6	47.8	30.4	04.3	08.6
2. Prepare for release through mass media, information regarding the school program for EMR children.	.652	04.3	34.7	43.4	08.6	08.6
3. Prepare a newsletter for distribution to parents of the EMR child.	.652	08.6	26.0	47.8	08.6	08.6
4. Maintain sole responsi- bility for releasing information concerning his class.	.586	17.3	39.1	30.4	04.3	08.6
6. Invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program.	.695	04.3	00.0	52.1	34.7	08.6
7. Make all psychological information available to the parents.	.608	13.0	56.5	08.6	08.6	13.0
8. Organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children.	.565	47.8	34.7	04.3	04.3	08.6

Table 4 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
9. Ask parents of EMR children to participate in all regular PTA activities.	.673	04.3	04.3	30.4	47.8	13.0



for Table 4 with forty-seven percent of the responses in the ASN category.

AGREEMENT WITHIN POPULATIONS:  
PRINCIPAL RESPONSES

Administration and Organization

Principals' agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the Administration and Organization category are tabulated in Table 5.

The range of agreement scores as tabulated in Table 5 is from .866 for role norm item three, to .599 for role norm item two.

Role norm item three (. . . attend all building meetings open to the entire staff . . .) displays the highest consensus with an agreement score of .866. Examination of the percentage distribution in Table 5 shows that seventy-three percent of the responses for this item fall in the AM response category.

Role norm item two (. . . determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class . . .) displays the lowest agreement score .599 in Table 5. The percentage score distribution shows that forty percent of the principals' responses fall into the PS response category. Further analysis of Table 5 shows that fifty-three percent of the principals' responses fall in the combined PSN and ASN response categories.

TABLE 5

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Administration  
and Organization Principal Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
3. Attend all building meetings open to the entire staff.	.866	00.0	00.0	20.0	73.3	06.6
5. Develop and maintain a social case history on each student in his class.	.733	00.0	00.0	53.3	40.0	06.6
6. Attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child.	.733	00.0	00.0	53.3	40.0	06.6
7. Ask permission from the building principal to attend special education conferences.	.733	00.0	06.6	53.3	33.3	06.6
8. Ask permission from the Director of Special Education to attend special education conferences.	.800	00.0	06.6	66.6	20.0	06.6
15. Keep written records updated monthly concerning the program of each student.	.766	00.0	00.0	60.0	33.3	06.6
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
1. Make the final determination on which students will be admitted to his class.	.666	40.0	46.0	06.6	00.0	06.6
2. Determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class.	.599	20.0	33.3	40.0	00.0	06.6

Table 5 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
4. Use itinerant special-ists to teach special class students; i.e., music teachers, physical education.	.699	06.6	00.0	53.3	33.3	06.6
9. Secure the approval of the building principal before presenting program changes to the Director of Special Education.	.666	06.6	06.6	26.6	53.3	06.6
10. Send suggestions for program changes directly to the Director of Special Education.	.633	13.3	60.0	06.6	06.6	13.3
11. Submit budget recommendations directly to the building principal.	.699	00.0	13.3	46.6	33.3	06.6
12. Submit budget recommendations directly to the Director of Special Education.	.666	20.0	46.6	26.6	00.0	06.6
13. Obtain the approval of the building principal prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	.633	06.6	20.0	40.0	26.6	06.6
14. Obtain the approval of the Director of Special Education prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	.699	06.6	53.3	33.3	00.0	06.6

## Curriculum and Instruction

Principals' agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in the Curriculum and Instruction category are tabulated in Table 6.

The range of agreement score as shown in Table 6 is from .900 for role norm items two and twelve to .633 for role norm items four and nine.

Role norm item two (. . . use behavior modification techniques in teaching with each individual child . . .) displays one of the highest agreement scores (.900) for Table 6. Examination of the percentage distribution indicates that one hundred percent of the responses fall in the combined PS and AM response categories.

Role norm item twelve (. . . volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners . . .) also shows the same agreement score as item two (.900). Examination of the percentage distribution indicates the identical distribution as item two, one hundred percent of the responses in the combined PS and AM response categories.

Role norm item four (. . . teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child . . .) displays one of the two lowest agreement scores, .633. The percentage score distribution indicates seventy-three percent of the principals' responses fall in the combined ASN and PSN categories. Role norm item nine (. . . take full responsibility for initiation of curriculum development in his classroom . . .) also has an agreement score of .633. The percentage score distribution indicates

TABLE 6

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Curriculum  
and Instruction Principals Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>Very High .900-.999</u>						
2. Use behavior modification techniques in teaching each individual child.	.900	00.0	00.0	80.0	20.0	00.0
12. Volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners.	.900	00.0	00.0	80.0	20.0	00.0
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
3. Use regular class students as tutors for the EMR child.	.766	00.0	33.3	60.0	00.0	06.6
5. Use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills.	.800	00.0	00.0	60.0	40.0	00.0
6. Make supplementary materials for his classroom.	.800	00.0	00.0	60.0	40.0	00.0
7. Test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child.	.766	00.0	00.0	53.3	46.6	00.0
8. Organize a curriculum which provides for repetition of basic subjects.	.800	00.0	00.0	60.0	40.0	00.0
11. Work with other teachers in assisting at special functions such as parents' night.	.766	00.0	00.0	46.6	53.3	00.0

Table 6 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
13. Initiate placement of EMR students with regular classroom students whenever they can meet minimum academic standards.	.766	00.0	00.0	46.6	53.3	00.0
14. Place EMR students with regular class students for such activities as art and physical education.	.833	00.0	00.0	66.6	33.3	00.0
15. Divide school day activities equally between academic and non-academic tasks.	.866	00.0	13.3	80.0	00.0	00.0
16. Utilize non-certificated persons as tutors in the instructional program.	.766	00.0	20.0	60.0	13.3	06.6
17. Test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests.	.833	06.6	20.0	73.3	00.0	00.0
18. Record deviant behavior data for the purpose of evaluating pupil adjustment.	.833	00.0	06.6	66.6	26.6	00.0
19. Review current literature to guide his selection of new teaching strategies.	.833	00.0	06.6	66.6	26.6	00.0
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
1. Determine what the curriculum content should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests; i.e., Stanford Achievement Test.	.699	06.6	20.0	53.3	13.3	06.6

Table 6 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
4. Teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child.	.633	40.0	33.3	20.0	06.6	00.0
9. Take full responsibility for the initiation of curriculum development for his classroom.	.633	06.6	40.0	33.3	20.0	00.0
10. Take turns with regular teachers in supervision of lunchroom and playground.	.666	00.0	13.3	33.3	46.6	06.6

that forty-six percent of the principals' responses fall in the combined ASN and PSN categories. Further examination shows that fifty-three percent of the principal responses fall in the combined PS and AM for this item.

### Guidance and Evaluation

Principals' agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in Guidance and Evaluation are displayed in Table 7.

The range of agreement scores as shown in Table 7 is from .933 for role norm item nine, to .666 for role norm items five and seven.

Role norm item nine (. . . utilize research findings concerning medical factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students . . .) displays the highest agreement score (.933) in Table 7. Examination of the percentage distribution indicates that eighty-six percent of the principals' responses fall in the PS category.

Role norm item five (. . . use grades as motivational devices . . .) and seven (. . . administer psychological tests; i.e., Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person . . .) both show identical moderately high agreement scores. Analysis of the percentage distribution scores in Table 7 for the above items show the largest percentage of responses in the combined ASN and PSN categories.



TABLE 7

Agreement and Percentage Scores for Guidance  
and Evaluation Principals Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>Very High .900-.999</u>						
9. Utilize research findings concerning medical factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students.	.933	00.0	00.0	86.6	13.3	00.0
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
1. Take all responsibility for counseling the children in his class.	.766	13.3	60.0	20.0	06.6	00.0
2. Counsel children regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.	.899	00.0	13.3	80.0	06.6	00.0
3. Use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique.	.733	13.3	06.6	66.6	06.6	06.6
4. Grade his students in accordance with standards employed in the regular classroom.	.766	53.3	46.6	00.0	00.0	00.0
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
5. Use grades as motivational devices.	.666	33.3	33.3	33.3	00.0	00.0
6. Administer educational diagnostic tests, such as the Wide Range Achievement Test.	.699	00.0	40.0	46.6	06.6	06.6
7. Administer psychological tests, Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person.	.666	33.3	40.0	20.0	06.6	00.0

Table 7 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	ASN	Percentage Scores			
			PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
8. Administer psychometric tests; i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test.	.699	33.3	40.0	26.6	00.0	00.0

School Community Relations

Principals' agreement and percentage scores for all role norm items in School Community Relations category are tabulated in Table 8.

The range of agreement scores as shown in Table 8 is from .899 for role norm item six to .599 for items five and seven.

Role norm item six (. . . invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program . . .) displays the highest score (.899) in Table 8. Analysis of the percentage distribution reveals that eighty percent of the responses are in the PS response category.

Role norm items five (. . . obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program . . .) and seven (. . . make all psychological information available to the parents . . .) both show identical low agreement scores (.599) on Table 8. Analysis of the percentage distribution for item five shows that seventy-nine percent of the principals' responses were in the combined PS and AM categories. Further analysis shows that the percentage distribution for item seven reveals that fifty-two percent of the principals' responses were in the combined PS and AM response categories.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN POPULATIONS:  
TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES

Teachers' and principals' differences in percentage of distribution of response scores for all role norm items in Administration and Organization category are tabulated in Table 9.

TABLE 8

Agreement and Percentage Scores for School  
Community Relations Principals Responses

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
<u>High .700-.899</u>						
1. Solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program.	.833	06.6	13.3	73.3	06.6	00.0
2. Prepare for release through mass media, information regarding the school program for EMR children.	.766	06.6	26.6	60.0	06.6	00.0
3. Prepare a newsletter for distribution to parents of the EMR child.	.733	06.6	06.6	66.6	06.6	13.3
6. Invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program.	.899	00.0	13.3	80.0	06.6	00.0
8. Organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children.	.733	60.0	33.3	00.0	06.6	00.0
<u>Moderately High .500-.699</u>						
4. Maintain sole responsibility for releasing information concerning his class.	.666	20.0	40.0	33.3	06.6	00.0
5. Obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program.	.599	20.0	40.0	33.3	06.6	00.0
7. Make all psychological information available to the parents.	.599	06.6	40.0	26.6	26.6	00.0

Table 8 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Agreement Score	Percentage Scores				
		ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
9. Ask parents of EMR chil- dren to participate in all regular PTA activi- ties.	.699	00.0	13.3	40.0	46.6	00.0

TABLE 9

Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals  
in Administration and Organization Role, as Measured  
by Analysis of Percentage Difference

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
1. Make the final determination on which students will be admitted to his class.	26.9	07.5	36.8	00.0	02.3
2. Determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class.	15.6	01.4	12.1	04.3	02.3
3. Attend all building meetings open to the entire staff.	04.3	00.0	27.8	29.8	02.3
4. Use itinerant specialists to teach special class students; i.e., music teacher, physical education.	06.6	04.3	18.5	18.8	02.0
5. Develop and maintain a social case history on each student in his class.	00.0	08.6	16.2	26.9	02.0
6. Attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child.	00.0	00.0	24.9	22.6	02.3
7. Ask permission from building principal to attend special education conferences.	08.6	02.3	01.1	02.8	02.3
8. Ask permission from the Director of Special Education to attend special education conferences.	04.3	10.7	14.4	01.7	02.3
9. Secure the approval of the building principal before presenting program changes to the Director of Special Education.	06.3	06.3	29.8	40.2	02.3
10. Send suggestions for program changes directly to the Director of Special Education.	08.9	25.2	36.8	02.0	04.6
11. Submit budget recommendations directly to the building principal.	04.3	04.0	01.1	07.2	02.3

Table 9 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
12. Submit budget recommendations directly to the Director of Special Education.	11.3	11.8	08.1	04.3	10.7
13. Obtain the approval of the building principal prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	02.0	02.6	03.4	00.0	02.3
14. Obtain the approval of the Director of Special Education prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	02.0	07.5	24.6	13.0	02.0
15. Keep written records, updated monthly, concerning the program of each student.	00.0	08.6	13.9	20.2	02.3

Role norm item one (. . . make the final determination on which students will be admitted to his class . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference that principals responded 34.4 percent more times in the combined ASN and PSN response categories than teachers. Further analysis of the percentage difference shows that teachers answered 36.8 percent more times in the PS category than principals.

Role norm item two (. . . determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class . . .) displays by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 17.0 percent more times in the combined ASN and PSN categories than teachers. Further analysis shows that teachers responded 12 percent more times in PS category than principals.

Role norm item three (. . . attend all building meetings open to the entire staff . . .) shows that principals responded 29.8 percent more times in the AM category than teachers. Further analysis indicates that teachers responded 27.8 percent more times in the PS category than principals.

Role norm item four (. . . use itinerate specialists to teach special class students; i.e., music teacher, physical education . . .) displays by analysis of percentage differences that teachers responded 18.8 percent more times in the AM category than principals. Principals, on the other hand, responded 18.5 percent more times in PS category than teachers.

Role norm item five (. . . develop and maintain a social case history on each student in his class . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 26.9 percent



more times in the AM category than teachers. However, in the PS category, teachers responded 16.2 percent more times than principals.

Role norm item six (. . . attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child . . .) displays by analysis of response distribution that teachers responded 47.5 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than principals.

Role norm item seven (. . . ask permission from building principal to attend special education conferences . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference less than 15 percent difference between teachers and principals, in the ASN, PSN, PS, and AM categories combined.

Role norm item eight (. . . ask permission from the Director of Special Education to attend special education conferences . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference that principals responded 16.1 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item nine (. . . secure the approval of the building principal before presenting program changes to the Director of Special Education . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage distribution that principals responded 40.2 percent more times in the AM category than teachers.

Role norm item ten (. . . send suggestions for program changes directly to the Director of Special Education . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage distribution that in the combined PS and AM categories the teachers responded 38.8 percent more times than principals.

Role norm item eleven (. . . submit budget recommendations directly to the building principal . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference that there is less than 15 percent difference between teachers and principals in the combined ASN, PSN, PS and AM categories.

Role norm item twelve (. . . submit budget recommendations directly to the Director of Special Education . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage difference that principals responded 23.1 percent more times in the combined ASN and PSN categories.

Role norm item thirteen (. . . obtain the approval of the building principal prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage of difference that teachers responded 37.6 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than principals.

Role norm item fifteen (. . . keep written records, updated monthly, concerning the program of each student . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that teachers responded 34.1 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than principals.

### Curriculum and Instruction

Teachers' and principals' differences in percentage of distribution of response scores for all role norm items in Curriculum and Instruction are tabulated in Table 10.

Role norm item one (. . . determine what the curriculum content should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests; i.e., Stanford Achievement Test . . .) indicated by

TABLE 10

Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals  
in Curriculum and Instruction Role, as Measured  
by Differences in Percent Distribution

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
1. Determine what the curriculum content should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests; i.e., Stanford Achievement Test.	15.0	06.0	09.8	08.9	02.3
2. Use behavior modification techniques in teaching each individual child.	00.0	00.0	32.1	27.8	04.3
3. Use regular class students as tutors for the EMR child.	00.0	02.8	05.2	00.0	02.3
4. Teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child.	12.1	02.8	11.3	02.3	04.3
5. Use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills.	00.0	00.0	38.2	33.9	04.3
6. Make supplementary materials for his classroom.	00.0	00.0	33.9	29.5	04.3
7. Test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child.	00.0	00.0	31.5	27.2	04.3
8. Organize a curriculum which provides for repetition of basic concepts.	00.0	00.0	29.5	25.2	04.3
9. Take full responsibility for the initiation of curriculum development for his classroom.	06.6	05.2	10.1	02.6	04.3
10. Take turns with regular teachers in supervision of lunchroom and playground.	00.0	04.0	11.5	09.0	02.3

Table 10 (continued)

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
11. Work with other teachers in assisting at special functions such as parents' night.	00.0	00.0	11.8	07.5	04.3
12. Volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners.	00.0	04.3	14.7	06.0	04.3
13. Initiate placement of EMR students with regular classroom students whenever they can meet minimum academic standards.	00.0	04.3	20.5	11.8	04.3
14. Place EMR students with regular class students for such activities as art and physical education.	00.0	00.0	14.4	10.1	04.3
15. Divide school day activities equally between academic and non-academic tasks.	08.6	04.0	23.4	13.0	02.3
16. Utilize non-certified persons as tutors in the instructional programs.	00.0	11.3	18.2	04.6	02.3
17. Test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests.	02.3	19.1	25.5	04.3	04.3
18. Record deviant behavior data for the purpose of evaluating pupil adjustment.	00.0	02.3	31.8	29.8	04.3
19. Review current literature to guide his selection of new teaching strategies.	00.0	06.6	14.4	16.8	04.3

analysis of percentage differences that teachers responded twenty-one percent more times in the combined ASN and PSN categories than principals. Further analysis shows that the principals responded 18.7 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item two (. . . use behavior modification techniques in teaching each individual child . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 32.1 percent more times in the PS category than teachers. On the other hand, teachers responded 27.8 percent more times in the AM category than did principals.

Role norm item three (. . . use regular class students as tutors for the EMR child . . .) indicates that teachers and principals responded with less than 15 percent difference in the combined ASN, PSN, PS and AM categories.

Role norm item four (. . . teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 26.6 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item five (. . . use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that teachers responded 33.9 percent more times in the AM category than principals. Further analysis shows that principals responded 38.2 percent more times in the PS category than teachers.

Role norm item six (. . . make supplementary materials for his classroom . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 33.9 percent more times in the PS category than teachers. However, further analysis shows teachers responding 29.5 percent more times in the AM category than principals.

Role norm item seven (. . . test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 31.5 percent more times than teachers in the PS category while teachers responded 27.2 percent more times in the AM category than principals.

Role norm item eight (. . . organize a curriculum which provides for repetition of basic concepts . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 29.5 percent more times than teachers in the PS category. Further analysis shows the teachers responding 25.2 percent more times than principals in the AM category.

Role norm item nine (. . . take full responsibility for the initiation of curriculum development in his classroom . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded in the combined ASN and PSN categories 12.7 percent more times than teachers.

Role norm item ten (. . . take turns with regular teachers in supervision of lunchroom and playground . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 20.5

percent more times than teachers in the combined PS and AM categories.

Role norm item eleven (. . . work with other teachers in assisting at special functions such as parents night . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 19.3 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item twelve (. . . volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 20.7 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item thirteen (. . . initiate placement of EMR students with regular classroom students whenever they can meet minimum academic standards . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 31.8 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item fourteen (. . . place EMR students with regular class students for such activities as art and physical education . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 24.5 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item fifteen (. . . divide school day activities equally between academic and non-academic tasks . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 23.4 percent more times in the PS category than teachers. On the other

hand, teachers responded thirteen percent more times in the AM category than did principals.

Role norm item sixteen (. . . utilize non-certified persons as tutors in the teachers responded 22.8 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than principals.

Role norm item seventeen (. . . test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 29.8 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item eighteen (. . . record deviant behavior data for the purpose of evaluating pupil adjustment . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference that principals responded 31.8 percent more times in the PS category than teachers. However, the teachers responded by marking the AM category 29.8 percent more times than the principals.

Role norm item nineteen (. . . review current literature to guide his selection of new teaching strategies . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals marked the PS category 14.4 percent more times than teachers, while the teachers marked the AM category 16.8 percent more times than principals.

### Guidance and Evaluation

Role norm item one (. . . take all responsibility for counseling the children in his class . . .) reveals by analysis of the differences in percentage response that teachers responded 34.4 percent more times in the ASN category than principals. On



TABLE 11

Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals  
in Guidance and Evaluation Role, as Measured  
by Differences of Percent Distribution

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
1. Take all responsibility for counseling the children in his class.	34.4	25.2	15.6	02.3	08.6
2. Counsel children regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.	04.3	34.4	58.2	06.3	13.0
3. Use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique.	13.3	10.7	10.1	06.3	06.3
4. Grade his students in accordance with standards employed in the regular classroom.	16.2	29.2	00.0	04.3	08.6
5. Use grades as motivational devices.	02.8	01.4	11.5	04.3	08.6
6. Administer educational diagnostic tests; i.e., the Wide Range Achievement test.	13.0	07.8	29.2	02.0	06.3
7. Administer psychological tests; i.e., Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person.	02.8	05.2	02.6	02.0	08.6
8. Administer psychometric tests; i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test.	02.8	09.5	09.2	13.0	08.6
9. Utilize research findings concerning medical factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students.	00.0	04.3	43.1	30.1	08.6

the other hand, principals responded 25.2 percent more times in the PSN category than teachers.

Role norm item two (. . . counsel children regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations . . .) indicates by analysis of the percentage differences that principals responded 58.2 percent more times than teachers in the PS category. However, further analysis of percentage differences shows that teachers responded 34.4 percent more times in the PSN category than principals.

Role norm item three (. . . use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique . . .) reveal by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 16.4 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item four (. . . guide his students in accordance with standards employed in the regular classroom . . .) shows by analysis of percentage difference that teachers responded 16.2 percent more times in the ASN category than teachers. Further analysis shows that principals responded 29.2 percent more times in PSN category than the teachers.

Role norm item five (. . . use grades as motivational devices . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 11.6 percent more times in the PS category than teachers.

Role norm item six (. . . administer educational diagnostic tests, such as the Wide Range Achievement Test . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals marked the combined PS and AM category 31.2 percent more times than teachers.

Role norm item seven (. . . administer psychological tests; i.e., Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that there is a less than fifteen percent difference in the combined ASN, PSN, PS and AM categories between teachers and principals.

Role norm item eight (. . . administer psychometric tests; i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage difference that principals responded 13.0 percent more times in the AM category than teachers.

Role norm item nine (. . . utilize research findings concerning medical factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 43.1 percent more times in the PS category than teachers. On the other hand, further analysis shows that teachers responded 30.1 percent more times in the AM category than principals.

#### School Community Relations

Role norm item one (. . . solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 45.1 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers. Further analysis shows that teachers responded 36.4 percent more times in the combined PSN and ASN categories than principals.

Role norm item two (. . . prepare for release through mass media information regarding the school program for EMR

TABLE 12

Between Population Comparisons of Teachers and Principals  
in School Community Relations Role, as Measured  
by Difference in Percentage Distribution

Role Norm Item (. . . Teacher Should)	Difference in Percentage Distribution				
	ASN	PSN	PS	AM	BLANK
1. Solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program.	02.0	34.4	42.8	02.3	08.6
2. Prepare for release through mass media information regarding the school program for EMR children.	02.3	08.1	16.5	02.0	08.6
3. Prepare a newsletter for distribution to parents of the EMR child.	02.0	19.4	18.8	02.0	04.6
4. Maintain sole responsibility for releasing information concerning his class.	02.6	00.8	02.8	02.3	08.6
5. Obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program.	13.3	02.3	07.2	14.2	08.6
6. Invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program.	04.3	13.3	27.8	28.1	08.6
7. Make all psychological information available to the parents.	06.3	16.5	17.9	17.9	13.0
8. Organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children.	12.1	01.4	04.3	02.3	08.6
9. Ask parents of EMR children to participate in all regular PTA activities.	04.3	08.9	09.5	01.1	13.0

children . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 18.5 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item three (. . . prepare a newsletter for distribution to parents of the EMR child . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 20.8 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item four (. . . maintain sole responsibility for releasing information concerning his class . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage difference a less than fifteen percent difference between teachers and principals in the combined ASN, PSN, PS and AM categories.

Role norm item five (. . . obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 21.4 more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

Role norm item six (. . . invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that teachers responded 28.1 percent more times in the AM category than principals. Further analysis shows that principals responded 27.8 percent more times in PS category than teachers.

Role norm item seven (. . . make all psychological information available to the parents . . .) reveals by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 35.8 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers.

However, further analysis shows that teachers responded 22.8 percent more times in the combined PSN and ASN categories than principals.

Role norm item eight (. . . organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children . . .) shows by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 13.4 percent more times in the combined ASN and PSN categories than teachers.

Role norm item nine (. . . ask parents of EMR children to participate in all regular PTA activities . . .) indicates by analysis of percentage differences that principals responded 10.6 percent more times in the combined PS and AM categories than teachers. However, further analysis shows that principals responded 8.9 percent more times in the PSN category than teachers.

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

#### DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This investigation was involved with the expectations held for the position of the elementary teacher of the EMR child by the incumbents and how those expectancies, as to function, compare with the expectancies held by the counter group, the building principals.

More specifically, this investigation attempted to answer the following questions pertaining to the role categories of Administration and Organization, Curriculum and Instruction, Guidance and Evaluation, and School Community Relations.

1. Is there consensus among the teachers of the elementary EMR child concerning selected roles?
2. Is there consensus among building principals concerning selected roles?
3. Is there consensus between teachers of the EMR child and building principals?

#### POPULATION STUDIED

The selection of the two role defining groups was based on the following criteria: (1) all respondents must have been working in Tacoma, Washington grade schools having specific

classes for the EMR child. (2) All building principals had to be in charge of those classes.

Twenty-six teachers of the EMR child were involved in the study and the fifteen principals of their buildings.

#### PERCENT OF RETURNS

Twenty-three of the twenty-six teachers responded to the questionnaire. This gave an 88 percent return for the teachers of the elementary EMR child.

Fifteen of the building principals returned the questionnaire for a return of 100 percent.

#### TEACHER RESPONSES

##### Within Group Agreement

Within group agreement data will be reviewed for each of the four response categories. The following points are considered relevant to interpretation of the data for each category:

1. Agreement values presented by the Leik scores.
  - A. The number of items in each of the agreement categories.
2. Relationships of items for within and between agreement categories.
3. Percentage distribution of responses.
  - A. Negative or positive directional trend.

##### Administration and Organization

The agreement scores in Table 1 are distributed into two categories, six in the high category, and nine in the moderately



high category. The high agreement category in Table 1 indicates in the data for items five and fifteen that teachers view record keeping as a task they must perform. A strong willingness to accept support and new ideas is indicated in the heavy positive response for items four and six.

In role norm item nine and ten there are indications that teachers feel they should confer with the building principal before going to the Director of Special Education about program changes. Role norm item seven also indicates this preference of the EMR teacher to seek the permission of the building principal first in matters pertaining to his building. This motivation is again prevalent in the items eleven and twelve relevant to budget recommendations. Preference for contacting the building principal prior to seeking out the Director of Special Education is further evidenced in the percentage scores for items thirteen and fourteen.

Both are concerned with parental approval to obtain a physical examination for their child. In thirteen, 69.4 percent of the responses fall in the combined PS and AM categories that the building principal must be contacted before the parents. While in fourteen, 68.4 percent of the responses fall in the combined ASN and PSN categories that the Director of Special Education should be contacted first.

With the exception of items twelve and fourteen, overall data for Table 2 indicates teachers responded affirmatively for all role norm items in the Administration and Organization role.

## Curriculum and Instruction

The agreement scores in Table 2 are divided into two agreement categories: fourteen in the high category, five in the moderately high category.

The data in Table 2 shows that 65.2 percent of respondents perceive item eight, which deals with repetition of basic concepts, as an important teacher role function. However, ambivalent feelings were prevalent in the percentage distribution of item seventeen which is concerned with the testing of their teaching effectiveness. The teachers indicated uncertainty about the use of standardized tests in evaluating the EMR child. The 39.1 percent response in the PSN response category indicates this clearly.

Items three and sixteen show a possible teacher concern for support in the classroom. While some uncertainty is shown to use regular class students as tutors, a strong feeling (86.8 percent of the responses falling in the positive PS and AM response categories) is indicated in item sixteen, use of non-certified tutors. The data in Table 2 for items thirteen and fourteen show a very strong feeling on the part of the teachers that an effort should be made to place students, whenever possible, into regular class settings for academic as well as non-academic pursuits.

Role norm items ten, eleven, and twelve indicate by heavy positive responses the cooperative attitude of the teachers of the elementary EMR child. They perceive as part of their function, sharing the responsibilities of building duties and assisting with children from regular classes who need special materials.

A high concern with the improvement of teaching techniques is shown in the larger percentage of responses in the AM response category for items six, seven, and nineteen.

Items two, five, and eighteen deal with various forms of individualizing the approach with each child. The data shows the teachers have responded in the positive categories concerning their functions in individualized programming for the EMR child. With the exception of items one and four, the teacher responses for this role norm category fall into the affirmative response categories.

#### Guidance and Evaluation

The agreement scores in Table 3 are distributed into three categories: one in the high category, seven in the moderately high category and one in the moderately low category.

The data in Table 3 indicates in item two that teachers do not wish to take a major role in counseling of children in their classes. Item one further bears this out with 47.8 of the responses falling in the ASN category.

Items four and five show by the distribution of percentage scores that the function of teachers when grading is to report grades to parents in such a manner that the parents obtain a realistic picture of the child's success rather than use grades as a motivational device.

The response distribution for role norm item three and nine indicates that teachers can understand more from research concerning internal problems that restrict academic growth than from the observation of behavior.

Percentage distribution in Table 3 shows that teachers do not perceive administering tests as part of their function. Items six, seven, and eight all show strong negative responses.

### School Community Relations

The agreement scores in Table 4 are distributed in two categories: one in the high category, and eight in the moderately high category.

The percentage scores for Table 4 show a strong teacher agreement to ask parents of the EMR child to participate in regular PTA. This data seems to agree with data in the previous section concerning the integration of students with regular school functions.

Data from items three and six indicates that teachers feel a need for a communication flow with parents of the EMR. However, in item seven there is a suggestion that certain information concerning the EMR child should not be made available. This is shown by the 69.9 percent response in the combined ASN and PSN categories.

Percentage distribution scores for items one, two, three, and four in Table 4 show the teachers do not see their role as primary school personnel responsible for communication with the community. However, there is a strong indication they feel this communication should be carried on by someone. This is shown by the strong response in the PS category.

Teachers answered in the affirmative in six of the nine role norm items in this section. As in the previous section

discussed, a lack of certainty was shown by the teachers in their responses.

## PRINCIPAL RESPONSES

### Administration and Organization

The agreement scores in Table 5 are distributed into two agreement categories: six in the high category, nine in the moderately high category.

Principal responses in both role norm items seven and eight indicate that both the building principal and the Director of Special Education should be asked before attending a special education conference. All responses for these two items fall into the affirmative response categories, with the greater percentage in the PS category.

It is strongly suggested that the teacher of the EMR child is to be a definite part of building staff by the 73.3 percent response in the AM category of item one.

The high agreement scores of items five and fifteen indicate the principals agreement with the teachers point of view that record keeping is a part of the teachers' role.

The percentage response of 53.3 in the AM category of item nine and the 60.0 percent in the PSN category of item ten would indicate that matters pertaining to building programs should be taken up with the principal first, not the Director of Special Education.

In items eleven and twelve a strong indication for budget matters to come to the principal is indicated. Further analysis

of the data shows the principals in low agreement as to whether or not the budget should be presented to the Director at all.

Principals have definite points of view on teachers' function concerning the placement and the timing of placement of children in class. This is definitely shown as an administrative function by the heavy marking in the ASN and PSN response categories on role norm items one and two.

In the matter of giving permission to teachers to contact a parent about physical exams for children, the principals indicate a desire to be contacted first, but show an openness to pass this problem along to the Director of Special Education.

A general trend for this role norm category is that the principals show a high degree of certainty about what the teachers' role should or should not be.

### Curriculum and Instruction

The agreement scores in Table 8 are divided into three categories: two in the very high category, thirteen in the high category and four in the moderately high category.

Principals responded 100 percent affirmatively that teacher function should provide for a repetition of basic concepts when teaching the EMR child. However, principals are not committed to the degree that teachers should use standardized tests to measure teaching effectiveness.

Role norm items two, five and six have to do with individualized instruction. Principals responded 100 percent in the combined PS and AM categories so these are definitely seen as teacher functions.

This same positive trend is seen in items thirteen and fourteen concerning placement of children with regular class students for non-academic activities.

For role norm items ten, eleven and twelve which pertain to the building responsibilities of the special class teacher, the principals marked a high percentage in the combined PS and AM categories for each item.

Generally, principals show a high within group agreement level with the exception of items four and nine.

### Guidance and Evaluation

The agreement scores in Table 7 are divided in three agreement categories: one in the very high category, four in the high category, and four in the moderately high category.

Role norm items one and two, dealing with counseling of the EMR child by teachers, shows that principals feel that the teachers' function is not to take the entire responsibility, but they may do some counseling in certain areas.

Role norm items four and five show that principals and teachers are in near agreement by percentage distribution concerning using grades as motivational devices and grading EMR students by the same academic standards. Both teachers and principals responded with the greatest percentage of their responses in the combined PSN and ASN categories.

Ambivalent feelings of the principals are indicated in role norm item three dealing with the use of play therapy. Although 66.6 percent of the responses are in the PS category, 19.6 are also in the combined ASN and PSN categories.

In role norm items seven and eight, a definite position on teacher function is taken by the principals on the issue of administering tests. In both items 73.3 percent of the responses were marked on the negative side.

### School Community Relations

The agreement scores in Table 8 are divided into two categories: five in the high category and four in the moderately high category.

Table 8 shows that principals feel teachers should ask parents of EMR children to participate in regular PTA activities. This is verified by 86.6 percent of the responses marked in the combined PS and AM categories in item nine. Further, 93.3 percent of the principals' responses for item eight were negatively directed against having teachers organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children.

In role norm items one, two, three and four in Table 8, concerning communication to the community about the EMR program, principals responded affirmatively for all items except item four, indicating a communication effort should be made with the community but that teachers should not be given the sole responsibility for this function.

Principals responded similarly to the teachers for the role norm items three, six and seven with the exception that principals' responses showed slightly higher agreement scores in items three and seven. Also, the teachers were slightly more negative about the release of psychological information in item seven.



Item five, which is concerned with obtaining written parental permission before placement of the child in the EMR program shows a low agreement score for the principals where the teachers took the affirmative view that this was their function to perform.

BETWEEN POPULATION COMPARISONS:  
TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES

Administration and Organization

In Chapter I, it was suggested the effectiveness of the teacher of the EMR child would seem to depend partially on the degree of consensus with the counter group most concerned with his performance. It was also suggested that differences arise because of the various points of view held by both groups relative to the educative duties required and methods used in the education of the EMR child.

Therefore, this part of Chapter IV will attempt to discuss those items showing some differences in agreement between teachers of the elementary EMR child and the principals of their buildings.

Table 9 displays two role norm items that show possible differences in agreement between teachers and principals.

Role norm item one, concerning teacher function in relation to the final decision on which students will be a part of his class shows the teachers indicated it as their function by a 36.8 percent greater response in the PS category than the principals. However, potential for conflict shows with principals responding 34.4 percent more times in the negative than the teachers.

Role norm item ten is the question of whether or not to go directly to the Director of Special Education with program changes. Conflict is possible here with teachers responding 38.8 percent more in the positive vein than principals.

### Curriculum and Instruction

Table 10 displays one role norm item that shows some possibility for conflict. Role norm item seventeen is concerned with evaluation of teachers teaching effectiveness by standardized tests. Teachers showed uncertainty in marking this item by dividing their responses between the negative and positive response categories. In the PS category principals responded 25.5 percent more times than teachers. However, teachers gave a greater response in the PSN category than principals, therefore the potential for conflict is present.

Principals perceive item seventeen as a teacher function while it is possible that teachers see this function as a threat to the autonomy of their classroom. Principals, on the opposite side, see the need for staff to evaluate their work with the children.

### Guidance and Evaluation

Table 11 displays one item that shows potential for conflict.

Role norm item two regarding the counseling of children on personal problems indicates 64.5 percent more principals than teachers feel this is a function of the teacher in the classroom. The conflict possibility is greater because 34.5 percent more

teachers than principals feel it is not a function of the teacher. Perhaps the teachers are reluctant to assume this role from lack of training, however the teachers seem to feel that this is properly the role of the teacher.

### School Community Relations

Table 12 displays two items that show some possible difference in agreement between teachers and principals.

Role norm item one indicates the teachers feel that giving talks in the community regarding the program is not a function of his job. However, 45.2 more principals than teachers answered that this was a function of the incumbent position. Here again the possibility of lack of training in necessary skills may be the only reason for this point of conflict.

Role norm item seven indicates some disagreement over the release of psychological information to the parents. A 36 percent greater number of the principals marked in the positive response category while 22.9 percent more of the teachers than principals indicate a negative response. The reason for conflict here may be that the teachers feel threatened by the parent group. This potential for conflict could be resolved if principals conferred with parents when this information was discussed.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

The data presented from this investigation indicates some differences exist between teachers of elementary EMR children and their building principals in all of the major role categories investigated.

Results of the investigation could provide a basis from which building principals can begin to identify functions that are not mutually specified. In this way, maximum efficiency, productivity and morale could be better obtained with his staff.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Additional research in this area should attempt to determine if, in fact, conflict does exist between building principals and teachers of the elementary EMR child, instead of the slight potential indicated in this investigation.

Parents of the EMR child should also be brought into the study as well as other counter groups in the community. Then a more composite picture of the role of the teacher in the community as well as school setting would be given.

Perhaps to personally interview each respondent would be beneficial so some interpretation could be made as to the validity of answers given on the questionnaire.

#### LIMITATIONS OF PRESENT INVESTIGATION

The outstanding limitation of the study is that the data does not show if conflict does, in fact, exist. Therefore, clarification of points of conflict was not possible. A more precise analysis could have been made by using interview and observation procedures.

The determination of significant differences, by statistical procedures, within groups would have made the study more meaningful.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### THE PROBLEM

The intention of this investigation was to study these four concerns: (1) identify the expectations which building principals held for teachers of the elementary EMR child; (2) identify the role of the elementary teacher of the EMR child as held by the incumbents; (3) to compare the expectations between the two groups to determine points of difference; and (4) to summarize the role of the teacher of the elementary EMR child according to the data gathered in this study.

#### METHOD

A questionnaire developed by Robert L. Myers was used to collect data on role clarification of the teacher of the elementary EMR child in four major role categories: Administration and Organization; Guidance and Evaluation; Curriculum and Instruction; and School Community Relations.

Twenty-six teachers of the EMR and fifteen building principals from Tacoma, Washington public schools were selected as respondents to the role clarification instrument.

Criterion for selection was that each teacher had to be working in a regular grade school building and each principal had to be in charge of those buildings.

Each respondent was mailed a questionnaire and a letter explaining the study and requesting compliance by return of the completed questionnaire.

Two weeks after the inventory was mailed, a follow-up post card was sent to all subjects soliciting their support in returning the role norm inventory. Data collection was terminated after two more weeks.

## RESULTS

Within population intrapositional consensus was measured by the Leik measure of ordinal consensus.

An analysis of the teachers' and principals' differences in percentage of distribution of response scores for all fifty-two items was done.

Results of this investigation show that agreement within population varies from high agreement to moderately low agreement for the teachers, and from very high agreement to moderately low agreement for the principals.

Administration and Organization - item one (. . . make final determination on which students will be admitted to his class . . .) and item ten (. . . send suggestions for program changes directly to the Director of Special Education . . .)

Curriculum and Instruction - item seventeen (. . . test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests . . .)

Guidance and Evaluation - item two (. . . counsel children regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations. . .)

School Community Relations - item one (. . . solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program . . .) and item seven (. . . make all psychological information available to the parents . . .)

### CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data, the following conclusions seem verified for the questions asked:

1. Teachers are in high to moderately high agreement for selected role norm items dealing with Administration and Organization; high to moderately high agreement for selected role norm items dealing with Curriculum and Instruction; predominately high to moderately low in agreement for selected role norm items in Guidance and Evaluation; and from high to moderately high in agreement for selected role norm items in School Community Relations.

2. Principals are in high to moderately high agreement for selected role norm items dealing with Administration and Organization; very high to moderately high agreement for selected role norm items dealing with Curriculum and Instruction; from very high to moderately high agreement for selected role norm items dealing with Guidance and Evaluation; and from high to moderately high in agreement for selected role norm items dealing with School Community Relations.

3. Teachers and principals differ to some degree on specific items of the selected role norm items in all of the major role norm categories investigated.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aubrey, R. F. "What is the Role of the Elementary School Teacher?" Elementary School Journal. March, 1968. 68, pp. 277-83.
2. Bates, F. L. "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," Social Forces. May, 1956. 34, pp. 313-321.
3. Biddle, B. J., and Thomas, E. J. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York, London, Sidney: John Riley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
4. Brookover, W. B. "Research on Teacher and Administrator Roles," The Journal of Educational Sociology. September, 1955. 29, pp. 2-13.
5. Dinkmeyer, D. "How Do You Think of Yourself as a Teacher?" Instructor. September, 1964. 74.
6. Fine, J. J. "Attitudes of Regular and Special Class Teachers Toward the Educable Mentally Retarded Child," Exceptional Children. February, 1967. pp. 429-430.
7. Foskett, J. M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Teacher. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, pp. 109.
8. Getzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G. "Role Conflict and Personality," Journal of Personality. September, 1955. 24, pp. 74-85.
9. Gross, N., McEachern, A. W., and Mason, W. S. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of School Superintendent. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
10. Leik, R. K. "A Measure of Ordinal Consensus," Pacific Sociological Review. 1966.
11. Mackie, R. P., Dunn, L. M., and Cain, L. F. "Professional Preparation for Teachers of Exceptional Children: An Overview." Bulletin, 1959, No. 6, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1960.
12. Mackie, R. P., Williams, H. M., and Dunn, L. M. "Teachers of Children Who are Mentally Retarded." Bulletin, 1957, No. 3, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1962 (reprinted: 1962).

13. MacNair, C. R. "Role Expectations for the Position of Assistant Superintendent of Instruction as Seen by Key Secondary Personnel." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.
14. Morphet, E. L. Johns, R. L., and Reller, T. L. Educational Administration. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
15. Myers, R. L. "Clarification of the Role of the Teacher of the Elementary Educable Mentally Retarded Child." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969.
16. Robinson, H. G., and Robinson, Nancy M. The Mentally Retarded Child. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

## APPENDICES

## QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements concern the role expectations for teachers of the educable mentally retarded child. We would like you to indicate what you think teachers of the educable mentally retarded (EMR) should or should not do in reference to the items listed.

Please respond in terms of how you, as an individual, honestly feel. Your responses will be considered privileged information and will be held in strict confidence. All reports will be anonymous.

Directions: Indicate to what degree do you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a mark (x) in one of the four spaces provided at the right of each statement. Please respond to each statement.

Absolutely Should Not	.....	ASN
Preferably Should Not	.....	PSN
Preferably Should	.....	PS
Absolutely Must	.....	AM

## ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

## Section I

---

I think the teacher of the Elementary EMR should . . .

---

Absolutely Should Not ..... ASN  
 Preferably Should Not ..... PSM  
 Preferably Should ..... PS  
 Absolutely Must ..... AM

ASN PSN PS AM

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Make the final determination on which students will be admitted to his class.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Determine the specific date that a new student will enter his class.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Attend all building meetings open to the entire staff.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Use itinerant specialists to teach special class students; i.e. music teacher, physical education.                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Develop and maintain a social case history on each student in his class.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Attend conferences pertaining to the EMR child.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Ask permission from the building principal to attend special education conferences.                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Ask permission from the director of special education to attend special education conferences.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Secure the approval of the building principal before presenting program changes to the director of special education. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Send suggestions for program changes directly to the director of special education.                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Submit budget recommendations directly to the building principal.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Submit budget recommendations directly to the director of special education.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

## Section I (continued)

	ASN	PSN	PS	AM
13. Obtain the approval of the building principal prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Obtain the approval of the director of special education, prior to requesting a parent to obtain a physical examination for their child.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Keep written records, updated monthly, concerning the program of each student.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## Section II

---

I think the teacher of the Elementary EMR should . . .

---

Absolutely Should Not ..... ASN  
 Preferably Should Not ..... PSN  
 Preferably Should ..... PS  
 Absolutely Must ..... AM

ASN PSN PS AM

- |  | ASN                      | PSN                      | PS                       | AM                       |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Determine what the curriculum should be for each individual by administering diagnostic tests; i.e., Stanford Achievement Test. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Use behavior modification techniques in teaching each individual child.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Use regular class students as tutors for the EMR child.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Teach only that subject matter that will be of vocational value to the child.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Use individualized instruction in teaching academic skills.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Make supplementary materials for his classroom.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Test different teaching methods to determine which are best for each individual EMR child.                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Organize a curriculum which provides for repetition of basic concepts.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Take full responsibility for the initiation of curriculum development for his classroom.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Take turns with regular teachers in supervision of lunchroom and playground.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Work with other teachers in assisting at special functions such as parents' night.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Volunteer to serve as a resource person for regular staff on teaching strategies for slow learners.                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



## CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## Section II (continued)

	ASN	PSN	PS	AM
13. Initiate placement of EMR students with regular classroom students whenever they can meet minimum academic standards.	∅	∅	∅	∅
14. Place EMR students with regular class students for such activities as art and physical education.	∅	∅	∅	∅
15. Divide school day activities equally between academic and non-academic tasks.	∅	∅	∅	∅
16. Utilize non-certificated persons as tutors in the instructional program.	∅	∅	∅	∅
17. Test teaching effectiveness by means of standardized tests.	∅	∅	∅	∅
18. Record deviant behavior data for the purpose of evaluating pupil adjustment.	∅	∅	∅	∅
19. Review current literature to guide his selection of new teaching strategies.	∅	∅	∅	∅

## GUIDANCE AND EVALUATION

## Section III

---

I think the teacher of the Elementary EMR should . . .

---

Absolutely Should Not ..... ASN  
 Preferably Should Not ..... PSN  
 Preferably Should ..... PS  
 Absolutely Must ..... AM

ASN PSN PS AM

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Take all responsibility for counseling the children in his class.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Counsel children regarding personal problems; i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Use play therapy as a guidance or teaching technique.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Grade his students in accordance with standards employed in the regular classroom.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Use grades as motivational devices.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Administer educational diagnostic tests, such as the Wide Range Achievement Tests.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Administer psychological tests; i.e., Bender Gestalt, Draw-a-Person.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Administer psychometric tests; i.e., Stanford Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Test.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Utilize research findings concerning medical factors that will limit academic achievement when specifying the educational objectives for his students. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONS

## Section IV

---

I think the teacher of the Elementary EMR should . . .

---

Absolutely Should Not ..... ASN  
 Preferably Should Not ..... PSN  
 Preferably Should ..... PS  
 Absolutely Must ..... AM

ASN PSN PS AM

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Solicit opportunities to give talks to community groups regarding his program.                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Prepare for release through mass media, information regarding the school program for EMR children. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Prepare a newsletter for distribution to parents of the EMR child.                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Maintain sole responsibility for releasing information concerning his class.                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Obtain written permission from each child's parents prior to placement in the EMR program.         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Invite parents to visit the special class prior to enrolling the child in the EMR program.         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Make all psychological information available to the parents.                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Organize a separate PTA for parents of EMR children.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Ask parents of EMR children to participate in all regular PTA activities.                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

LETTER MAILED TO RESPONDENTS

Dear

May we have twenty minutes of your time? This is to request your assistance in completing the attached survey form. We did receive Mr. Herman B. Sowell's permission before making this request of you. This survey is a continuation of a state-wide field project in Wisconsin by doctoral students. Past groups included in the project have been regular class teachers, Special Education Directors, school psychologists, teacher trainers and trainees. The purpose of the project is to find how much the groups agree in regard to the functions of teachers of the elementary EMR.

You need not sign the form. All information will be anonymous in the project reports. The results of the general project will be sent to your district for your use.

The project should be of real value to all involved. Your cooperation in completing the form and returning it as soon as possible is urgently requested.

Thank you for your assistance. We hope you have had a successful and enjoyable year.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Myers, D. Ed  
Director Special Education  
White River School District  
Buckley, Washington

Stephen M. Melseth  
Instructional Supervisor  
Rainier School

---

On April 8, I sent you a questionnaire concerning teacher function of those teachers who teach elementary EMR children. The responses have been very gratifying. However, in order to obtain a maximum return, and to insure a more meaningful analysis, I am requesting that you check your files to determine if you have responded to the questionnaire. If you have, please disregard this reminder.

Sincerely,