1979

Role Conflict and the Teacher: An Empirical Study of Role Conflict and its Relationship to Classroom Organizational Patterns and Selected Teacher Characteristics

Elizabeth Drugan

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Drugan, Elizabeth, "Role Conflict and the Teacher: An Empirical Study of Role Conflict and its Relationship to Classroom Organizational Patterns and Selected Teacher Characteristics" (1979). Dissertations. 1828.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1828
ROLE CONFLICT AND THE TEACHER: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF
ROLE CONFLICT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CLASSROOM
ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS AND SELECTED TEACHER
CHARACTERISTICS

by

Elizabeth A. Drugan, S.H.C.J.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

May
1979
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page
---|---
1. INTRODUCTION | 1
   - Statement of the Problem
   - Significance of the Study
   - Theoretical Framework
   - Hypotheses
   - Definition of Terms
   - Summary

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 17
   - Sources of Role Conflict
   - Empirical Studies of Role Conflict
   - Empirical Studies of School Organizational Context and the Teacher
   - Summary

3. METHODOLOGY | 44
   - Population
   - Questionnaire Development
   - Scoring of the Instrument
   - Validity
   - Reliability
   - Questionnaire Distribution and Responses
   - Formation of Categories of Teachers
   - Design of the Study
   - Summary

4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA | 71
   - Main Effects
   - Interaction Effects for Factors A and B
   - Interaction Effects for Factors B and C
   - Interaction Effects for A, B and C
   - Summary of Results
   - Discussion
   - Summary

5. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 103
Summary
Recommendations for Future Research
Limitations of the Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY. ........................................... 125
APPENDIX. .................................................... 135
LIST OF TABLES

Table                                      Page

1. Curricular and Instructional Patterns of Organization as Perceived by Superintendents by District and School. 47
2. Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix of Role Conflict Instrument 60
3. Reliabilities for Sub-Areas of Role Conflict Instrument 62
4. Number of Returned and Useable Questionnaires by District and School 64
5. Summary Data of Analysis of Variance for Teachers Grouped by Curricular and Instructional Organizational Pattern and Role Conflict Scores on Two Inventories 73
6. T-Tests Comparing All Possible Pairs of Mean Scores for the Four Sub-Areas of the Role Conflict Instrument 74
7. Summary Data and ANOVA for Teachers, Grouped by Classroom Organization, and Role Conflict (Sub-Area I - Goals) 76
8. Summary Data and ANOVA for Teachers, Grouped by Classroom Organization, and Role Conflict (Sub-Area II - Autonomy) 76
9. Summary Data and ANOVA for Teachers, Grouped by Classroom Organization, and Role Conflict (Sub-Area III - Values) 77
10. Summary Data and ANOVA for Teachers, Grouped by Classroom Organization, and Role Conflict (Sub-Area IV - Commitment) 77
11. Sub-Area and Total Role Conflict Mean Scores by Curricular and Instructional Organizational Patterns 84
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA for Teachers by Age and Role Conflict</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA for Teachers by Years Teaching and Role Conflict</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA for Teachers by Years Teaching in School and Role Conflict</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA for Teachers by Teaching Level and Role Conflict</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interaction of Teacher Groups x Scales</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Interaction of Scales x Inventories</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Interaction of Groups x Scales x Inventories</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is deeply grateful to Dr. Steven Miller whose intelligent direction and constant help enabled this dissertation to become viable; to Dr. Pedro Saavedra whose skills in computer programming and in analysis of data sharpened the accuracy of the study; to Dr. Jack Kavanagh and Dr. John Wozniak whose careful reading and resultant recommendations for the dissertation increased its value.

The author would also like to thank the Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus who supported her in so many ways during the preparation of this dissertation, Father David Hassel who gave editing guidance, Mary Anne Connelly who adapted so often to my needs in typing this manuscript, and finally to all my friends and colleagues who have made this research possible.

Lastly, I must thank all the superintendents of schools and their faculties whose interest in my work enabled me to collect the necessary data for this study.
VITA

Elizabeth Drugan was born on June 17, 1932, in Stoneham, Massachusetts, to John and Elizabeth (Campbell) Drugan. She received her elementary and high school education in the parochial school in Melrose, Massachusetts.

After completing high school, she entered the Society of the Holy Child Jesus in Rosemont, Pennsylvania. Her first teaching assignment was in St. Mary's School in Melrose, Massachusetts, where she continued to teach junior high for twelve years. Following this assignment, she went to Our Lady of Humility School in Zion, Illinois, and remained there as principal until 1969.

While working on her Masters Degree in Education at Northwestern University, she taught science at Nichols Middle School in Evanston for one year. Following the completion of her degree work at Northwestern, she was awarded an assistantship at Loyola University in Chicago where she began her doctoral studies. While completing these studies, she taught for both the School of Education and the Sociology Department at Loyola. She also taught for two semesters at Northeastern Illinois University in their Teacher Education Program and worked with the Disadvantaged Student Grant Program at Daley College in Chicago.

She is presently working for the Archdiocesan Office of Education in Chicago as a Research Consultant in the Planning Department.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In American society, the goals of the school are interpreted by conflicting viewpoints. The conflict arises out of the differing philosophical perspectives which focus upon the nature of the school and upon its relationship to the larger society. Only at the most general level does one find some consensus about goals. For example, David Goslin claims that most schools set out to serve society by (1) transmitting the culture; (2) supporting the discovery of new knowledge; (3) allocating individuals to positions in society.\footnote{David A. Goslin, \textit{The School in Contemporary Society} (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965).} In spite of the fact that these goals are general, analysis shows that there is conflict and confusion surrounding them. To illustrate, the conflict inherent in Goslin's first goal may be cited. Teachers are expected to transmit and preserve our cultural heritage. It is assumed that the values to be transmitted are what may be called the core values of American society. Although core values are relatively stable, they may seem to shift because of a new expression, or they may be undergoing essential transformation. Today, the latter alternative is true as our society experiences a pervasive and deep change of values. Predictions of the effect which
this changing pattern of values will have on tomorrow's society are impossible to make. The conflict is obvious. Teachers are expected to transmit inherited values which are rapidly being transformed in order to prepare students for a future which is unknown.

Conflict is due not only to the uncertainties and confusion surrounding the goals of formal education, but also to the range of differing and sometimes contradictory expectations about the role of the teacher within the school community. Teachers have to deal with the expectations which administrators have for their role. They are also vulnerable to pressures concerning their role from other groups: school board members, community organizations and parents. Public support for mass education brought with it the opportunity for the public to oversee the school's activities. This supervision can impinge on the autonomy which teachers feel is their right as professionals. Teachers do not ask for complete independence, but for the opportunity to direct matters that are of a professional nature, such as decisions regarding curriculum, teaching method, and selection of materials.

Much has been written concerning the effect which the above conflicts have on the role of American teachers. It is the purpose of this study to attempt a measurement of role conflict arising from these sources as well as from the apparent lack of career opportunities within the profession. Association between role conflict and different types of
classroom organization will then be examined. Since the past ten years have witnessed a renewed interest in meeting the needs of the individual student through alternate modes of structuring the classroom, it is appropriate to investigate the possible effects the new structures may have on role conflict for teachers. Finally the relationship between role conflict and selected personal characteristics of teachers will be examined.

Statement of the Problem

This study, therefore, aims to examine the role conflict of the teacher principally as it arises from the conflicting demands made directly or indirectly by the goals of schooling. More specifically, the study measures the degree of role conflict (both that personally experienced within the teacher and that observed in other teachers) and its relationship to classroom organization and to particular teacher characteristics. A major hypothesis of this study will be that a definite relationship does exist between role conflict and organizational patterns within the school.

According to Musgrove and Taylor, "changes in the organization of education and more general processes of social change are combining to make a troubled teaching profession." They further state that teachers feel their status is

threatened where school reorganization has occurred since there is anxiety and uncertainty about their new role.³

For the purposes of this study, changes in the organization of education will be defined according to a spectrum ranging from a "traditional type" of classroom, where the teacher plans the objectives, materials and rates of learning, to an "open type" of classroom where the student plans his own objectives, materials and rate of learning. The type of classroom organization will be ascertained through a survey developed according to a model of the curricular and instructional process suggested by Smith and Keith.⁴ The model represents five levels of classroom organization as follows:

1. **Traditional**
   All children using the same books and materials, moving at the same rate towards the same goals.

2. **Individualization:** variation in rate
   Possible variation in starting point; some children move through the material faster.

3. **Individualization:** the same goals but varied materials and rates
   Children are directed toward the same outcomes but may branch into special material (often remedial).

4. **Individualization:** different goals, different materials, and varying rates
   Pupils work toward different ends which involve different materials and varying rates as well.

³In general, the phrase "reorganization of the school" is used by these researchers to refer to broad changes in English education, such as the gradual disappearance of the clearly defined differences between grammar and secondary modern schools.

Individualization: Pupils determine ends, means, pupil choice in goals, materials, and rates of progress.

In this study, teachers will be categorized according to their perception of how they organize for teaching. For example, a teacher who plans the same objectives and materials for the whole class and has the expectation that all students finish at approximately the same time will be classified as a "traditional" teacher. The five levels of the model represent five possible groups of teachers to be formed from survey results.

A survey will also be utilized to measure role conflict. The instrument to be used is based on one developed by Gerald R. Grace who studied the intra-role conflicts of one hundred and fifty (150) English secondary school teachers in a prosperous Midland borough. This writer used Grace's instrument and added items, judged from the literature to be relevant for American teachers, to each of the four areas designed by the author. Grace's instrument is modeled on the Getzel-Guba format in which subjects are asked to respond to each of the items on the survey twice. The purpose of the repetition is to measure role conflict on two levels—experienced conflict for the teacher himself and perceived conflict.

---


in other teachers. The measures of role conflict will serve as the dependent variables for the study and will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The scope of the present study should be stated. The writer does not intend to study the effects of role conflict, but merely the degree of conflict experienced and perceived by teachers as it varies with classroom organization. For example, Johnson\(^7\) claims that the assumption is generally made that role conflict lessens the teacher's satisfaction with his work and affects his performance. Charters\(^8\) likewise states that role conflict is both disruptive and tension-producing and causes anxieties if there is prolonged exposure. Verification of these and similar ideas related to the consequences of role conflict is not the intent of this study.

**Significance of the Study**

The thesis and scope of the study having been outlined, it is appropriate that its potential significance for educational practice be discussed. During their own elementary, high school, and college schooling, teachers have been socialized into a set of role expectations which are for the most part tradition-bound. The teaching role, as they learned to


idealize it, put each of them in the center of the classroom. It was the teacher who determined the goals, chose the materials to be used by the student towards these goals, set the norms for measuring the successful achievement of the goals and evaluated the students' attempts to achieve these goals. In many schools today, however, the individualized program places the student in the center of the classroom and the teacher in the wings, so that the latter can prompt the student when he feels the need of help. This shift of position between student and teacher represents a significant change for the teacher. Thus the present study attempts to discover, first, whether teachers in an individualized type of classroom situation personally experience more role conflict than teachers in a traditional classroom; and secondly, whether the teacher in the individualized type of classroom perceives more role conflict in other teachers than does the teacher in the traditional classroom.

The question is significant because of the traditionally diffuse nature of the role obligation of teachers. As Wilson states it:

... the business of socializing children—of motivating, inspiring and encouraging them, of transmitting values to them, awakening in them a respect for facts and a sense of critical appreciation—all of this is unspecific. ... The role obligation is diffuse, difficult to delimit, and the activities of the role are highly diverse.9

Likewise, Wilson points out that diffuse roles in which

"there is a high commitment to other people are subject to considerable internal conflicts and insecurities."\textsuperscript{10} If there are conflicts intrinsic to the teacher's role, do these intensify for the teacher in a classroom where the goals are more diffuse, i.e., in the individualized classroom? Individualized programs require teachers to plan special activities for each child. Special activities require that diagnosis and prescription precede their planning. Mastery has to be secondary to learning. Variations in learning type, ability and background must be taken into account by the teacher. In sum, the activities of the teacher in the individualized classroom are even more difficult to delimit and are more diverse than the activities of the teacher in the traditional classroom. Thus, it appears that role conflict for the individualized teacher is greater than for the traditional teacher. A fuller description of the individualized programs typical of the districts cooperating in this study will be given in Chapter 3.

Other significant aspects of this study concern the points of conflict: namely, ambiguity of goals, transformation in values, lack of autonomy and the obstacles to career mobility. These areas of conflict will be tested according to the type of classroom organization from two perspectives—personal experience of conflict within the teacher, and his or her observance of conflict in others.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 27.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that is the basis for this study is the "pattern variable" scheme formulated by Talcott Parsons as part of his General Theory of Action. The meaning of the pattern variables is rooted in the theory of action, and something of that theory must be presented before the pattern variables can be defined.

The point of reference for all terms in the theory of action is the action of an individual actor or of a collectivity of actors. Action is defined as "behavior oriented to the attainment of ends in situations, by means of the normatively regulated expenditure of energy." Parsons claims that action has an orientation "when it is guided by the meaning which the actor attaches to it in its relationship to his interests and goals." Each orientation of action includes not only the actor but also a set of objects of orientation which are classified as being either nonsocial or social. Nonsocial objects are those which are physical objects or accumulated cultural resources. Social objects are individual actors and collectivities.

The orientation to objects necessitates selection and choice. There are two considerations involved in all instances of choosing a selected alternative. First, there is the actor's motivational orientation, derived from the actor's

12 Ibid., p. 53. 13 Ibid., p. 4.
sensitivity to the possible rewards or deprivations which a situation may provide in terms of his needs. Second, there is his value orientation based in expectations acquired from past experiences concerning the appropriate criteria for deciding among alternatives.

Parsons has postulated that actors select from both motivational and value orientations when they choose in any social situation. Specifically, he maintains, "the actor must make five specific dichotomous choices before any situation will have a determinate meaning." The pattern variables are the five dichotomies which formulate these choice alternates. Any specific action is characterized by a pattern of these five choices.

One side of the dichotomy must be chosen by an actor before the meaning of a situation is fixed for him. Consequently, it is only after the choice has been made that he can act with respect to that situation.

The five basic pattern variables are:

1. affectivity - affective neutrality
2. self-orientation - collectivity-orientation
3. universalism - particularism
4. ascription - achievement
5. specificity - diffuseness

The pattern variables are used to distinguish the aspects of any social relationship. Thus, according to Parsons, every time we act, and in each role in which we act, we are emphasizing one or another side of the five basic

\[\text{14} \text{Ibid., p. 76.}\]
divisions. For example, the actor may stress either specificity (that is, his relationship will be limited to a narrowly defined exchange) or diffuseness (his involvement will extend over a wide range of problems or relationships). The choice that is made is a learned response and dependent upon the actor's socialization.

According to Farson's conceptual scheme, the rights and duties, specifying the actions of incumbents in their roles, are defined by the pattern variables. Furthermore, roles may often be characterized by the emphasis placed on one or other side of the five basic divisions. The teacher's role in the high school may be said to be affectively neutral since it is not ideally guided by emotions but rather by instrumental or moral considerations. In relating to students, the teacher should be guided by the performance of the students (achievement), not by previously assumed qualities (ascription). Universal criteria should be applied in grading the students rather than particularistic standards, such as looks, personality, likableness, and so on. However, this is not to say that the other pattern does not intrude in the above relationships since the two sides are not independent. It is precisely this intrusion that often causes tension and a sense of dilemma. Nonetheless, choices must be made by an individual before a situation can have a fixed meaning.

Since this study, however, is primarily concerned with role conflict accruing from the diffuse nature of the teacher's role expectations, the other pattern variables
(affectivity versus affective neutrality; universalism versus particularism; ascription versus achievement; and self-orientation versus collectivity-orientation) will not be examined in detail. Further discussion of the pattern variables will center on the specificity versus diffuseness category of the scheme.

On the social system level, Parsons defines specificity-diffuseness as follows:

**Diffuseness:** the role expectation that the role incumbent, at the relevant choice point, will accept any potential significance of a social object, including obligation to it, which is compatible with his other interests and obligations, and that he will give priority to this expectation over any disposition to confine the role-orientation to a specific range of significance of the object.

**Specificity:** the role expectation that the role incumbent, at the relevant choice point, will be oriented to a social object only within a specific range of its relevance as a cathetic object or as an instrumental cathetic object or as an instrumental means of condition and that he will give priority to this expectation over any disposition.\(^\text{15}\)

The diffuseness of the teacher's role is obvious. The obligations of the role are open-ended and lack specificity. The teacher cannot guarantee high achievement scores, internalization of "x" number of values, or formation of habits deemed desirable in our society. However, the open-endedness of the role does not preclude specific obligations from arising and from demanding response. The need for specificity of responsibility and obligation might be a function of the teacher's personality. He might have a need to see results

\(^{15}\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 84.\)
in the form of high test scores, or a "well-disciplined" class. On the other hand, conflict arising from the diverse nature of the role might be intensified by the conflicting opinions over what should be happening in the classroom. Parents, school board members, fellow teachers, and principals can all contribute to this type of conflict. Transmission of values in a pluralistic society is another source of conflict exacerbated by the diffuse nature of the role. The values which the school is supposed to transmit are often not the values to which the children are exposed in other environments important to their lives. These are only a few of the examples which could be cited to illustrate the tension that can occur because of the open-ended nature of the teacher's role and expectations.

In summary, the pattern variable scheme of Talcott Parsons constitutes the theoretical framework for this study. Thus, it is assumed that one or the other side of the five basic patterns is emphasized each time one acts, and in each role in which one acts. Only one, namely the diffuseness-specificity patterns, has been singled out for this research because this patterns is generally accepted as being a source of conflict for teachers.

**Hypotheses**

Given the emphasis on the importance of the diffuseness-specificity dimension for the understanding of potential
teacher role conflict, the following hypotheses will be investigated in this study:

\[ \text{H}_{01} \]: Role conflict will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

\[ \text{H}_{02} \]: Role conflict over the ambiguity of educational goals will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

\[ \text{H}_{03} \]: Role conflict over lack of autonomy will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

\[ \text{H}_{04} \]: Role conflict over divergence in values between society and school will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

\[ \text{H}_{05} \]: Role conflict over the commitment vs. career dilemma will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

**Definition of Terms**

Definitions of terms essential to an understanding of this study are as follows:

**Role conflict.** Conflict produced by the real or perceived tension between the dimensions of specificity and diffuseness that are intrinsic to the role of the teacher.

**Perceived conflict.** Extent to which certain situations are seen as problems for other teachers and, therefore, a source of role conflict.

**Experienced conflict.** Extent to which certain situations are experienced personally by teachers as problematic, and, therefore, a source of role conflict.

Role conflict will be measured on both the perceptual and experiential levels in the following four areas: 16

16Wilson, op. cit., p. 27.
1. conflict intrinsic to the role because of its diverse obligations.

2. conflict deriving from the diverse expectations of other members of the teacher's role-set.

3. conflict arising from divergent value-commitments of the role and of the wider society.

4. conflict stemming from commitments to the role and commitments to the career line.

**Traditional classroom.** A classroom in which objectives, materials and rate of learning are determined by the teacher for the whole class.

**Mixed classroom.** A classroom in which there is variation of objectives, materials and rates of learning in terms of one or two of these elements being planned for the individual rather than for the whole class. Classrooms in which enrichment and remediation are provided are examples of this type of classroom.

**Individualized classroom.** A classroom in which objectives, materials and rates of learning are determined on an individual basis rather than on a lockstep basis for the whole class.

**Total perceived conflict.** A measure of conflict determined by summing the four measures of perceived conflict in others as outlined above.

**Total experienced conflict.** Measure of conflict determined by summing the four measures of conflict on the experiential level as outlined above.
Summary

This study will focus on intra-role conflict for teachers, i.e., conflict intrinsic to the nature of the teacher's role. The particular aspect of the role that will be investigated is its diffuseness. Diffuse roles are those in which the range of obligations defined by role expectations are fairly open-ended. Tensions arise due to specific expectations that must be met despite the unlimited commitment to other people which a diffuse role demands. Conflict will be measured on two levels—experienced and perceived. Measures of conflict will then be related to organization patterns of classroom by categorizing teachers on the basis of perceived planning of objectives, materials and rates of learning for their students. Finally the relationship between role conflict and selected personal characteristics will be investigated.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The educational literature abounds with many empirically untested assertions regarding what constitutes the sources of role conflict for teachers. The first section of this review will draw on some of these assertions as they relate to the situations described in the role conflict instrument utilized for this study. Secondly, empirical studies investigating role conflict, both intra- and inter-role, will be reported. The concluding section will cite studies designed to investigate different organizational structures within the school and their effects on teachers.

Sources of Role Conflict

Wilson\(^1\) suggests four possible categories of problem situations for teachers. All four categories are related to the diffuseness of the teacher's role which demands high commitment to other people. He maintains that roles involving high commitment to other people "are subject to considerable internal conflicts and insecurities."\(^2\) The first area conceptualized as problematic for teachers arises from the


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 27.
diffuse obligations of the role. In a similar vein, Douglas Rugh writes:

No one in America has set clear limits or boundaries of responsibility for the public school teacher. The teacher is caught not only in the dilemma of role conflict but is continually frustrated in attempting to reach goals that are both impossible and professionally illegitimate.3

Marie Wirsing examines American attempts to provide a basis for developing curricula through formulating statements of the major purposes and goals. She summarizes these attempts as follows:

Unfortunately, these efforts to achieve verbal agreement on educational goals have promoted the practice of giving lip service to the stock words and phrases that describe the goals, in the belief that everyone interprets them the same. In reality the classroom teacher is confronted with a set of glittering generalities which presumably serve as guidelines for teaching.4

Addressing the issue of goals as problems for American schools and their personnel, David Swift asserts that:

... the goals of the American public school ... are vague, overly ambitious, and contradictory. Being vague, they do not provide meaningful guides for decisions on specific, day-to-day issues. Being overly ambitious, they force schools to try to do many things, with the result that few things are done well. And being contradictory, schools sometimes work for mutually exclusive ends, so that success in one area automatically means failure in another.5

Related to goal ambiguity is the consequent difficulty

---


that teachers have in assessing what they have actually accomplished in the classroom. Kelsall and Kelsall state the issues in this way:

Indeed the conflicts and insecurities arising from the diverse obligations society has attached to the teacher's role are almost endless. To appreciate this one has only to think of the chronic uncertainty to which she is exposed on the question of how effectively she has performed the required tasks in a field such as socialization, a process which by its very nature can virtually never be regarded as complete. 6

Dan Lortie, investigating the endemic uncertainties of teaching, 7 gave a sample of teachers the opportunity to discuss the problem of assessment. 8 Sixty-four percent of one group of respondents said "they encountered problems in assessing their work, and of these two-thirds said the problem was serious." 9 He reviewed the testimony of this particular group of teachers. His analysis of interviews revealed that no aspect of the teacher's work evoked as much emotion as that involving the intangible nature of teaching which complicates the reward-getting process for some teachers.

The second set of situations conceptualized as being


8 Dan Lortie's technique in attempting to "search for the nature and content of the ethos" (ibid., p. viii) of teaching used a variety of approaches and methods: "historical review, national and local surveys, findings from observational studies by other researchers, and content analysis of intensive interviews." (Ibid., p. ix.)

9 Ibid., p. 142.
possible sources of strain for teachers are those which "de-
rive from the diverse expectations of those whose activities
impinge on the role."\(^{10}\) This conflict is also related to
the diffuse obligations of the role, since teachers are pub-
lic servants and their role-set\(^{11}\) includes parents of the
students, superintendents, principals, the students them-
selves and anyone else who has opinions about what teachers
should and should not do. On the other hand, teachers are
referred to as professionals, and as such, can lay claim to
having an expertise which entitles them to autonomy.\(^{12}\)

Infringement upon the autonomy of teachers is a fre-
quently mentioned issue in the educational literature. Broad
generalizations, implying teachers experience conflict over
the professional vs. public-servant aspects of their role,
are made but there is little empirical evidence to substan-
tiate this claim. The following passages are rather typical
statements concerning this particular dilemma for teachers:

As transmitter of learning, the teacher is expected to

\(^{10}\)Wilson, "The Teacher's Role: A Sociological Analysis,"
p. 27.

\(^{11}\)In this paper "role-set" will be the term used to des-
ignate that "complement of role relationships which persons
have by virtue of occupying a particular social status" as
defined by Robert K. Merton in *Social Theory and Social Struc-

\(^{12}\)"The principal of autonomy is to localize responsibil-
ity where it can be efficiently performed." T.M. Stinnett,
*Professional Problems of Teachers*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Mac-
millan Company, 1968), p. 276. The term autonomy is not used
in this study to mean complete independence or sovereignty,
but rather the right and responsibility of a professional
group to direct affairs that are of a strictly professional
nature, e.g., decisions regarding curriculum, teaching
methods, textbook selection, defining of competent teachers,
etc.
be an expert but still to be a public servant. This conflict is evident when parents visit the school and talk to teachers as public servants even while demanding that they teach sophisticated material. It is also indicated by the fact that state legislators, boards of education, and administrators choose much of the material to be taught without permitting the teacher to enter into the decision. The expertise expected of teachers often is not relied upon by administrators or boards for some curricular decisions.13

Teachers have virtually no control over their standards of work. They have little control over the subjects to be taught; the materials to be used; the criteria for deciding who should be admitted, retained, and graduated... the qualifications for teacher training; the forms to be used in reporting pupil progress; school boundary lines and the criteria for permitting students to attend; and other matters that affect teaching.14

The teacher's position in the school as a whole is an inconsistent one. On the one hand, he is in sole command of his classroom; on the other hand, he lacks the salary, prestige, and decision-making power, of many other professionals. Teachers' lack of autonomy and their discontent with their position may partially explain what often seems to be an overemphasis upon classroom authority and resistance to any new teaching methods which appear to threaten such authority.15

The above three passages exemplify references which either directly or indirectly state that teachers experience conflict over their lack of autonomy as "professionals." In one of the few works investigating this area of the teacher's role, Lieberman has shown that teachers have less control over matters pertaining to their occupation than do members of established professions.16 Whether teachers actually do


experience strain and conflict over this fact is a largely unanswered question on an empirical level.

According to Wilson, role conflict for the teacher also stems from the "divergent value commitments of the role and of the wider society."\(^{17}\) As is the case with the above mentioned categories, there is little empirical evidence related to this claim of Wilson's, but there is much written about it. Many of the assertions about values causing dilemmas for the American public school teacher rest on the assumption that, by and large, the teacher has been socialized to the acceptance of the "core values"\(^{18}\) of middle class American society. The conflict stems from the fact that society, outside the school, no longer appears to uphold these traditional or core values but expects teachers to do so in the classroom. The following excerpts serve to illustrate the kinds of assertions that are made regarding this particular problem for teachers.

The teacher is the surrogate of middle-class morality. Parents expect the teacher to be a better model of behavior for their children than they are themselves.\(^{19}\)

\(^{17}\) Wilson, "The Teacher's Role: A Sociological Analysis," p. 27.

\(^{18}\) Core values may be grouped in the following five broad categories: (1) Puritan morality, (2) work-success ethic, (3) individualism, (4) achievement orientation, and (5) future-time orientation. George D. Splindler, ed., Education and Culture (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), pp. 136-139. However, the instrument measuring role conflict for this study used the term, traditional values, and cited examples, such as: honesty, integrity, respect for others, etc.

Parents look to the teacher as a custodian of traditional values and to a large extent these expectations are met, but even in the sphere of values the rapidity of social change induces pressures towards flexibility. Different social groups hold different sets of values and the "central core," if such exists, is far from being self-evident to the teacher. In pre-industrial societies, the values which were transmitted were the values of elite groups and much more easily discerned by the teacher. 20

Another obvious role conflict is that between the desire for social reform through education and the conservative nature of prevalent-middle class ideas. The teacher is presumed to be a conservative force in maintaining the moral standards acceptable to the middle class but is also supposed to improve society by working with the young. The reformer may be in direct conflict with the established norms which he is presumed to be teaching. This conflict is a very difficult one for a teacher who realizes a need to improve society but has middle-class inclinations by virtue of his origins or his strivings for upward mobility. 21

Barry Sugarman, commenting upon the value conflict between school and society, writes:

It seems likely that the number of strongly-committed idealistic teachers of both kinds 22 does not represent the majority of the profession. Their importance for schools, however, is greater than their numerical size would suggest because the official utterances of heads and others who speak on behalf of the schools generally articulate some version of these idealistic values.


22 Two groups of idealistic teachers are specified: those who are intellectually-oriented and concerned that their pupils have a genuine appreciation of and curiosity about learning and those who are humanely-oriented and who work to develop attitudes of kindliness and tolerance toward others. Barry Sugarman, The School and Moral Development (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., Barnes and Noble Import Division, 1973), pp. 22-23.
The strange fact is that, in spite of the gap between the values of the highly-committed teacher and those of most of the adult male population, the school is expected by important interest groups to espouse those idealistic values. In a curious way, many people seem to feel that it is good for their children to be exposed to such ideals when they are young.\textsuperscript{23}

Finally, reference to George Splindler’s work regarding values should be made. He has theorized that values may be classified into traditional values and emergent values. He writes:

In this perspective, many conflicts between parents and teachers, school boards and educators, parents and children, and between the various personages and groups within the school system (teachers against teachers, administrators against teachers and so on) can be understood as conflicts that grow out of sharp differences in values that mirror social and cultural transformation of tremendous scope—and for which none of the actors in the situation can be held personally accountable. . . . If these conflicts can be seen as emerging out of great sociocultural shifts—out of a veritable transformation of a way of life—they will lose some of their sting.\textsuperscript{24}

The final category of role conflict conceptualized by Wilson is strain "arising from conflict between commitment to the role and commitment to the career line."\textsuperscript{25} The organization of the school offers most teachers little opportunity for advancement in terms of status, prestige, and monetary rewards, unless the teacher moves away from the client he was trained to serve and into administration.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 24.

\textsuperscript{24}Splindler, Education and Culture, p. 142.

\textsuperscript{25}Wilson, "The Teacher's Role: A Sociological Analysis," p. 27.
There has been theoretical writing and some empirical investigation relating to this conflict, but it has been concerned largely with postulating reasons for teaching remaining a "marginal profession." The expression "professional marginality" refers to the situation of work groups which, "while toward or at the 'profession' end of the continuum on some and often many characteristics, are at the same time noticeably at the opposite end of the continuum on others." 26

One characteristic that places teaching at the opposite end from profession on the continuum is "lack of commitment" in the sense of a career for many teachers. The occupation is dominated by women whose careers are often interrupted by family obligations. 27 Detailed discussion of this phenomenon is not appropriate to this review, except to note that differences in conflict between men and women in this area are often cited in the literature. This fact, as mentioned above, is advanced as one of the reasons that teaching has remained a marginal profession.

Commenting on conflict in this area, Elizabeth Cohen writes:


There are relatively few opportunities for professional advancement in elementary school teaching. Ambitious classroom teachers cannot look forward to an increase in responsibility and influence without somehow leaving the classroom. They may leave education altogether; they may return to schools of education in search of credits or advanced degrees; or they may move into the field of school administration. At this time, however, the possibility of moving into administration appears as a viable alternative to the small number of male elementary school teachers, but not to the female teachers who wish to have a wider impact on education. Examination of state directories of education reveals comparatively few women in the field of school administration; and graduate students in school administration are almost all male; indeed, very few women apply to such programs.28

Addressing the same issue, Dan Lortie comments:

I begin with a commonplace observation—there is a near lack of any significant career progression in the work lives of those who stay in teaching. 'Near lack' is stated because the career possesses some slope; there are incremental, annual gains; the possibility of improvement through mobility . . . ; the chance of a department chairmanship which, in some systems, marks genuine status change. In the main, however, the teacher who has attained tenure rank is unlikely to experience significant career steps after that point. Compared to career systems in practically every other kind of organization, the early and late status of the person who stays in teaching are remarkably similar.29

Empirical Studies of Role Conflict

The second section of this review will focus on studies investigating role conflict. As mentioned above, there has been much discussion of teachers' role behavior, and, in particular, of role conflicts experienced by teachers, but


empirical study of such conflict is scarce. There is virtually no indexed reference to role (except the roles of teachers in preschool) in the Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Furthermore, the work that has been done does not fall into easily defined categories. The most frequently used scheme, and the one to be utilized for this review, is that of classifying role conflict under two headings: namely, inter-role and intra-role conflict. These two types of conflict, according to Morrison and McIntyre, may be defined as follows:

Inter-role conflict results from the fact that individuals occupy several roles; these roles may demand different values, attitudes or loyalties, and it is not clear which role should be adopted.

Intra-role conflict occurs when the norms and expectations of different members of the role-set do not appear to be compatible.

A frequently mentioned study of inter-role conflict was done by Getzels and Guba, and their work has served as a model for this type of research. The primary goal of their research, examining the relationships between two organized roles, those of officer and of teacher in a military situation, was to develop a method for investigating role conflict in a real life situation. The role theory pertinent to their

---


study may be summarized as follows:

Role conflicts ensue whenever an actor is required to fill two or more roles whose expectations are in some particulars inconsistent. The severity of the conflict is a function situationally of the relative incompatibility and rigor of definition of the expectations, and personalistically of certain adjustive mechanisms of the individuals filling the roles. An actor who is in conflict must necessarily ignore some of the expectations of one or more of the roles, and to the extent that he does so, he is held to be ineffective.\(^{32}\)

The single major conflict, identified by the researchers from interview data, was between the officer role and teacher role. Using this data, two role conflict instruments were designed. The first was a situational instrument used to measure the extent of conflict from school to school; the second was a personalistic instrument to measure the degree of conflict from officer-instructor to officer-instructor within each school. The schedules contained four major problem areas and between ten and twelve items were devised for each of the areas. The problems stated in the items were selected on the basis of the frequency of their being mentioned in interviews conducted by the researchers.

The findings of these researchers made it possible to categorize the schools into three groups: high, medium and low conflict schools. The schools with the least amount of conflict were military in nature; the schools with the greatest conflict were the two least military schools. An item by item analysis revealed that one salient reason why

\(^{32}\)Ibid., p. 166.
civilian-content instructors, who thought of themselves as teachers first and officers second, experienced conflict was the following: they perceived that too often military rank rather than professional competence and experience determines position of an officer at a military base school. It was also found that high conflict instructors were the relatively ineffective ones.

A detailed summary of the research findings is beyond the scope of this review. However, it should be noted that through the study of Getzels and Guba significant progress was made in developing an empirical approach for studying role conflict. The authors worked out of a theoretical position and devised inventories to measure conflict within schools (situational) and within individuals (personalistic). The personalistic instrument was found to have significant value in predicting effectiveness of the instructor.

The same authors conducted a study related to the structure of roles and role conflict in teachers which focused on three major issues:

(1) The nature of the expectations attaching to the teacher role, (2) the extent of conflict among these expectations, and (3) the differential effect of such conflict on the teachers as a function of certain personal and social characteristics. 34

After conducting extended interviews with forty-one teachers, Getzels and Guba formulated a group instrument to measure

situational and personalistic aspects of role conflict. The instrument was based principally on teacher expressed dissatisfaction. Three areas were isolated and each was located in a role that a teacher occupies in addition to the teacher role: namely, the socio-economic role, the citizen role and the professional role. A personal questionnaire was developed to be used in determining the relationships between individual characteristics and role conflict.

The data obtained through the instruments led the authors to conclude that:

1. The teacher is defined both by core expectations common to the teaching situation in general and by significantly varying expectations that are a function of local and community conditions.

2. Many of the expectations attached to the teacher role are inconsistent with expectations attached to other roles the teacher typically occupies. That is, the teaching situation is in many critical elements characterized by role conflict.

3. The nature of the role conflicts is systematically related to certain differences among schools and among communities.

4. The existence of role conflicts may be taken as evidence that the teacher role is imperfectly integrated with other roles. The consequences of role conflict may be frustration for the individual teacher and ineffectiveness of the educational institution.

5. There are differential reactions among teachers in the extent of their liability (or being troubled by) role conflict in the teaching situation. These differential reactions are systematically and meaningfully related to certain personal characteristics of teachers.35

Another study investigating inter-role conflict was done by Lloyd V. Manwiller.36 His study "attempts to ascertain


the extent of agreement between teachers and members of boards of education on what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable teacher behavior."37 Since boards of education formulate official policies, rules and regulations for teachers, Kanwiller's study rests on the assumption that consensus between their expectations and those of teachers concerning what the community wants is necessary to prevent teacher dissatisfaction and low instructional efficiency in the classroom. However, he restricts the study to include only expectations regarding behavior "which arises in connection with personal and family, social and recreational, economic, civic, and religious aspects of teachers' lives."38 His review of the literature points to the fact that at the time of his study, and it might be added at the present time also, "the status of expectations regarding teachers as revealed thus far by research, presents a picture that is generally vague, indistinct and even disharmonious."39 In addition, this study outlined eight conclusions regarding the degree of disagreement between teachers and school board members about what each believes the expectations of the community are for the social role of the teacher. In summary, it may be said that "while differences existed between school districts on expectations regarding teachers, it appeared

37 Ibid., p. 316.
38 Ibid., p. 317.
39 Ibid., p. 319.
that teachers and school board members interpreted behaviors similarly as acceptable or unacceptable teacher conduct in their respective communities." 40

Intra-role conflict has also been the object of some empirical work. For example, researchers have examined conflict as a product of differing expectations for the role of teacher by those in counter positions to the teacher, or members of the teacher's role set. The classic study done by Gross, Mason and McEachern 41 exemplifies this approach and is worthy of note, even though it is concerned with the role of the superintendent rather than with that of the teacher. Their interest and analysis focused on the perceived expectations for the position of superintendent by various groups and individuals in counter positions. Four situations likely to be problematic for a superintendent were presented in questionnaire form to one-hundred-and-five school superintendents. Three expectations were described and each superintendent was asked to indicate what those in positions counter to his would expect him to do in each situation. Incompatible expectations were further analyzed in terms of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the expectations. Open-ended questions were utilized to discover how much anxiety was created and how the conflict was resolved. For purposes of

40 Ibid., p. 352.

predicting expected role behavior, the superintendents were categorized into one of three possible types according to whether they were principally oriented toward legitimacy or sanctions in making decisions. Finally, the authors made predictions about the behavior of each superintendent in resolving role conflict. In comparing predictions with the behavior of the superintendents, significantly more correct predictions were made than would have been expected by chance at the .01 level.

Perceived role conflict in teachers has been examined by researchers who asked teachers to rate the expectations which they perceive significant others to have for the role of teacher. Musgrove 42 had groups of teachers rank four aspects of the teacher's role (discipline, teaching, personality, and organization) as they valued them and as they thought four groups of individuals in salient counter positions valued them. Comparison of the degree of agreement or disagreement among the ranks yielded a measure of role conflict on the perceptual level.

Biddle, Rosencranz, Tomich and Twyman 43 conducted an extensive study on the role of teacher. The purpose of their research was "to examine and interpret evidence for the


existence of shared inaccuracies in the role of the public school teacher."\(^4^4\) Respondents represented various social positions "defined in relationship with the public school system and were sampled through schools."\(^4^5\)

This study differed from the two cited above, in that "among other tasks, respondents were asked to give their own norms and then to attribute norms to three object positions: people in general, teachers, and school officials."\(^4^6\) It was demonstrated that distorted ideas of one another's norms existed among teachers and those with whom they interact. Their data seemed to reveal that "shared inaccuracies were more likely with immature subjects" (pupils) "and with increased social distance between subject and object positions."\(^4^7\)

Another study of intra-role conflict was done by Gerald R. Grace\(^4^8\) on the intra-role conflicts of 150 English secondary school teachers in a prosperous Midland borough. The present study is a partial replication of Grace's work. He focused on the four areas of conflict within the teacher's role as conceptualized by Wilson. Like Getzels and Guba, his study is on the perceptual-experiential levels and his schedules for measuring conflict are modelled after theirs.

\(^{4^4}\)Ibid., p. 303.
\(^{4^5}\)Ibid., p. 305.
\(^{4^6}\)Ibid.
\(^{4^7}\)Ibid., p. 309
\(^{4^8}\)Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher.
In general, Grace found conflict perceived by teachers in all four areas with conflict between role commitment and career orientation, and between divergent value orientations being seen as greater problems in the teaching situation than conflict from the diffuse goals of schooling and lack of autonomy. Experienced conflict was low as compared with measured conflict on the perceptual level. Nonetheless, there was evidence of conflict in all four areas. Further discussion of Grace's work will be incorporated into Chapter 5 where conclusions and interpretations from the present study will be discussed.

Empirical Studies of School Organizational Context and the Teacher

The final section of this review will be concerned with several studies which have tried to identify structural relationships and conditions within the school that affect the teacher's role. In 1955, Wayne Gordon49 wrote that the teacher's perspective "with its failure to incorporate the reality of the social structure in which he works prevents him from seeing problems as a consequence of this generic structure."50 He goes on to criticize the fact that the "present moralistic evaluation" of the teacher's role...
blame on the teacher while ignoring the organizational context in which he works.

At the present time, there is still a paucity of studies investigating the organizational structure of the school and its effects on teachers. On the other hand, there have been a number of studies whose purpose has been to examine variables, including structural characteristics of the school, as explanatory of change, particularly change involving innovation.\(^{51}\)

One study that did attempt to assess how the internal organization of the school influenced the way in which the teacher perceives his role was done by Stanley Soles.\(^{52}\) The purpose of the study was to find out "if teacher expectations for a school staff were significantly related to the particular type of internal organization used in the school."\(^{53}\) In the sample of American high schools used, it was discovered that the teachers in schools which were organized on the basis of specialization (single-period type of scheduling) were more 'task-oriented' than teachers who spent a good part of the day teaching a single class (multiple-period type of scheduling). The latter group of teachers were more group-

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid., p. 227.
oriented and concerned with the welfare of the members of the class.

Another study was done by Elizabeth Cohen\footnote{Elizabeth G. Cohen, "Open-Space Schools: The Opportunity to Become Ambitious," Sociology of Education 46 (Spring 1973): 143-161.} on the effects of structural characteristics on women teachers. Her purpose was to examine the effect of working in open-space schools on the relationship of ambition to dissatisfaction. Her research showed that "there was a sharply increased level of job satisfaction among open-space school teachers. Forty-six percent of the open-space school faculty had a high score on Job Satisfaction, while only twenty-eight percent of the self-contained classroom teachers had such a score."\footnote{Ibid., p. 149} Her findings relating to ambition and dissatisfaction showed that the more vertically ambitious a teacher is the more dissatisfied she is whether she is in an open-space school or the traditional self-contained classroom. However, cross-tabulated job satisfaction scores with scores on professional ambition showed that teachers "with high scores on professional ambition are more satisfied with their jobs than are women with low scores on professional ambition in open-space schools only."\footnote{Ibid., p. 151.} The reverse of this relationship existed for teachers in self-contained classrooms.

Herriott and St. John\footnote{Robert E. Herriott and Nancy Hoyt St. John, Social Class and the Urban School (New York: Wiley, 1966).} investigated the effects of the
social class composition of the student body on the job-related attitudes and behavior of the staff in urban schools.\textsuperscript{58} They also examined the association between the social class composition of the pupils and characteristics of the staff, in terms of the individuals assigned to work in urban schools. Schools were categorized as being "highest," "moderately high," "moderately low," and "lowest" in socioeconomic status.\textsuperscript{59} For purposes of this review, only findings regarding teacher satisfaction and career aspirations in schools of differing SES composition will be noted. It was found that the role of teachers and principals, as defined "by their


\textsuperscript{59}Social class composition or socioeconomic status of a school may be determined in a variety of ways. For example, the proportion of upper class students attending a given school may be the basis for categorizing the schools into three or more groups. The social class of the student may also be determined in a variety of ways, such as, his or her father's education and/or occupation, or father's and mother's education. For an explanation of the way in which Herriott and St. John classified schools by SES, see Social Class and the Urban School, Chapter 2.
views of the needs of pupils, is very different in schools of different socioeconomic composition." Teachers in schools of lowest SES indicated the least satisfaction with various aspects of their teaching situation. "Teaching performance, whether in respect to competence in subject matter, innovation, interest in pupils, cooperation with school personnel, teaching methods, or the maintenance of discipline, was found to be somewhat poorer in schools of lowest than of highest SES." However, it should be noted that, although the trend was consistent over many of the items on the teacher questionnaire, none of the differences was very large. Finally, forty-two percent of the teachers in the schools of lowest SES desired to move to schools in a better neighborhood in contrast to eighteen percent of the teachers in the highest SES schools who had the same desire.

Another study, focusing on the contextual effects of the school on the teacher role, was done by Ralph Larkin. His purpose was to examine the influence of the community context of the school and some internal organizational aspects of the school on teacher leadership styles. Three dimensions of leadership—task orientation, power orientation, and expressive orientation—were used to assess the leadership style of each teacher. He found a positive relationship

60 Ibid., p. 205.  
61 Ibid., p. 207.  
between the socioeconomic status of the community and the expressiveness of the teachers as perceived by the students. However, the task and power dimensions were "relatively unaffected by the social status of the community." Teacher leadership styles were not linearly related to class size, school size, organizational climate, and racial composition of the student population. Only when the school contained very great number of minority students were teachers perceived as being more authoritarian. The organizational structure variable (a measure of deviance from self-contained classroom structures) effected the task and expressive orientations of the teachers. The greater the deviation from the self-contained classroom, the more likely it was "that pupils perceive their teachers as having lower task and expressive orientations." Power orientation was not greatly affected by organizational structure. However, the study showed that the greater the deviation from the self-contained classroom, the less active was the leadership role of the teacher.

Gerald Moeller investigated the relationship between the extent of school bureaucratization and the teacher's sense of power to affect school system policy. Specifically, his hypothesis was "that bureaucracy in school system organization induces in teachers a sense of powerlessness to

---

63 Ibid., p. 475.  
64 Ibid., p. 477.  
affect school system policy." Empirical results from the study gave no support to this hypothesis. The teachers in high bureaucratic systems were significantly higher in sense of power than were teachers in low bureaucratic systems. Moeller interpreted this finding by stating that:

Bureaucracy provides the teacher with an understandable and predictable ethos in which to pursue his profession. This predictability, far from reducing sense of power, sets a higher level of sense of power than is found in the less bureaucratized school organizations. ... Thus, the school system sets the general level of sense of power and the teacher varies from this level by his own personal orientation toward power.

Case studies have been done in American schools and mention should be made of one of these studies since it peripherally noted organizational factors that have an effect on role dissatisfaction and role conflict for the American school teacher. The author, Gertrude McPherson, conducted the study as part of her teaching duties in an elementary school, which became the setting for the study. The work primarily focused on role-set conflicts and the low morale and dissatisfaction produced by these conflicts. McPherson, however, moved from the role-set problems to make some rather broad generalizations concerning the way in which the structure of school played a part in creating problems for teachers who wanted to do something new—to innovate. She wrote:

---

66 Ibid., p. 140.  
67 Ibid., p. 156.  
The innovative teacher, the one who wishes to organize her classroom differently, to teach what is not in the curriculum, the one who believes that discipline may be less important than excitement, is at a real disadvantage and is given little opportunity to try out her ideas. Significant change in the organization, focus, methods and even goals of the school would necessitate help, encouragement, and specific direction from the administrative hierarchy, from those above the teacher in the system.69

Summary

The teacher's role demands high commitment to other people and may be categorized as a diffuse role. Writers allude to the problems inherent in the diffuse role and describe them as conflict-producing. For teachers, these problems include goals that are vague and sometimes contradictory. There is chronic uncertainty regarding effectiveness in the classroom. Related to this conflict over the intangible nature of teaching is that which derives from the lack of decision-making power in matters directly related to teaching. Broad generalizations which imply that teachers experience conflict over their lack of autonomy are frequently made in the literature. There is, however, little empirical evidence to support this claim. Likewise there is little on the empirical level to verify that teachers experience problems over the goal of transmitting values, the third area conceptualized as being problematic for teachers. Finally, the fact that there is little vertical mobility associated with the teaching role is considered another

69Ibid., p. 213.
problem area in terms of the diffuseness dimension. The role expectations include preparation for work in the classroom, and for the majority of teachers remaining in the classroom is prohibitive of career advancement. Teachers cannot anticipate increased responsibility without somehow leaving the classroom.

The above four areas are depicted in the literature as being problems for teachers and sources of intra-role conflict. Little has been done to verify the extent to which teachers actually do experience conflict over these matters. Furthermore, there has been no attempt to relate conflict in these areas to organizational patterns in classrooms. Innovations involving the structures of the classroom are becoming more commonplace and their effect on role conflict for the teacher needs to be examined.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study is to discover relationships between areas of role conflict for teachers and classroom organizational patterns. Secondly, relationships between selected teacher characteristics and role conflict were to be investigated. Data were gathered by means of survey instruments distributed in public school districts where contrasting curricular and instructional organizational patterns existed.

It was hypothesized that role conflict would be greater for teachers in highly individualized classrooms than for teachers in traditional classrooms. Classroom organizational patterns on the curricular and instructional levels were determined through a checklist based on the model developed by Smith and Keith\(^1\) for purposes of their work in an innovative school. The model has three underlying dimensions: objectives, materials, and rate of progress.\(^2\)

Role conflict schedules were based on the format developed by Gerald R. Grace for research on teachers in England.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Smith and Keith, Anatomy of Educational Innovation: An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School, p. 331.

\(^2\)See Chapter 1, p. 4.

\(^3\)Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher, pp. 30-33.
The theoretical orientation was that of the pattern variable scheme of Talcott Parsons; the pattern variables pertinent to the instruments were diffuseness versus specificity.\textsuperscript{4} Intra-role conflict was assumed to have its origin in the diffuseness of the teachers' role in four areas:

1. Ambiguity of educational goals since many of the goals are difficult to assess and thus teaching provides a limited sense of achievement.

2. Lack of autonomy for public school teachers who are vulnerable to conflicting opinions regarding the way the role should be performed.

3. Conflicting sets of values for the teacher who is expected to transmit 'traditional' values which are not upheld by society outside the school.

4. Career versus commitment aspects of the role since there is little vertical mobility accessible to the teacher unless he/she leaves the classroom.\textsuperscript{5}

The above four areas provided the basis for the development of the variables used to measure role conflict. Descriptive statements, which reflected each of the four areas, were constructed. There were four statements pertinent to Area I, four for Area II, six for Area III and four for Area IV (see Appendix A).

Finally a questionnaire was developed in order that relationships between role conflict and personal characteristics of teachers might be investigated (see Appendix A).

Population

In line with Smith and Keith's model of curricular and

\textsuperscript{4}See Chapter 1, pp. 9-11.

\textsuperscript{5}Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher, pp. 3-27.
Instructional organization in the classroom, school districts had to be chosen in which organizational patterns ranged from the traditional to the highly individualized. Three districts in the northeastern part of Illinois were found that met with this criterion and also provided a racially and socioeconomically heterogenous population. Since anonymity was requested by the superintendents, the three districts were labelled District A, District B and District C.

In each of the three districts, classroom organizational patterns varied. This was ascertained by visiting schools in each district and having conferences with the respective superintendents. Each superintendent was briefed on the purpose of the study: namely, to study role conflict and its relationship to classroom organizational patterns. The model being used to determine the degree of classroom individualization was shown to each superintendent. He was asked to judge how the teachers in each of his schools would categorize themselves in terms of curricular and instructional organization. The results are shown in Table 1.

The superintendents' principal source of information regarding the degree of individualization in each of their schools was direct and frequent contact with their principals. Another source was visits to the schools and discussions with teachers. These particular superintendents also took an active part in the curricular and instructional decisions made in their districts.

The categorization was general as may be observed from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Curricular and Instructional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Number following Curricular and Instructional Organization refers to steps in Keith and Smith's model. See Chapter 1, p. 4.

<sup>b</sup>The building housing this school was constructed as an "open space school." Open education with its philosophy of maximizing possibilities for the learner to make choices regarding his own learning activities is not synonymous with the open space school. It should be noted, however, that "a physical environment which does not present barriers to free movement facilitates "open education." Ruth C. Flurry, "Open Education: What Is It?" in Open Education: A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers, eds. Ewald B. Nyquist and Gene R. Hawes (New York: A National General Company, 1972), p. 104.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Curricular and Instructional Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td>K - 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>K - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>K - 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Walls were removed so that open education could be facilitated in grades 4, 5 and 6.*
Table 1. For example, the teachers in School A, which housed grades K to 6 were categorized as using curricular and instructional organizational patterns, ranging from traditional to highly individualized. Some of the teachers in grades 1 to 3 were categorized as being traditional, whereas others were mixed; i.e., they fell somewhere between the traditional teacher and the individualized teacher patterns. According to their superintendent, however, all the teachers in grades 4 to 6 were individualized in their curricular and instructional organization.

This categorization by the superintendents and the writer's observations in the schools influenced the conclusion that teachers in District A would categorize themselves from the traditional to highly individualized with the greater number being toward the individualized end of the continuum. On the other hand, teachers in District B and C were more traditional in their instructional and curricular organization and, therefore, would tend to categorize themselves more toward the opposite end of the continuum. It seemed reasonable to assume that the population to be studied in relationship to role conflict provided a sufficiently heterogeneous grouping so that the four different types of classroom organizational patterns would emerge in line with the model developed by Keith and Smith:

1. Traditional - teachers select goals, materials and determine rate of learning for the group as a whole.
2. Mixed - teachers allow for variation in rate of learning or for variation in both materials and rate of learning, based on the individual learner's needs.

3. Individualized - teachers determine goals, materials, and rate of learning on an individualized rather than group basis.

4. Highly Individualized - individual learners determine their own goals, materials, and rate of learning with guidance from the teacher.

The total number of teachers included in the study was two hundred forty-four (244).

**Questionnaire Development**

A three-part questionnaire was developed for use in this study. A search of the literature indicated that there was no ready-made instrument that included all of the areas the writer wanted to investigate. Therefore, it was necessary to construct in its entirety Part I of the questionnaire which was used to determine curricular and instructional organization of the classroom. Part II of the questionnaire was based on Gerald Grace's instrument for measuring role conflict. This part of the questionnaire had four sections, and the first two items of each section were taken from Grace's instrument while the other items were constructed for use in this study. The final part of the questionnaire sought information regarding personal characteristics of

---


7 See Appendix for the instrument in its entirety.
teachers and was similar to many other instruments developed for this purpose.8

Part I of the questionnaire was a checklist developed to determine how a teacher perceived his/her classroom practice on the instructional and curricular levels. There were three sections to this part of the survey, and it was based on the model developed by Smith and Keith and outlined in Part II of Chapter I. Each of the three dimensions on which their model was developed constituted a separate section of this part of the questionnaire. The teacher was asked to check on the first section how objectives were determined; on the second section how materials were determined; and on the third section how the rate of progress for accomplishing objectives was determined. These three dimensions, objectives, study habits (subdivided into learner diagnosis and a variety of teaching materials and aids) and time, were also cited by Richard W. Burns as a means of determining the individualization of a classroom setting. He writes:

... in practice, there are degrees of individualization which do not take into account all the features of the ideal. Ideally, individualized instruction is a system which tailor-makes learning in terms of learner needs and characteristics.9

It was planned that four patterns of organization would emerge because of the format of the questionnaire and the


variety of classroom environments included in the study. If a teacher checked the first item on each of the three sections, the teacher would be categorized as using traditional techniques. On the other hand, if the learner determines his own objectives, the materials to be used and proceeds at his own pace to accomplish objectives, the teacher would have checked the third item on the first two sections, and the second item on the third section, and would be categorized as using highly individualized techniques.

The second part of the questionnaire dealt with role conflict and had two sections or schedules, each subdivided into four separate areas. As mentioned above, the first two items in each of the areas were taken from Grace's instrument. Two items were added to three of the areas and four to one area. These items were developed from suggested areas in the literature.

The two schedules of Part II of the questionnaire were identical. On the first schedule teachers were asked to rate on a scale from zero to four the degree of conflict they perceived other teachers to experience due to the stated problematic situation regardless of their personal experience of the situation. The second time teachers were asked to rate their personal experience of the situation, that is, whether they have felt the problem and, if so, to what extent.10

The four sub-areas of each schedule were identified in the following way: 11

1. Sub-area I - Goals
2. Sub-area II - Autonomy
3. Sub-area III - Values
4. Sub-area IV - Career

Part III of the questionnaire consisted of items which asked for background information on the respondent.

Scoring of the Instrument

The instruments were scored in terms of variations in personal experience of conflict and perception of conflict in others. Each item in both administrations was responded to on a five-point scale. Differences were noted according to the mean score of any item. For example, where such scores were zero, the conflict was assumed not to exist for the individual, while scores "other than zero gave a quantitative index of the extensiveness of the situation." 12 A teacher with a mean score of 3.0 was assumed to be more troubled by conflict situations than a teacher with a score of 1.0.

Role conflict scores were determined for each sub-area by summing the numbers marked on the Likert scale. The total conflict for each of the schedules was obtained in a similar manner. The rationale for the above summations was

11 See second page of this chapter.

a factor analysis done on the instrument. The factor analysis will be discussed later in the chapter. This principle of determining an index through factor analysis is outlined by Overall and Klett.13

Validity

The initial phase of the investigation was concerned with evaluating the instrument for validity. The pertinent questions to be explored were (1) does the wording of the items have essentially the same meaning to all readers and (2) does the test measure what it is said to measure. The first question was answered through piloting the instrument. The instrument was piloted in four elementary schools. It was necessary to select schools in which a variety of instructional and curricular techniques were used. Visits were made to several schools and discussions with principals afforded the writer enough information to select schools where teachers were using techniques that could be categorized from traditional to individualized. One pilot school used the IGE program (Individually Guided Education);14 two schools had teachers whose instructional and curricular organization varied from traditional to highly individualized and the fourth school's teachers were traditional.


The first two parts of the pilot questionnaire were administered by the writer to teachers in three out of the four schools. In the fourth school, the principal gave out the questionnaires. The final part was not given, since it was concerned with personal data and the purpose of piloting the instrument was intended to assess the readability of the items pertaining to classroom organization and role conflict. Written comments on the clarity and readability of the directions and items were sought from the teachers. Subsequent discussions were held with the teachers from three out of the four schools. These discussions and the written comments of teachers provided input for revising the wording of directions and several of the items, and assured the writer of the readability of the instrument.

The second question dealing with construct validity was important since the instrument pertained to assessment of perceptions. As mentioned above, the first part of the questionnaire was developed on a model designed by Keith and Smith and the dimensions they isolated to measure the degree of individualization were also outlined by Robert Burns.\(^{15}\) John Bouchard provided further evidence that these dimensions may be utilized to assess the degree of individualization. He wrote:

\[\text{there are at least four possible approaches to the individualization of instruction. These include:}\
\[\text{1. The adjustment of rate of learning.}\]

\(^{15}\)Burns, "Methods for Individualizing Instruction," pp. 55-56.
2. The adjustment of instructional modes.
3. The adjustment of curriculum.
4. The adjustment of instructional materials.  

His article focused on curriculum strategies for individualizing instruction. The critical strategy, as he perceived it, was that "educational objectives must be adjusted to the capabilities, interests and needs of each child." Again the three dimensions emerged: objectives, materials, and rate of learning. The adjusting of these three dimensions necessitates varying instructional modes.

It appeared to the writer that the literature cited above provided sufficient evidence that the dimensions selected for measuring the degree of individualization in classrooms did, in fact, provide identifiable characteristics that serve to differentiate classroom organization on a curricular and instructional level.

Construct validity for this section of the questionnaire was also established through inspection of the questionnaires from the IGE school and the school where teachers used traditional methods. This examination showed that the type of classroom organization described by the principal was reinforced by the responses of the teachers in these two schools. Ten of the twelve teachers in the IGE school categorized themselves as individualized.  

---

17 Ibid., p. 264.
18 See step #4 of Keith and Smith's model on p. 4.
at the school, described as being essentially traditional in its instructional practices, categorized themselves as being traditional.\textsuperscript{19} However, of the forty-nine teachers to whom the questionnaire was administered, only two categorized themselves as being highly individualized.\textsuperscript{20} This fact influenced the writer to call the assistant superintendent of the district where the two open-space facilities were located for confirmation regarding the degree of individualization in these schools. His assurance that a number of these teachers would categorize themselves in the group of highly individualized teachers seemed to warrant inclusion of the third item in the first two sections of Part I of the questionnaire, designed to determine curricular and instructional organization of the classroom (see Appendix A).

Construct validity was established for the role conflict schedule principally from the literature,\textsuperscript{21} as well as through lengthy discussions with teachers who had taken the pilot instrument. As mentioned above, the teachers were asked to comment on the items since it was necessary to ascertain that the questionnaire was readable. Follow-up questions to the teachers who had made comments were utilized to discover whether or not the items were considered to be relevant sources of conflict for teachers. Their

\textsuperscript{19}See steps \#1 and 2 of the above model.  
\textsuperscript{20}See step \#5 of the above model.  
\textsuperscript{21}See Chapter 2, pp. 17-26.
responses indicated that the situations mentioned in the items were, in fact, sources of conflict for teachers and could be used as valid indicators or role conflict for teachers. No items were deleted as a result of the discussions with twenty-eight of the forty-nine teachers who took the pilot instrument.

Reliability

Since the design of the study called for a repeated measures analysis of the data, it was necessary to establish that the role conflict schedule had internal consistency. The responses of the teachers in the population participating in the actual study were utilized for this purpose. A principal factor analysis was used to examine the structure of the role conflict schedules so that basic conceptual dimensions could be identified. As mentioned above, the same instrument was administered twice. On the first schedule, each teacher was asked to rate how problematic he/she thought a particular situation was for other teachers; on the second schedule, he/she was asked to rate how problematic the same situation was for himself/herself. In general, the items followed the same structure, "making some assertion about teachers, and contrasting this assertion with a statement about another group of people or set of conditions." The following item, taken from the inventory, may be cited to illustrate the kind of problematic situation to which

22See Appendix, Inventory II, p.138.
teachers were asked to respond:

The teacher, unlike many professional practitioners, is subject to a variety of conflicting opinions as to how he should carry out his professional work.\textsuperscript{23}

Since there were four sub-areas to the instrument, it was hypothesized that there were four factors. A principal component analysis was done and in examining the eigenvalues, and using the Scree test,\textsuperscript{24} it was determined that five factors were appropriate for the interpretation of the data (Table 2). A principal factor analysis was then performed extracting five factors and rotating through a varimax solution. As a result of inspecting this analysis, two variables were dropped from the third sub-area (values) for each schedule since their factor loadings were low on the factor, whereas the other four variables in sub-area III had high factor loadings. This was the only area that had six variables, so the dropping of the two variables equated all four sub-areas. The two variables were not used in any subsequent analysis and are not reported in the tables.

As may be seen from Table 2, this analysis also showed that the variables comprising sub-area II (lack of autonomy) loaded on a different factor (the fifth factor) for schedule II where the teachers were asked to rate situations as problematic for themselves. Therefore, it could be hypothesized that in this area, the variables were measuring a dimension of conflict not measured by the first schedule.

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-areas</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Career</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Career</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All factor loading less than .35 have been omitted from the table.
After determining the conceptual dimensions of the instrument which necessitated the dropping of two variables, a reliability test was carried out. The major concerns in establishing reliability were two-fold: (1) to determine the reliability of the composite score, and (2) to determine the correlation between scores measuring the same area but from a different perspective; namely, perception of others experiencing conflict in the area, and the reporting of self conflict in the same area. These reliability coefficients were necessary for the repeated measure design since the determination of main effects from the first factor (curricular and instructional organization) utilized the composite score of the instrument. Main effects from the second factor (the four scales measuring role conflict) called for the composite score of each area over the two schedules. The reliability coefficient used to determine the internal consistency for the instrument was Cronbach's Standardized Item Alpha. Reliabilities ranged from .77 to .80 for the sub-areas of Schedule I; .83 to .88 for the sub-area of Schedule II and the reliability of the total instrument was .93 (Table 3). Thus it would appear that the questionnaire is reliable and that it has internal consistency. Finally, justification was provided for using both the composite score of each area over the two schedules and the total composite score in the repeated measures design being used for data analysis in this

---

TABLE 3

RELIABILITIES FOR SUB-AREAS OF ROLE CONFLICT INSTRUMENTa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area I</th>
<th>Area II</th>
<th>Area III</th>
<th>Area IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals Inventory I&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Inventory II&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELIABILITIES FOR THE SUB-AREAS OF INVENTORIES I AND II COMBINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area I</th>
<th>Area II</th>
<th>Area III</th>
<th>Area IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals Inventory I&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of Instrument: .93

<sup>a</sup>Cronbach's Standardized Alpha.

<sup>b</sup>Inventory I - Teachers were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt other teachers experienced problematic situations expressed in items.

<sup>c</sup>Inventory II - Teachers were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt personally troubled by problematic situations.
study.

**Questionnaire Distribution and Responses**

The questionnaire, with a cover letter explaining the nature of the research and asking for cooperation, was brought to the three school districts in the Spring of 1975. Each superintendent felt that his personal distribution of the materials would result in a higher rate of response. The superintendents of Districts A and B gave the surveys to their building principals for distribution to teachers and District C's questionnaires were given to teachers at a district faculty meeting. A week after their distribution, the returned surveys were collected from each of the superintendents. One follow-up visit was made in order to get any surveys that were returned after the date set by the superintendents for their return.

As indicated in Table 4, 189 questionnaires were returned or 77.4% of the total number distributed. However, of the 189 returned questionnaires, 46 teachers failed to complete Part I, designed to determine perception of classroom organization and 13 more teachers omitted one or more responses on the role conflict schedules. Therefore, for the statistical analysis of the effect of classroom organization on role conflict, there were 130 usable questionnaires, or 53.3%.

For the second part of the analysis, namely, examining relationships between personal characteristics of teachers
### TABLE 4

**NUMBER OF RETURNED AND USABLE QUESTIONNAIRES BY DISTRICT AND SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Questionnaires Distributed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Usable</th>
<th>Percent Useable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and role conflict, the number of questionnaires varied from the number used in the major analysis. Questionnaires completed on the demographic characteristic being examined will be used for this part of the study.

**Formation of Categories of Teachers**

Teachers were classified as traditional, mixed or individualized on the basis of classroom objectives, materials, and rate of learning. This process was completed through a number of different steps. First the teachers were classified into a 2x3x3 model, based on the format of Part I of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The three variables of the model were subdivided as follows:

**a. Objectives:**
1 - teacher selects objectives for the class as a whole;
2 - teacher selects goals for learner on an individualized basis;
3 - learner is responsible for self-selection of goals with guidance from the teacher.

**b. Materials:**
1 - teacher selects materials for class as a whole;
2 - teacher selects materials for learner on an individualized basis;
3 - learner is responsible for self-selection of goals with guidance from the teacher.

**c. Rate of Learning:**
1 - teacher determines rate of learning for class as a whole;
2 - teacher determines rate of learning for the student on an individualized basis.

Teachers were assigned to appropriate cells contingent upon their responses to the items on Part I of the questionnaire. The following distribution resulted:
The cells were then examined. Since there were only six responses that placed teachers in a category on the "three" level of objectives or materials, or both objectives and materials, the decision was made to collapse the "three" cells over the "two" cells with the following 2x2x2 model resulting:

Finally, teachers were classified into the following groups:

1. Traditional - Teachers on the "one" level on each of the three dimensions. (N=35)

2. Mixed - Teachers on the "one" level on 1 or 2 of the dimensions. (N=38)

3. Individualized - Teachers on the "two" level on each of the three dimensions. (N=70)

The above mentioned three groups became the three levels of Factor A (the independent variable) to be discussed in the next section on the design of the study.
Design of the Study

An ex post facto design utilizing data gathered by means of a questionnaire distributed to all the teachers in three districts was employed in this study. Hypotheses one through five were tested using a repeated measures 3x4x2 factorial design. A least squares solution was done since the number of teachers in the groups representing the different types of classroom organization were unequal, and it was assumed that the number of teachers in each group was proportional to the number of teachers actually in each of these groups in the population. 26

The model utilized may be represented in the following manner:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & C_1 & & & C_2 \\
 B_1 & & & & \\
 B_2 & & & & \\
 B_3 & & & & \\
 B_4 & & & & \\
 B_1 & & B_2 & B_3 & B_4 \\
 A_1 & & & & \\
 A_2 & & & & \\
 A_3 & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

where:

1. The levels of factor A represent different types of curricular and instructional organization and the number of individuals in each of the strata is assumed to be proportional to the number of individuals actually in the population.

2. Factor B represents the four scales of the role.

---

conflict instrument.

3. Factor C represents the two schedules of the instrument—the first schedule designed to measure perception of conflict in other teachers; the second schedule, to measure actual experience of conflict in self.

This design may be symbolized as a $pxqxrx$ factorial experiment in which there are repeated measure on the last two factors. There were $n$ subjects in each group and each of them was observed under all or combinations of factors $B$ and $C$ but only under one level of Factor $A$.

The second part of the study was designed to investigate the effects of demographic or personal characteristics of teachers (independent variables) on role conflict measures (dependent variables). The personal characteristics investigated were those related to age, length of time teaching and teaching level. Analysis of variance was the statistical method used to investigate the relationship of these personal characteristics to role conflict.

Summary

The primary purpose of the study was to discover relationships between areas of role conflict and classroom organizational patterns. A variety of different classroom types, ranging from traditional to highly individualized, were located in three public school districts in Illinois, and the superintendent in each one agreed to cooperate in
the study. The population for the study consisted of all the teachers in these districts. They were categorized by classroom type, based on their responses to Part I of the questionnaire. This part of the survey was based on a model constructed by Smith and Keith. Role conflict was measured by an instrument which had four sub-areas; namely, goals, autonomy, values and commitment. There were two parts to the role conflict instrument. The same items were on both parts; however, on the first schedule teachers were asked to report to what extent they felt other teachers experienced the proposed conflict situation and on the second schedule, to what extent they themselves were troubled by the situation. The third part of the questionnaire asked for personal data on the teacher for purposes of further analysis of role conflict. Construct validity was established for Parts I and II of the questionnaire. Internal consistency for the role conflict instrument was determined through a principal factor analysis, and Cronbach's Alpha yielded a .93 for this part of the questionnaire. The overall rate of return for the questionnaire was 77.4%. One hundred and thirty or 53.3% of the total number of questionnaires distributed were usable. The design utilized was an ex post facto design. A 3x4x2 factorial design was used to determine the relationship between classroom organizational type and role conflict. The relationship of personal characteristics to measures of role
conflict were tested through analysis of variance.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Part I

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether a significant relationship existed between classroom organization type and role conflict. Classroom organization was ascertained through a checklist with three dimensions: objectives, materials and rate of learning. Role conflict was measured through an instrument, subdivided into four areas: goals, autonomy, values and commitment. Each of these areas was also tested to determine whether any or all of them could distinguish classroom type. Possible relationships were investigated in terms of the following hypotheses:

$H_{01}$: Role conflict will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

$H_{02}$: Role conflict over the ambiguity of educational goals will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

$H_{03}$: Role conflict over lack of autonomy will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

$H_{04}$: Role conflict over conflict in values between society and school will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.
H05: Role conflict over the commitment vs. career dilemma will not be greater for teachers in individualized classrooms than for teachers in mixed or traditional classrooms.

These hypotheses were tested using a 3x4x2 analysis of variance with repeated measures on the last two factors. Teachers grouped by type of curricular and instructional organization was the independent variable (Factor A) and area of conflict (Factor B) and self vs. others (Factor C) were the repeated measures.\(^1\) The results of the analysis are given in Table 5.\(^2\)

**Main Effects**

No significant main effects were found among role conflict mean scores due to different types of curricular and instructional organization. Therefore, hypothesis 1 could not be rejected.

The significant main effects due to Factor B (the four scales) indicated that there were differences among the means of the four scales. The results of the t-tests performed to ascertain which pairs of means differed significantly are reported in Table 6.

The table indicates that each scale differed significantly from each of the others. The greatest difference in mean scores was found between the scale measuring conflict

\(^1\)The levels of Factors A, B and C are described on pp. 67 and 68 of Chapter 3.

TABLE 5
SUMMARY DATA OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEACHERS GROUPED BY CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN AND ROLE CONFLICT SCORES ON TWO INVENTORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between subjects</td>
<td>7455.26</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Teacher Groups)</td>
<td>242.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121.33</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within groups [error (a)]</td>
<td>7212.58</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>56.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects</td>
<td>11896.12</td>
<td>910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Scales)</td>
<td>1996.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>665.57</td>
<td>52.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>257.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>3.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x subjects within groups [error (b)]</td>
<td>4867.61</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Inventories)</td>
<td>1127.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1127.78</td>
<td>78.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x subjects within groups [error (c)]</td>
<td>1820.3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>191.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>15.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>90.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>3.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC x subjects within groups [error (bc)]</td>
<td>1530.39</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001
** p < .01
* p < .05
TABLE 6

T-TESTS COMPARING ALL POSSIBLE PAIRS OF MEAN SCORES FOR THE FOUR SUB-AREAS OF THE ROLE CONFLICT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1, goals</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-4.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2, autonomy</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1, goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3, values</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1, goals</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4, commitment</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2, autonomy</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-5.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3, values</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2, autonomy</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4, commitment</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3, values</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 4, commitment</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .000
* p < .01

over values (sub-area III), and that measuring conflict over commitment (sub-area IV). Specifically, the mean role conflict score for sub-area III, conflict due to the fact that the school is expected to uphold certain values that society ignores (mean of 20.6), contrasted sharply with the mean score of sub-area IV, conflict over the lack of career opportunities in teaching (mean of 13.2). Teachers also expressed much greater conflict over values (sub-area III) than they did over the ambiguity of teaching goals (sub-area IV) with means of 20.6 and 14.8 respectively. In line with the above
findings, the least difference in conflict among all possible pairs was between conflict over ambiguity of teaching goals (sub-area I) and conflict over commitment (sub-area IV).

Main effects from C (the two inventories) were significant at the .001 level. This difference reflects the fact that the total score for Inventory I was higher than that for Inventory II.3 In other words, people perceive greater problems in others than in themselves.

Interaction Effects for Factors A and B

A significant interaction effect was found between factors A and B. Since this interaction suggested that one or more of the four sub-areas of role conflict could distinguish type of classroom organization, hypotheses two through five could not be rejected and had to be tested one by one. The results of the one-way analyses of variance used to do this testing are reported in tables 7 through 10.

Hypotheses 2, 3 and 5 could not be rejected, since in the three sub-areas (ambiguity of goals, lack of autonomy and the commitment vs. career dilemma) the F ratios were not significant. In the fourth sub-area the F ratio was significant, but the directionality of the result was opposite to that predicted since it was hypothesized that teachers in individualized classrooms would experience greater conflict

3This finding is in line with that of Guba, and will be discussed later in this chapter. See E. G. Guba, "Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952), pp. 50-55.
### TABLE 7

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANOVA FOR TEACHERS, GROUPED BY CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION, AND ROLE CONFLICT (SUB-AREA I - GOALS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>s.s.</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>1.06 (n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5989.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6089.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANOVA FOR TEACHERS, GROUPED BY CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION, AND ROLE CONFLICT (SUB-AREA II - AUTONOMY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>s.s.</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>1.86 (n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5361.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5518.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 9**

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANOVA FOR TEACHERS, GROUPED BY CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION, AND ROLE CONFLICT (SUB-AREA III - VALUES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>s.s.</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>691.9</td>
<td>345.9</td>
<td>6.9(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6371.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7063.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 10**

**SUMMARY DATA AND ANOVA FOR TEACHERS, GROUPED BY CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION, AND ROLE CONFLICT (SUB-AREA IV - COMMITMENT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>s.s.</th>
<th>m.s.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>50(n.s.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6438.0</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6488.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than those in traditional or mixed classrooms. Therefore, hypothesis 4 could not be rejected.

A Newman-Keuls\(^4\) a posteriori contrast showed that group 1 (the traditional teachers) was the group that differed significantly from the other two groups (individualized and mixed). Homogeneity of variance was assured through Cochran's \(\chi^2\) that yielded a probability of .298.

The AB interaction is further illustrated in Figure 1 which shows graphically the variability in the simple effects for Factor B (the four scales) at the levels of Factor A (different teacher types). In sub-areas II and III (autonomy and values) traditional teachers had the highest scores, mixed teachers were second and the individualized teachers had the lowest mean scores. However, in the area of goals (sub-area I), mean conflict scores of the individualized teachers reflected somewhat more conflict than that reported by the mixed teachers who had the lowest mean scores in this area. Also, in the area of commitment (sub-area IV), mixed teachers had the lowest mean scores with the individualized teachers indicating the greatest amount of conflict in this area.

Finally, the figure clearly reflects the fact that in all the sub-areas relating directly to their work in the classroom, i.e., goals, autonomy and values, it was the traditional teachers who indicated the greatest amount of role conflict.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 62.
Figure 1: Interaction of Teacher Groups X Scales
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Interaction Effects for Factors B and C

A significant interaction effect was found between Factor B (the four scales) and Factor C (the two inventories). The t-tests which were performed showed significant differences between all possible pairs of scales on each inventory except for two pairs. This result indicated the sources of the interaction which has been graphically represented in Figure 2.

On Inventory II, teachers' self-reporting of conflict over the ambiguities of the goals of teaching (sub-area I) did not differ significantly from their problems with lack of autonomy (sub-area II). However, there was a significant difference between the two mean scores when teachers reported their perception of other teachers' conflict in these two areas on Inventory I with conflict over lack of autonomy (sub-area II) being sharply higher than conflict over ambiguity of educational goals (sub-area I).

There were also differences in self vs. others perception of conflict in the areas of uncertain goals (sub-area I) and commitment (sub-area IV). In this case, it was self-reporting of conflict between these two areas on Inventory II that was significant. Teachers' responses indicated that they experienced significantly lower conflict over commitment.

---

6 Inventory I (others) - This inventory measured teachers' perception of other teachers' experience in each of the four areas. Inventory II (self) - Self-reporting of conflict was measured on this inventory.
Figure 2: Interaction of Scales x Inventories
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(sub-area IV) than that which they experienced because of ambiguous educational goals (sub-area I). There was no significant difference between the mean scores of these two areas on Inventory I (others).

**Interaction Effects for A, B and C**

A significant ABC interaction was also explored through the use of t-tests. Comparisons were made for all possible pairs of scales on both inventories by individual groups of teachers. The pairs of scales were examined for traditional teachers, mixed teachers and individualized teachers. Possible sources of interaction may be seen on Figure 3.

For traditional and mixed teachers, there was no significant difference in mean conflict scores for sub-area I (goals) across the two inventories. However, the group of individualized teachers had a significantly higher mean score for this sub-area on Inventory I (others) than they had on Inventory II (self). The means were 8.2 and 6.2 respectively. See Table 11.

Another possible source of interaction may be located between scales I (goals) and IV (commitment). On Inventory I (others), none of the three groups differed significantly on the mean scores between these two areas. On Inventory II (self), the individualized teachers again reported about the same amount of conflict for the two areas, but the traditional and mixed teachers had significantly higher scores in the sub-area of goals than in the sub-area of commitment.
Figure 3: Interaction of Groups x Scales x Inventories
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TABLE 11

SUB-AREA AND TOTAL ROLE CONFLICT MEAN SCORES BY CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area I (Goals)</th>
<th>Area II (Autonomy)</th>
<th>Area III (Values)</th>
<th>Area IV (Commitment)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2**</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=67</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other
**Self
In summary, the possible sources of ABC interaction may be found in one group of teachers differing from the other two across the two inventories. For both of the above mentioned sources of interaction, it was the individualized teachers who differed from the traditional and mixed teachers in the self vs. others reporting of conflict either within a sub-area or between sub-areas. Specifically, it was the fact that individualized teachers showed a significant difference in the way that they responded to items pertaining to the ambiguous goals of teachers across the two inventories that seems to be the origin of the ABC interactions.

As mentioned above, the significant main effects of Factor C, the two inventories, indicated that people tend to see other peoples’ problems as being greater than their own. This finding could not be used to assume independence for the two inventories. Nor could it be used to claim objectivity for the responses to Inventory I (others), since people are likely to impute to others feelings about a situation that they themselves have. Analysis of the BC interactions showed that each scale followed this pattern of people overestimating the problems of others (see Figure 2); therefore, variability along this dimension could not be used to interpret these BC interactions. Since additional data is needed to interpret these BC interactions, they will be discussed at the end of the chapter. Direct interpretation of the first BC interaction (sub-areas, autonomy and goals) will be made in terms of the factor analysis of the instrument. Interpretation of the
second BC interaction (sub-areas, goals and commitment) may be inferred from the discussion of the above second order interaction involving the ambiguities of the goals of teaching. As may be clearly seen from Figure 3, both the traditional and mixed teachers deviated in the sub-area, goals, from the pattern of people tending to see other peoples' problems as being greater than their own.

Part II

In the second phase of the study, the writer investigated the relationship between demographic characteristics of teachers and role conflict. The characteristics explored were those related to age, length of time teaching and teaching level. The results of the one-way analyses of variance, used to test for significant differences in these areas, have been reported in table form and will be discussed in the context of the chapter.

The one-way analyses of variance were completed, using the same population included in the major analysis of the study; namely, investigating the relationship between classroom organization and role conflict. Secondly, the analyses were performed with the population that had no missing data on the personal characteristic being examined in relation to role conflict. Finally, the tests were run, using the data from the population that had no missing data on any of the personal characteristics being studied. Thus a constant number of teachers was provided for the analyses. Each of the
analyses provided essentially the same results. Conflict over values and commitment were stronger variables in distinguishing groups of teachers than were the variables measuring conflict over goals and autonomy. See tables 12 through 15.

Although scale 1 (goals) was a weak variable in distinguishing groups of teachers categorized on any of the above variables, it should be noted that in general the youngest and least experienced group of teachers reported the most conflict in this area. Furthermore, teachers in the junior high grades were also higher on this scale than were the teachers in the primary and intermediate levels.

Tables 12 through 15 show the same trend for Scale II (autonomy) with the youngest teachers reporting the most conflict; however, the results were somewhat more mixed for this scale. The tables also show that there was a marked difference between the self vs. other reporting of conflict on this scale. As discussed above, this finding is consistent with other results of the study which strongly indicate that people tend to perceive in others greater problems than in themselves. What is significant about the finding on this scale is the magnitude and consistency of the difference between the mean scores on the two inventories across teachers grouped on any of the four demographic characteristics.

Scale III (values) was a stronger variable in distinguishing teachers grouped by age, length of time teaching and teaching level. In the case of the first two character-
### TABLE 12

ANOVA FOR TEACHERS BY AGE AND ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>25 years and under (33)</th>
<th>26 to 39 years (79)</th>
<th>40 years and over (51)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Others)</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Self)</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Others)</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Self)</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Others)</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Self)</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Others)</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Self)</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.03**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01
### TABLE 13

ANOVA FOR TEACHERS BY YEARS TEACHING AND ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>5 years and under (65)</th>
<th>6-15 years (67)</th>
<th>16 years and over (35)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Others)</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Self)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Others)</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Self)</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Others)</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>3.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Self)</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Others)</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>3.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Self)</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.56**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  
* p < .05
### TABLE 14

**ANOVA FOR TEACHERS BY YEARS TEACHING IN SCHOOL AND ROLE CONFLICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>5 years and under (97)</th>
<th>6-15 years (58)</th>
<th>16 years and over (13)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Others)</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Self)</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Others)</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Self)</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Others)</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Self)</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Others)</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>6.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Self)</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>9.95**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** ** p < .0001
* * p < .001
TABLE 15

ANOVA FOR TEACHERS BY TEACHING LEVEL AND ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Primary (58)</th>
<th>Intermediate (51)</th>
<th>Junior High (53)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Others)</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals (Self)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Others)</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (Self)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Others)</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>4.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values (Self)</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Others)</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Self)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
istics, age and length of time teaching, the scale distinguished teachers on Inventory I (others) with the youngest and least experienced teachers reporting less conflict over values than the older and more experienced teachers. Values distinguished teachers grouped by teaching level on both inventories. The primary teachers reported the least amount of conflict on this scale.

Since the sub-area of values identified teachers grouped according to the way in which they organized their classrooms, the question arose as to whether or not this relationship could be explained by the demographic characteristics of age, length of time teaching and teaching level. Therefore, cross-tabulations were run in order to see whether a systematic relationship existed between classroom organization and these personal characteristics of teachers. The relationship between age and classroom organization was marginal, though not significant, with a chi square of 9.08 and a significance of .059. No relationship was found between the other characteristics of teachers and classroom organization. Thus, according to this analysis, none of these demographic characteristics examined explained the relationship established between teachers grouped according to the way in which they organized their classroom and role conflict over values.

The fourth sub-area, commitment, identified teachers grouped on three out of the four demographic variables examined with teaching level being the exception. Again on this scale, there is a marked and consistent difference between
the mean conflict scores on the inventories. The scores on Inventory I (others) were higher than the scores on Inventory II (self) with the discrepancy becoming greater as the age and experience of the teacher increases.

Summary of Results

Investigation of relationships between teachers grouped by curricular and instructional organization (different teacher types) and role conflict produced the following results:

1) An analysis of variance procedure (3 factor design) with repeated measures on the last two factors indicated:

a. no significant main effects on total role conflict due to different teacher types;

b. a significant F statistic of 52.09 (p < .001) for the four scales of role conflict;

c. a significant F statistic of 78.70 (p < .001) for the two inventories;

d. a significant F statistic of 3.356 (p < .01) for the interaction between the factor Teacher Types and the factor Scales;

e. no significant interaction effects for the factor Teacher Types and the factor Inventories;

f. a significant F statistic of 15.83 (p < .001) for the interaction effects between the factor Scales and the factor Inventories;

g. a significant F statistic of 15.03 (p < .05) for the interaction effects between the factor Teacher Types and the factor Scales and the factor Inventories.

2) ANOVA procedures yielded a significant F statistic of 6.9 for role conflict over values (scale III) due to different teacher types; no significant differences for role conflict over goals, autonomy, commitment
(scales I, II, IV) due to different teacher types.

3) T-test procedures applied to the four scales showed that each scale differed significantly from each of the others (composite scores for each scale over the two inventories); each scale differed significantly from each of the others on both Inventory I and Inventory II except for two pairs, goals and autonomy (scales I and II) on Inventory II and goals and commitment (scales I and IV) on Inventory I.

4) ANOVA procedures applied to demographic characteristics of teachers and role conflict scales showed values and commitment to be stronger variables in distinguishing groups of teachers than the variables, goals and autonomy.

5) Using cross tabulations, no significant relationships were found to explain the relationship established between teacher types and role conflict over values.

Discussion

Even though the research hypotheses were in the main unsupported some interesting findings emerged. Conflict over values was able to distinguish teacher types with traditional teachers reporting the greatest amount of conflict in this area. Furthermore, traditional teachers indicated that they experienced more conflict over the ambiguity of educational goals and their lack of decision-making power than did either the mixed or individualized teachers. These results might be reflecting the nature of a general conflict factor being measured by the instrument which has an alpha coefficient of .93. Social forces now favor individualized instruction, and those teachers organizing their classrooms around the principles of individualization are moving in the accepted direction for educational change. Traditional teachers, on the other
hand, symbolize a more conservative position in their classroom organization. Of this type of classroom organization, Hutchins was prompted to write: "Ways must be found to break the lockstep, the system by which all pupils proceed at the same pace through the same curriculum for the same number of years." In criticizing the traditional classroom, Hutchins was adding his voice to those of many others, both scholars and popular critics, who have strongly advocated more individualization in classrooms. The criticism of the traditional classroom, together with the advocacy of individualized classrooms, forms the basis for the interpretation of the above findings. The role conflict scores of the traditional teachers are reflecting a felt pressure for change in the direction of individualization. Finally, the effects of organizational change, hypothesized as being a source of role conflict, are offset for those teachers who are moving with the forces for educational change, characteristic of the 1960s and affecting the 1970s.

Another interesting finding emerged from the investigation of the structure of the role conflict instrument. The basic conceptual dimensions, identified through a principal component analysis, indicated that five factors were appropriate for the interpretation of the data. The principal factor analysis showed that the variables comprising scales

---

I, III, and IV (goals, values and commitment) corresponded to factors II, I, and III, respectively. The variables in scale II (autonomy), however, loaded on the fourth factor for Inventory I and the fifth factor for Inventory II. Since this switch to another factor occurred only in the area of autonomy for the two administrations of the instrument, it could be hypothesized that something was being measured by the second inventory that was not being measured by the first. Furthermore, interpretation of the BC interaction showed that teachers revealed little difference between conflict over goals and conflict over autonomy when reporting self-experience of conflict, but reported significantly greater conflict over autonomy than over goals when reporting perceived conflict in others. This interaction effect may be interpreted in terms of the factor analysis finding. The self-reporting of conflict over lack of autonomy may be a measure of the conflict experienced over role behavior associated with organizational status or status within the school, and more specifically within the classroom.

In the day to day running of their classrooms, teachers may be saying that they do not experience a great deal of conflict. They may be saying that they experience low conflict over the degree of autonomy granted them in setting classroom goals and other decision-making tasks allowed them in their respective classrooms. They may be affirming the power they have to adapt and tailor changes in curriculum
and instruction to meet their own needs, inclinations and standards. Schlechty, for instance, maintains that autonomy on the classroom level is carefully safeguarded by teachers who protect the boundaries of their classrooms from intrusion by local school administrators and other system administrators. Therefore, this writer maintains that it is on this level that autonomy is the source of low conflict for teachers. This finding is in line with Lortie's in his study of teachers in the Boston area. In response to questions seeking proposals for increasing their effectiveness and satisfaction with teaching, very few teachers expressed a desire for greater autonomy.

On the other hand, when the teachers in this study looked out at other teachers to report on perceived conflict in others, there is apparently a change in their frame of reference. As mentioned above, something different is being measured. Assuming their responses to the items on this scale were subjective on both inventories as they were on the other three scales (goals, values and commitment), the change in the frame of reference can be interpreted to be a change in role-set. As teachers looked out at other teachers, the role became associated with community status rather than with organizational status. On this level, there is sharply more conflict expressed by teachers. School boards, administrators,

---


university professors, textbook publishers and other groups do have the power to effect curricular and instructional changes with little or no input from teachers. In studying innovations in education, Pellegrin concluded that the greatest stimuli to changes in education originate outside the field. These stimuli to change are not only outside the local community, but in most instances, outside the education profession itself. Although teachers can tailor these changes to suit their own needs in the classroom, there is the always present reality that decision-making on the school or system-wide level is largely outside the domain of the classroom teachers. Since the community status of the teacher has been traditionally low, a crucial factor in achieving higher status for teachers would be opportunities to participate on the system-wide level in decision-making that directly affects their work in the classroom. In summary, this writer interprets the factor shift for the autonomy scale to be the result of teachers' perception of their autonomy in terms of role-set. Consequently, on the classroom level there is decidedly less conflict for the teacher over this dimension of role conflict than there is on the larger or system-wide level.

Another finding that warrants some discussion was the result of a second-order interaction. In the sub-area of goals, neither the traditional nor the mixed teachers reported any difference in the self vs. others perception of conflict. 

---

This is unique and merits interpretation since it is an exception to the pattern observed when this model of administering surveys is followed. As mentioned above, people generally tend to see in others greater problems than they see in themselves. Or as Guba asserts "there may well be a tendency for a respondent to impute to this group of 'other instructors' the feelings and opinions which he himself holds. On Inventory II, the subject is asked to rate himself, and it would not be unreasonable for him to minimize his feelings for fear of some real or imagined sanctions." Table 11 clearly shows that the pattern was strong for all four sub-areas for the individualized teachers, and for all sub-areas except that of goals for the traditional or mixed teachers. If Guba's interpretation of the respondents' pattern in rating himself and others is correct, then it can be assumed that the traditional and mixed teachers felt no need to minimize their feelings about the ambiguity of goals in teaching; that is, their teaching goals are easier to assess in terms of achievement. Individualized teachers, on the other hand, are struggling perhaps to have their students achieve minimal standards set by the respective districts, while at the same time attempting to meet the needs of each child on an individual basis. For the individualized teacher, then, the problem is essentially one of motivating the child to achieve at acceptable levels of performance without using the traditional method of competition and ranking students on the basis of their

11Guba, "Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," p. 53.
performance in comparison with their peers. According to this writer's interpretation, therefore, separate analysis of the inventories indicates that conflict over the uncertain goals of teaching is heightened for the individualized teacher caught in the dilemma of meeting the individual student where he is and meeting the district's norms of where he should be.

**Summary**

A questionnaire designed to measure role conflict in self and others in each of the four areas—diffuse goals of education, lack of autonomy, values, and commitment to teaching—was administered to 130 teachers. A checklist constructed with three underlying dimensions—objectives, materials and rate of learning—was also administered to these teachers for the purpose of categorizing them into groups, ranging from those using individualized to those using traditional techniques. It was hypothesized that teachers using individualized methods would experience greater conflict than those using traditional methods. A 3x4x2 analysis of variance with repeated measures on the last two factors was performed with type of curricular and instructional organization as the independent factor, and area of conflict and self vs. others as the repeated measures. No significant difference between groups was found, but a significant group by area of conflict interaction was found. A post-facto analysis revealed that traditional teachers experienced greater conflict in the area
of values than did mixed or individualized teachers. The directionality of this result was opposite to that predicted. A significant three-way interaction was also found.

Significant main effects and a significant interaction were found for the repeated measures. Greater conflict was experienced in the area of values, followed by lack of autonomy, diffuse goals, and commitment to teaching in that order. Teachers reported that others experienced greater conflict than they themselves did, and this effect was most marked for autonomy and commitment.

Finally, the four areas of role conflict were examined in relation to demographic characteristics of teachers; namely, age, length of time teaching and teaching level. Although goals and autonomy were weak variables in distinguishing groups of teachers, in general, it was the youngest and least experienced group of teachers who reported the most conflict in these areas. Teachers in the junior high grades were also higher on the scale measuring conflict over ambiguous goals than were the teachers in the primary and intermediate grades. Values and commitment were stronger variables in distinguishing groups of teachers. The fact that values identified teachers grouped by age, length of time teaching and teaching level as they did when teachers were grouped by classroom organization necessitated cross tabulations being run. It was possible that the relationship established between values and type of classroom organization could be explained by the demographic characteristics mentioned above.
The results of the cross tabulations were not sufficient to explain the relationship established between teachers grouped according to the way in which they organized their classroom and role conflict over values.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Gerald Grace conducted an important study during the time period 1967 to 1970 on the intra-role conflicts of one hundred fifty English secondary school teachers in a prosperous Midland borough. In conducting the study, Grace was directly influenced by the pattern variable scheme developed by Talcott Parsons. This scheme attempts to analyze a person's basic normative-value choices in defining his relationships to others in any social situation. It has also been used to categorize roles.

According to this framework, the teacher's role has been characterized as essentially diffuse. It is therefore difficult to delimit this role because its activities are highly diverse. However, this diffuseness of the role does not preclude specific obligations from arising and demanding fulfillment. In other words, the need for specificity enters the diffuseness of the role. Furthermore, this intrusion may be the source of internal conflict and tension.

1 Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher.
2 Parsons and Shils, eds., Towards a General Theory of Action.
Gerald Grace's study focused on this tension or conflict between the diffuse nature of the teacher's role and the specific obligations attached to it. The purpose of his study was not to validate Parson's typology for categorizing roles but to use aspects of the pattern variable scheme for an empirical investigation of role conflict in teachers.

To some extent, the present study is a replication of Grace's work. Both studies had as their main purpose the examination of the extent of role conflict, perceived and experienced in four areas related to the role's diffuseness: ambiguity of goals, vulnerability, pluralism of values, and the dilemma of role commitment vs. career. Furthermore, both studies attempted to investigate the relationship between particular categories of teachers and particular categories of role conflict for purposes of developing role conflict profiles.

The format of the questionnaire used to measure role conflict in both studies was based on a model devised by Getzels and Guba, and had three separate parts. The first section was designed to measure role conflict perception in other teachers; the second part to measure role conflict experience; and the final section to obtain personal data on the responding teacher. The present study also had a

---


section in its survey instrument designed to obtain information regarding the curricular and instructional organization of each teacher’s classroom. This information was needed since the major independent variable for the study was the grouping of teachers by their classroom organizational patterns.

For purposes of this study, Grace's questionnaire items were incorporated into the instrument developed for measuring role conflict. His instrument contained eight items in contrast to the sixteen items used for the final analysis of the data in this study. The items were presented to the respondents in the form of problems which teachers might encounter in their work.

In addition to the fact that eight original items were constructed for the role conflict instrument used in this research, there are other differences between the studies. These limit the comparison of results. The major difference lies in the methodologies of the respective studies. Grace initiated his analysis by examining the role conflict schedules to determine the range of scores in each area, with special reference being made to the percentage of teachers who indicated rejection of a sub-area as problematic by rating it 0 on a scale of 0 to 4. Since the percentages were low for each area, he assumed that the areas were valid as sources of role conflict. He then dichotomized the scores into high and low in order to compare various groups of teachers on overall levels of perceived and experienced role
conflict as well as on the four sub-areas of role conflict. Comparison of areas in terms of their importance as sources of conflict were made. Then role conflict profiles were established for teachers. These were categorized on a number of dimensions. One of his major categories was high school type, i.e., grammar, bi-lateral and secondary modern. Grace applied the chi-square test to determine the significance of differences.

The methodology for this study included a 3x4x2 repeated measures design for investigating the relationship between classroom organization and role conflict. The investigation of this relationship through analysis of variance techniques formed the major part of this study and set it apart from Grace's study. Main effects from the three factors: teachers typed by classroom organizational patterns, the two schedules, and the four scales, in addition to interaction effects from these three factors, were systematically examined. This examination permitted role conflict profiles to be established for teachers according to their classroom type. It also permitted comparisons to be made between overall levels of perceived and experienced role conflict, and among the four scales in terms of their relative importance as sources of conflict for teachers. Analysis of variance was also used for the second part of this study which focused on discovering relationships between teachers who are categorized by personal characteristics and by areas of role conflict.

As mentioned above, only broad comparisons can be made
between the two studies. Grace used scores dichotomized into high and low and analyzed them through chi-square. The major organizational variable that he used was high school type. This writer used mean scores since the statistical analysis was done through analysis of variance. The major organizational variable for this study was classroom organizational type: traditional, mixed and individualized.

It should also be noted that after Grace analyzed his data, he systematically interviewed teachers and reported the results of the interviews to give the interpretation of his results greater clarity. This writer chose not to report the results of interviews, since they did not significantly clarify the major analysis of this study.

In spite of the above-mentioned differences, some interesting observations can be made about the respective results of the two studies. In comparing the scores on the two schedules, both studies showed lower scores on Schedule II (personal experience of role conflict) than on Schedule I (perception of others' experience of role conflict). This result coincided with findings of Getzels⁵ and Guba,⁶ the researchers who outlined the model of the two schedules utilized in the present study and in Grace's study. However, unlike this writer and the above-mentioned researchers, Grace attributed the lower scores on Schedule II to the

⁵Getzels, "The Assessment of Personality and Prejudice by the Method of Paired Direct and Projective Questionnaires."
⁶Guba, "Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation."
teachers' compliance with the investigator's request that they make a clear distinction between their perceptions and experiences. Guba, on the other hand, felt his analysis indicated that projection could account partially for the lower scores on Schedule II. Examination of frequency polygons and of high intercorrelations between the two inventories influenced this assumption that both inventories were, to some extent, measuring personal feelings, although in different degrees. However, Guba did not discount a degree of independence for the instruments. According to his analysis, both inventories were able to make the discriminations for which they were designed. It should also be noted that Getzels, investigating the relationship between paired direct and projective questions, constructed frequency polygons whose curves were similar to those of Guba's. This provided further evidence that the two inventories were not independent to the degree that might be desired.

This writer's assumption of projection, when the subjects were asked to rate how other teachers felt about a given situation, is based on the result of a factor analysis of the instrument. This analysis was performed for the purpose of establishing the conceptual dimensions of the instrument. In three out of the four sub-areas of the instrument, the high factor loadings occurred on the same factor for both inventories, e.g., the variables comprising sub-area III (values) loaded on Factor I in both schedules. In these three areas, the same thing was being measured, although in
different degrees. However, in sub-area II (autonomy), the high factor loadings switched to another factor for Schedule II. This writer interpreted the appearance of another factor for this sub-area to the fact that a role has both community and organizational status. On Schedule I, role conflict was being rated by teachers according to the community status of the role. Traditionally, the teacher's role has low status in the community. In contrast to other professionals, the teacher is vulnerable to varied and numerous pressures, many of which come from outside the educational community. In writing about the vulnerability of American teachers, Grace claimed that:

A major area of role conflict for the teacher in America arises out of the clash between the long-standing tradition of the teacher as a salaried employee of the community and local public servant and the aspiration of many teachers for professional status involving greater autonomy and cosmopolitan rather than local standards and values.7

In rating the same items on Schedule II, however, teachers changed role-sets. Personal experience of conflict in the area became associated with the expectations of those in the school or, more specifically, in their own classrooms. In the classroom the teacher does have a greater degree of autonomy. There are boundaries, the classroom walls for most teachers, and these boundaries are closely protected. Within these boundaries, teachers can make their own decisions and modify decisions made by those in the community or beyond.

7Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher, p. 19.
it. Thus the lower scores for this area on Schedule II are reflecting the difference between the community and organizational status of the role.

According to this interpretation, a clear distinction between perceptions and experiences was not made by teachers. Rather experience was being rated on each of the four scales for both inventories. More research needs to be done on the use of the same instrument for two purposes, i.e., in order to differentiate between the situational and personalistic aspects of role conflict.

This writer's interpretation that in this study the instruments failed to discriminate on a situational basis is based largely on the results of the factor analysis as discussed above. Another possible interpretation is that some scales lend themselves less easily to projection than others, and that the autonomy scale could be cited as an example of this. It can also be assumed that individual items on a schedule vary in potential for encouraging or discouraging projection.

This writer's rejection of the latter interpretation is based on the fact that a chi-square test failed to show any systematic relationship between the role conflict scores on either schedule and the three districts cooperating in the study.8 Discussions with principals, the superintendent and

---

8 Total role conflict scores were trichotomized (low, medium, high conflict) for the chi-square analysis. Inventory I (other): \( \chi^2 = 2.75, \text{d.f.} = 4, p < .6 \); Inventory II (self): \( \chi^2 = 8.82, \text{d.f.} = 4, p < .07 \). For the autonomy scale (other): \( \chi^2 = 1.24, \text{d.f.} = 4, p < .97 \); autonomy scale (self): \( \chi^2 = 54.6, \text{d.f.} = 4, p < .05 \).
teachers in each of these districts gave strong indication of differences in permissiveness among the three districts. It would appear that if situational differences were being measured, they would surface on Inventory I (others). The latter is obviously based on the assumption that teachers use, as their point of reference, their own schools and districts when they rate other teachers' opinions on a problem situation.

In summary, both Grace's study and this study resulted in significantly lower scores for Schedule II (self) than for Schedule I (others). Since "theoretical considerations suggest two variables as crucial to the analysis of role conflict: a situational variable and a personalistic variable," identifying these variables is important for further work in the field. As previously mentioned, it is commonly acknowledged that a person cannot totally abstract himself from his personal feelings about a situation. In line with this reasoning, higher scores on the "other" inventory do not of themselves indicate anything more than difference in degree. What is needed, therefore, is more conclusive evidence to demonstrate that this difference in degree is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the instruments are strong enough to distinguish the situational from the personalistic variables in role conflict.

In addition to comparing interpretations regarding the

similarities in the scoring of the two instruments, some observations should be made about the respective importance that American and English teachers attached to the various areas of role conflict. As was predicted by Grace, American teachers perceive conflict over autonomy, or over the lack of autonomy, to be a greater problem than do their counterparts in England. Even though only rough comparisons can be made because of the different methodologies utilized in the respective studies, it is obvious that the structure of our school system provides more pressure in this area than does the English system. On the perceived scale, 47.3% of the English scored "high." This was approximately 16 percentage points lower than the scores for perceived conflict over divergent value orientations and for the dilemma over commitment to teaching vs. a career. The latter was slightly more important as a perceived area of conflict than the former. This put problems associated with career aspirations vs. commitment to teaching in the forefront as the major sources of perceived conflict for English teachers. This contrasts sharply with American teachers who experienced this as the lowest area of conflict and perceived it in nearly the same way. 10

It is important to note that in Grace's study a crucial

10 Some explanation of this finding concerning American teachers might be that only 37% of the sample were men. This is in contrast with the English sample which was approximately 50% men. This is a greater problem area for men than for women. Using the T-test, the difference between American male and female teachers' mean scores on the fourth scale (commitment) for the Self Inventory was found to be significant at the .01 level.
variable for establishing role conflict profiles is the type of high school. As might be expected, teachers in secondary modern schools were higher in role conflict over their lack of autonomy than were grammar school teachers. Grace saw this conflict as reflecting "marked differences in the teacher's evaluation of his role and profession and those of the general public with whom he interacted. Graduate teachers within such schools felt themselves to be less vulnerable in this respect and the indications are that the certificate in education as a professional qualification exposes its holders to a feeling of role vulnerability." 

American teachers, on the other hand, indicated that lack of autonomy was second in importance as an area of conflict for them on both the perceptual and experiential levels with scores of 10.1 and 7.0 respectively on a scale of 0 to 16. As mentioned above, the importance of lack of autonomy as a problem for American teachers was correctly predicted by Grace. He also predicted that it would be of greater importance to American teachers than to English teachers. He wrote: "Above all, a sense of autonomy emerged as being the most prized possession of the British school teacher, the enjoyment of which prevented serious experience of role conflict.

In England, grammar schools supply a high quality of college preparatory education. In the secondary modern or technical schools, the opportunities to prepare for college or to train for more prestigious occupations are minimal. The objectives or goals of the secondary modern schools are less certain than are those of the grammar schools. See Ralph H. Turner, "Sponsored and Contest Mobility in the School System," American Sociological Review 25 (December 1960): 855-867.

Grace, Role Conflict and the Teacher, p. 71.
in this area."\textsuperscript{13} Autonomy is not one of the most prized possessions of American school teachers, but the above difference in regard to American teachers' perception and experience of conflict over lack of autonomy warrants further study.

In the sub-area of values, conflict registered as a serious problem in both studies. As Grace noted "... the emergence of value conflict as the most important area of role conflict experience for the sample as a whole is yet further evidence of the concern which many teachers have for this sector of their role."\textsuperscript{14} Sixty-three percent of English teachers had high scores for perceived conflict over values; whereas 36\% scored high in this area for role conflict experience. Throughout the reporting of his results, Grace accounted for the difference between the percentage of high and low scorers on the schedules to the greater discriminatory power of Schedule II with its focus on direct personal experience. The analysis of variance techniques utilized in the present study did not show any such pattern. Only the Values scale was strong enough to differentiate teachers by classroom organizational patterns; in fact, it distinguished teachers on both schedules. Furthermore, when teachers were grouped by age and by years of teaching, it was schedule I (others) that served to separate groups of teachers on this dimension of role conflict. For both studies there was the pattern of older teachers expressing greater concern over value conflicts

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 71.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
than younger teachers.

When one compares the conflict over ambiguities of educational goals with the expressed conflict in the other sub-areas, teachers in both samples expressed less concern.

Grace writes:

Conflict arising from role diffuseness or ambiguity was not a prevalent condition of the teaching situation in general, although men teachers, particularly if working in secondary modern schools, were prone to relatively high levels of conflict perception and experience.\textsuperscript{15}

This area provided interesting results for the present study. It was the only area in which there was little or no difference between traditional and mixed teachers experience and perception of role conflict. As a matter of fact, traditional teachers had a slightly higher mean score for their experience of problems in this area than for their perception of it in others. Individualized teachers, on the other hand, followed the pattern of the other scales when they rated their experience and perception of role conflict in this area.

If the assumption is accepted that people tend to impute to others feelings that they themselves have, this finding has interesting implications for individualized teachers. It would seem to confirm Grace's observation that teachers involved in new teaching and learning methods "had found a higher level of interest among their pupils as a result of these approaches but that there was also evidence of some concern over what had been accomplished in actual learning."\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 58.  \textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 107.
Grace, however, had only a small number of teachers who were involved in classroom organizational changes. This fact did not allow him to draw any firm conclusions about the relationship between changing concepts of the teacher's role and exposure to conflict associated with role diffuseness. Nevertheless, he did see the need for more research in the area. The finding from the present study indicates that changing organizational patterns in the classroom are suggestive of the need for more intensive study of this area.

In concluding the comparison between the present study and that of Grace, it may be said that both studies resulted in teachers rating their perception of conflict in others as being greater than their own. Furthermore, in comparing relative importance of areas of conflict, both American and English teachers rated conflict over values as being the greatest. One possible interpretation of this finding is that teachers are unsure of their own values in this time of dramatic change in values in both countries. Conflict over lack of autonomy showed itself to be a greater problem in the United States than in England. English teachers, on the other hand, expressed more concern over the fact that movement along career lines involves departure from the classroom for the majority of teachers. Finally, teachers as a whole, in both studies, saw conflict associated with the ambiguities of goals in teaching as the least significant of the four conflict areas presented to them.

In terms of profiling teachers along the length-of-time-
teaching dimension, the more conflicted teachers in the English sample were teachers with more than ten years experience. This was true for each of the four areas of conflict, although the difference was not generally significant. In the present study, in three out of the four areas, the least experienced teachers expressed the greatest concern. The only exception was in the area of values. In this area, it was the most experienced teachers who rated conflict in the area as being the most important.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Comparisons between the two studies revealed broad similarities and differences in their respective results and pointed to the need of further work in the area of role conflict. As discussed above, more research needs to be done on the dual administration of a survey instrument for the purpose of differentiating between the personalistic and situational aspects of role conflict. Edgerton writes:

> Until structural sources of tension are recognized and managed, merely personal resolution of tensions remain illusory and transitory. In other words, the usual psychological orientation in education that accounts for tension and conflict strictly in terms of personality shortcomings is not enough.¹⁷

In order to isolate the sources of tension from personality shortcomings, accurate measures of each are needed. This study had for its major purpose the examination of the relationships between the organization of the classroom and role

¹⁷Susan Edgerton, "Teachers in Role Conflict: The Hidden Dilemma," *Phi Delta Kappan* 59 (October 1977): 120.
conflict on a situational and personalistic basis. The relationship between personal characteristics of teachers and role conflict was also examined. Analysis of the results indicated that administering the role conflict schedule twice to discriminate between the situational and personalistic aspects of role conflict was not effective in this study. The patterns that emerged when results of the two schedules were compared was that the scores from schedule II (self) were consistently lower than those from schedule I (others) and significance in an area was generally found on both schedules. Since schedule II was designed to measure personal experience of role conflict, this writer expected stronger evidence of its ability to differentiate groups determined by personal characteristics. Additional research needs to be done with this model, the dual administration of an instrument, to further test its potential for differentiating between the personal and situational in role conflict.

Another finding from the study that warrants further investigation is the fact that, generally, younger teachers expressed more concern over the problematic situations presented than the older teachers. Of particular interest is the relationship between years of teaching and conflict over autonomy, since the least experienced teachers expressed greater concern over this issue than the more experienced teachers. The question that needs investigation is whether teachers do become more autonomous in relation to their experience or whether their expectations for decision-making
power diminish. Related to this issue is the question of whether teachers' expectations regarding their status as professionals gives way to accepting themselves as technicians as they become more experienced.

Further work also needs to be done on the relationship between change or innovation in schools and role conflict. Corwin discussing his study of the Teacher Corps noted that "there were small positive correlations between innovation and the number of teachers reporting that the program had created problems for them." He further commented that these correlations supported the idea that conflict often accompanies change. The present study did not support this notion of conflict accompanying change, when change was defined in terms of classroom organization. Individualized teachers demonstrated lower conflict than traditional teachers. This finding was interpreted in terms of social pressure for greater individualization which caused conflict for the traditional teachers. According to this interpretation, pressure for change had a greater impact on producing conflict than did the change itself.

In conclusion, more research is needed to support or deny the assertions made about role conflict for teachers. This study has raised questions about the effects on change on teachers. Does the pressure for change cause greater conflict for teachers than organizational change itself? The

study has also raised questions about teachers' problems over their lack of decision-making power in the schools. Are teachers in more conflict over the low status of their role than they are over the degree of decision-making power that they actually have in their work? This is a particularly interesting question in light of the changes that the schools have experienced in the last two decades. These changes have affected curriculum, instruction and evaluation. Yet, if one examines the origin of many of these changes, including the present pressure for greater accountability from teachers concretized in the form of legislation mandating competency testing, there is little evidence to support the notion that these changes have originated with teachers or even from their professional organizations. Further questions were raised by the study regarding the effects that teaching experience has on the expectations that teachers have regarding themselves as professionals. All of these questions and other related to role conflict should have priority for researchers interested in teachers and their effectiveness in the classroom.

Limitations of the Study

Since the summary of this study and the areas for further research have been presented, it is now appropriate that the limitations of the study be discussed. The design of the study called for an investigation of the relationship between type of classroom organization and role
conflict. The dependent and independent variables were defined respectively as the measure of role conflict and the type of classroom organization. The major hypothesis stated that individualized teachers experience significantly greater role conflict than do traditional or mixed teachers. In other words, classroom structure could be a causative agent of role conflict.

Analysis of the data showed that a significant difference in value conflict did exist among teacher types. However, the direction of the result was opposite to that predicted. Among the three groups of teachers it was the traditional teachers who reported significantly greater conflict over values. Furthermore, they reported greater conflict over their lack of autonomy and over their goals of teaching than did the individualized or mixed teachers; however, these differences were not significant.

The fact that value conflict identified teachers grouped according to classroom organization was given a situational interpretation by the writer. Classroom organization became the causative agent of the conflict. Specifically, classroom organization based on traditional modes produced greater conflict over values in teachers than did the individualized or mixed classroom. Social forces favoring the individualized type of organization provided the major explanation advanced for the interpretation of this finding.

The above interpretation is in line with the sociological perspective of examining role conflict as a fact of the
environment of a person. The Getzels and Guba study\(^\text{19}\) assumes this perspective when these authors examine the problem of the relationship between school and community as represented by the demands made upon teachers. These researchers conceptualize many of the demands made by the teachers' publics as a source of conflict. They find that the conflict may be situationally variant; i.e., the conflict may be greater in one school than in another. Furthermore, the role conflict can also be dependent on personal situations. When teachers are categorized by personal characteristics, such as age, length of time teaching and other personal factors, role conflict has the potential of identifying groups of teachers.

The writer had further reinforcement for this interpretation from empirical studies outlined in Chapter 2. Studies done by Cohen\(^\text{20}\) and Moeller\(^\text{21}\) may be cited as examples of this perspective. Cohen studied the effects of the open classroom upon the relationship between ambition and dissatisfaction. Moeller looked at the degree of bureaucracy in a school as a factor in determining a teacher's sense of power. In summary, group differences in attitudes or conflicts or reactions may be attributed to varying


\(^{21}\)Moeller, "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power."
structures according to the sociological perspective.

This assumption that the situational factor is the determining factor in role conflict is precisely where the major limitation of the study resides. There is no hard evidence to refute a psychological perspective from being taken. For example, a teacher may be experiencing role conflict over values and this conflict influences his/her decision to remain traditional in classroom organization. It would, therefore, be the conflict that effects choice of classroom type rather than the classroom type effecting role conflict.

An interpretation based on the psychological perspective may have its origin in a variety of psychological concepts. In the above-mentioned case, teachers experiencing conflict over values may be using a defense mechanism, such as rationalization, to justify the decision of remaining traditional. Teachers could rationalize that children need the order and routine of the traditional classroom when, in fact, it is their own need for stability that is the underlying factor in the choice of classroom type. In other words, the conflict over values is at the base of the decision to be in a traditional classroom for these teachers.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present an in-depth discussion of the further implications for this study if it were to use a psychological rather than a sociological perspective for interpretative purposes.
It suffices to say that there is much evidence to support the sociological interpretation, even though the possibility that the psychological perspective is appropriate for interpretative purposes cannot be discounted. It remains for future researchers to distinguish the tension caused by structural sources from the tension caused by psychological factors. More work in this area will enable researchers to more accurately determine how structure is related to role conflict in the school setting.
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APPENDIX
Dear Teacher:

I would greatly appreciate your help with a study on which I am currently working. Its purpose is to discover more about what troubles teachers and to suggest some reasons for the existence of conflict situations.

Enclosed are three Inventories that are of primary importance to the study. You are asked to respond to each of the items on the Inventories with as much accuracy as you can. Please be assured that your answers will be kept confidential. If you are interested in the preliminary results of the study and want to cooperate in a follow-up, you may sign your name at the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your valuable assistance. Without it the study would not be possible. Hopefully, through your cooperation, knowledge will be gained that might in some way profit each of us in the teaching profession.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth Drugan
Graduate Department of Education
Loyola University
Inventory I

Classroom Organization

Instructions

Listed below is a series of statements describing classroom organization on the curricular and instructional levels. The purpose of this Inventory is to determine the way in which learners' goals and objectives are selected, instructional materials are chosen, and the rate of learning is decided in your classroom. There are three sections to this inventory. You are asked to circle the number of one statement from each of the sections. The statements whose numbers you circle should describe as closely as possible your classroom practices on these levels. If you alternate practices according to the subject you are teaching, please circle the number of the statement which describes the practice you use most frequently. Please circle only one number from each section.

I Goals

1. Classroom goals or objectives are determined by the teacher for the group on the basis of what is found to be needed by, or of interest to, most members of the group.

2. Goals or objectives are selected by the teacher for the individual learners who work toward different objectives determined on the basis of their needs and interests.

3. Goals or objectives are selected by the learner with guidance from the teacher.

II Materials

1. The materials the learner uses are determined by the teacher and all learners use essentially the same instructional materials and equipment to accomplish objectives.

2. The materials the learners use are determined by the teacher but the individual learners use different instructional materials to accomplish individually prescribed objectives.

3. The individual learner determines the materials which he/she will use to accomplish selected objectives.
III Rates

1. All learners proceed toward selected goals or objectives at a rate deemed appropriate for the group as a whole.

2. Learners proceed toward selected goals or objectives at varying rates determined on an individual basis in relation to the learner's needs and abilities.
Inventory II

Schedules I and II

Instructions

Listed below is a series of statements, each of which is descriptive of a situation that relates to teachers. The purpose of this Inventory is two-fold: to determine the extent to which you think these situations are problematic for teachers, and to determine the degree to which you personally are troubled by them when they do exist.

On Schedule I of the Inventory you are to use as the criterion for your judgment the extent to which you think the situation is problematic for teachers regardless of your personal experience of the situation described. On Schedule II you are to use as the criterion for your judgment the extent to which you personally feel troubled by the situation if you have experienced it as a problem. In general, the items of the Inventory follow the same structure, making some assertion about teachers, and contrasting this assertion with a statement about another group of people or set of conditions. In rating each item, you are to consider primarily the assertion itself rather than whether or not you agree with the contrasting statement.

Sample Item

Area II, #1. The teacher, unlike many professional practitioners, is subject to a variety of conflicting opinions as to how he should carry out his professional work.

In this example, the portion of the item which reads, "unlike many professional practitioners" is included merely to underline the assertion that teachers are subject to a variety of conflicting opinions as to how they should carry out their professional work.

Each item is followed by a series of numbers 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. You are to rate each item according to the following code:

0. Not a problem at all
1. A problem of little importance
2. A problem of moderate importance
3. A problem of great importance
4. A problem of very great importance

The terms next to the numbers are not precise descriptions of the five points of the scale, but are used merely to
indicate that "0" is the low point of the scale and "4" is the high point.

In piloting this survey, it was found that most teachers finished it in twenty to thirty minutes. Please be assured of the confidentiality and respect with which your response will be treated.

Schedule I

The following statements refer to possible problems that are involved in the teacher's work. Regardless of your personal experiences of these problems, will you please indicate whether you see them as actual problems for teachers, and if so, how important your believe them to be in the teaching situation.

Scale: This seems to me to be
0. Not a problem at all
1. A problem of little importance
2. A problem of moderate importance
3. A problem of great importance
4. A problem of very great importance.

Circle the number at the right of each statement to indicate your response.

Area I

1. Many occupations give clear "knowledge of results" to practitioners, but teaching by its very nature can do this only to a limited extent.  

2. The teacher's work requires a considerable input of energy and yet for all this the teacher can never be certain of what he has accomplished with his pupils.  

3. Satisfaction is derived from evidence of doing a job successfully, but for the teacher, it is becoming increasingly necessary to depend on a "sense of achievement" rather than on definite results as a measure of success.  

4. Since no one has set definite limits to classroom responsibilities for American teachers, they are frustrated in trying to attain goals that are impossible to achieve.
Area II

1. The teacher, unlike many professional practitioners, is subject to a "variety of conflicting opinions" as to how he should carry out his professional work.

2. The teacher is a professional practitioner, but despite this is generally treated as if he were not.

3. Although professional judgment might seem to be the logical determinant in the matter of selecting curriculum materials, in actuality, classroom teachers often have little to say about the materials they can make available to their students.

4. Although the teacher as a transmitter of learning is expected to be an expert, the community (parents, school board, etc.) with its conflicting demands, denies the teacher the autonomy necessary for effective change in curricular and instructional processes.

Area III

1. The teacher is expected to uphold such traditional values and standards as honesty and respect for persons and property, yet at the same time society in general largely ignores these values and standards.

2. In a society that is becoming skeptical and permissive, it is increasingly difficult for teachers to maintain traditional values and standards.

3. The community expects the school to be an instrument of social change and reform, but refuses teachers the right to allow students freedom to challenge existing social values in classroom discussions.

4. While the community expects the teacher to represent such traditional values as integrity, tolerance, and loyalty, it liberally exposes students to values of a very different kind through the mass media and many other ways.
5. Our cultural values point to prizing ease and sociability but teachers are expected to motivate students to sacrifice immediate gratification for eventual achievement and reward.

6. While parents assert that their children's gaining knowledge in school is a primary value, at the same time these same parents are much more interested in achievement scores than evidence of real learning.

Area IV

1. To obtain promotion, the teacher must be mobile and "gain experience," yet the nature of the work ideally requires a sustained relationship with particular groups of pupils.

2. In this society which stresses "getting on," it is becoming increasingly difficult for the teacher to stay committed to a particular school.

3. Society considers the successful teacher to be one who has learned to adapt teaching methods and materials to the greatest possible development of each learner assigned to him, yet rewards this teacher by moving him away from the client he is trained to serve.

4. According to educators, continuity and stability of staff are of great importance to a school, yet the committed teacher is not adequately compensated through salary increases in the school and is placed in a position of seeking change for increased remuneration.
Schedule II

In the previous schedule you were asked whether you saw certain suggested problems as actual problems in the teaching situation. Will you please indicate here whether any of these problems has caused you any personal concern (i.e., that you have felt this problem and been to some extent troubled by it). If so, will you please indicate to what extent.

Scale: I have personally felt this as a problem
0. Not at all
1. To a small extent
2. To a moderate extent
3. To a great extent
4. To a very great extent

Circle the number at the right of each statement to indicate your response.

Area I

1. Many occupations give clear "knowledge of results" to practitioners, but teaching by its very nature can do this only to a limited extent.
2. The teacher's work requires a considerable input of energy and yet for all this the teacher can never be certain of what he has accomplished with his pupils.
3. Satisfaction is derived from evidence of doing a job successfully, but for the teacher, it is becoming increasingly necessary to depend on a "sense of achievement" rather than on definite results as a measure of success.
4. Since no one has set definite limits to classroom responsibilities for American teachers, they are frustrated in trying to attain goals that are impossible to achieve.

Area II

1. The teacher, unlike many professional practitioners, is subject to a "variety of conflicting opinions" as to how he should carry out his professional work.
2. The teacher is a professional practitioner, but despite this is generally treated as if he were not.

3. Although professional judgment might seem to be the logical determinant in the matter of selecting curriculum materials, in actuality, classroom teachers often have little to say about the materials they can make available to their students.

4. Although the teacher as a transmitter of learning is expected to be an expert, the community (parents, school board, etc.) with its conflicting demands, denies the teacher the autonomy necessary for effective change in curricular and instructional processes.

Area III

1. The teacher is expected to uphold such traditional values and standards as honesty and respect for persons and property, yet at the same time society in general largely ignores these values and standards.

2. In a society that is becoming skeptical and permissive, it is increasingly difficult for teachers to maintain traditional values and standards.

3. The community expects the school to be an instrument of social change and reform, but refuses teachers the right to allow students freedom to challenge existing social values in classroom discussions.

4. While the community expects the teacher to represent such traditional values as integrity, tolerance, and loyalty, it liberally exposes students to values of a very different kind through the mass media and many other ways.

5. Our cultural values point to prizing ease and sociability but teachers are expected to motivate students to sacrifice immediate gratification for eventual achievement and reward.

6. While parents assert that their children's gaining knowledge in school is a primary value, at the same time these same parents
are much more interested in achievement scores than evidence of real learning.

Area IV

1. To obtain promotion, the teacher must be mobile and "gain experience," yet the nature of the work ideally requires a sustained relationship with particular groups of pupils.

2. In this society which stresses "getting on," it is becoming increasingly difficult for the teacher to stay committed to a particular school.

3. Society considers the successful teacher to be one who has learned to adapt teaching methods and materials to the greatest possible development of each learner assigned to him, yet rewards this teacher by moving him away from the client he is trained to serve.

4. According to educators, continuity and stability of staff are of great importance to a school, yet the committed teacher is not adequately compensated through salary increases in the school and is placed in a position of seeking change for increased remuneration.
Personal Information Questionnaire

The information requested in this questionnaire is necessary in order to permit certain comparisons to be made with the results of the Inventories which you have filled out. The responses that you give will be held in the strictest confidence, and no one associated with your school will have access to them.

1-3.

(Do not write in this space)

4-5. Age (Last birthday): ______

6. Sex (Circle appropriate number):
   1 Male
   2 Female

7-8. How long have you been teaching? (Closest number of years): ______

9-10. How long have you been employed by the system in which you now teach? (Closest number of years): ______

11-12. How long have you been employed by the school in which you now teach? (Closest number of years): ______

13. Marital status (Circle appropriate number):
   1 Single
   2 Married
   3 Other (e.g., separated, widowed, etc.)

14-15. What is the level on which you teach? (Circle one number between 01 and 04.)
   01 Pre-school children (kindergarten, etc.)
   02 Primary grades (grades 1, 2, 3)
   03 Intermediate grades (grades 4, 5, 6)
   04 Upper grades (grades 7, 8)

16-17. What is the area in which you do the majority of your teaching? (Circle one number between 05 and 17.) If your time is evenly divided among several areas, circle the one number which designates the area for which you are primarily trained. If you are in a self-contained classroom circle number 16.
05 English
06 Art
07 Music
08 Foreign Language
09 Home Economics
10 Industrial and Vocational Arts
12 Mathematics
13 Physical Education
14 Science
15 Social Studies
16 Self-contained classroom

18. Formal Education (Circle highest level achieved):
1 0-2 years of college
2 2-4 years of college
3 Hold Bachelor's degree
4 Graduate work beyond the Bachelor's degree
5 Hold Master's degree
6 Graduate work beyond the Master's degree
7 Hold Doctor's degree

19. Undergraduate Grade Point Average (Circle closest approximation):
1 3.6-4.0
2 3.0-3.5
3 2.5-2.9
4 2.0-2.4
5 1.5-1.9

20. Do you feel that you are now teaching the subject or subjects which are most in line with your interests?
1 Yes
2 No

21. Do you feel that you are now teaching the subject or subjects which you are most competent to teach?
1 Yes
2 No

22. Do you feel adequately trained for the instructional techniques (traditional or individualized) that you presently use?
1 Yes
2 No
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