



1973

An Attitudinal Study Related To Differentiated Staffing In Secondary Schools

A. Nick Noskowski
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Noskowski, A. Nick. (1973). *An Attitudinal Study Related To Differentiated Staffing In Secondary Schools*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3064

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgebney@pacific.edu.

AN ATTITUDINAL STUDY
RELATED TO DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING
IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of the Pacific

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

by
A. Nick Noskowski

April 1973

This dissertation, written and submitted by

A. NICK NOSKOWSKI

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

J. Marc Jantzen

Dissertation Committee:

Reeun O. Mao

Chairman

Ruth Marie Faurot

Lawrence J. Osborne

Carl D. Lang

Roger Schermer

Dated May 9, 1973

AN ATTITUDINAL STUDY RELATED TO DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING
IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Abstract of Dissertation

The Problem

The problem of this study was to survey the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward differentiated staffing and its acceptance at the secondary level.

Procedures

A questionnaire was developed by the writer selecting items from an extensive examination of the literature related to differentiated staffing and from models in the field. The instrument was reviewed by graduate students and teachers. The data were summarized and analyzed.

Findings

1. The authority of master teachers within their subject matter areas should surpass that of administrators as far as decisions related to curriculum and instruction are concerned.
2. Teachers seeking promotion in a traditional system have had to leave the classroom.
3. It is common to find the ten-year professional with the same instructional duties he had the day he began his career.
4. Traditional staffing patterns with their constant number of periods per day inhibit the effective utilization of teacher talent.
5. The single salary schedule avoids the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement.
6. It is difficult for the principal to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas.

Recommendations

1. The assessment of career aspirations and levels of responsibility that teachers are willing to accept should be studied.
2. The relationship of status in teaching and financial reward based on the complexity and intensity of the assignment the teacher chose to prepare for should be investigated.
3. The duties and functions of senior and master teachers to determine what their effect would be on the improvement of instruction should be explored.
4. The compensation of teachers for their time and talents other than by straight payment for graduate units and time spent in service should be examined.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My most sincere appreciation to Dr. Rollin C. Fox, my major adviser, for his personal assistance and continual encouragement as well as his wise counsel. He gave unselfishly of his time and without his help this study could not have been completed.

The writer also wishes to express his thanks to his committee for their time, good counsel, and criticisms which improved this paper considerably more than it was at the onset: Dr. Lawrence Osborne, Dr. Carl Lang, Dr. Roger Reimer, and especially Dr. Ruth Faurot and Dr. T. C. Coleman.

Finally, the writer would be remiss if he failed to express his thanks to:

Dr. Stanley France, whose statistical assistance was invaluable;

Dr. Lowell Keith, who always found time to share his thoughts which the writer found inestimable;

Dr. Willis N. Potter, whose kindness and good will have never been forgotten;

Dr. Joan Smith, whose encouragement was a greater inspiration than she will ever know;

Dr. William Theimer, Jr., whose aid, expertise, and motivation were incalculable;

My wife, Mary Ann, whose love and understanding mean more than words could express.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.	Page vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii

Chapter

1. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS. . .	1
THE PROBLEM	3
Statement of the Problem.	3
Importance of the Problem	4
PROCEDURE	6
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.	7
HYPOTHESES.	10
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.	10
SUMMARY	11
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	12
THE STATUS OF TEACHERS.	12
Roles and Competency in Classroom Related to Instruction.	12
As Decision Makers Related to Instruction	16
THE STAFFING OF TEACHERS.	18
THE SALARIES OF TEACHERS.	28
THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATION.	32
SUMMARY	35

Chapter

Page

3. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	37
SOURCES OF DATA	37
THE INSTRUMENT.	38
The Status of Teachers.	41
The Staffing of Teachers.	41
The Salaries of Teachers.	41
The Role of the Administration.	42
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT.	42
TREATMENT OF THE DATA	43
SUMMARY	43
4. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS.	45
The Status of Teachers.	45
Roles and competency in classroom related to instruction.	45
Decision-making related to instruction	46
Teacher Staffing.	46
Teacher Salaries.	47
Role of Administration.	47
HYPOTHESIS I: STATUS OF TEACHERS	47
Nonsignificant Variables: The Status of Teachers.	55
Discussion of nonsignificant variables	55
Summary of Hypothesis I: The Status of Teachers.	57
HYPOTHESIS II: STAFFING OF TEACHERS.	60
Nonsignificant Variables: The Staffing of Teachers.	62

	vi
Chapter	Page
Discussion of nonsignificant variables	62
Summary of Hypothesis II: The Staffing of Teachers.	67
HYPOTHESIS III: SALARIES OF TEACHERS .	67
Nonsignificant Variables: The Salaries of Teachers.	70
Discussion of nonsignificant variables	70
Summary of Hypothesis III: The Salaries of Teachers.	72
HYPOTHESIS IV: THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION.	75
Nonsignificant Variables: The Role of the Administration	78
Discussion of nonsignificant variables	78
SUMMARY	81
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	84
The Status of Teachers.	84
The Staffing of Teachers.	85
The Salaries of Teachers.	85
The Role of the Administration.	85
CONCLUSIONS	86
The Status of Teachers.	86
The Staffing of Teachers.	87
The Salaries of Teachers.	89
The Role of the Administration.	91

Chapter

Page

Characteristics of a Differentiated Staffing Plan for a Specific High School.	93
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH. .	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	96
APPENDIXES.	103
A. Letters of Transmittal.	104
B. Questionnaire	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. AUTHORITY OF THE MASTER TEACHER.	49
II. TEACHER PROMOTIONS	51
III. INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES	53
IV. NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE STATUS OF TEACHERS.	58
V. INFLEXIBILITY OF THE SCHOOL DAY.	61
VI. NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE STAFFING OF TEACHERS.	65
VII. THE SINGLE SALARY SCHEDULE	69
VIII. NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE SALARIES OF TEACHERS.	73
IX. KNOWLEDGEABILITY OF THE PRINCIPAL IN ALL CURRICULAR AREAS	76
X. NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION	80

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

Page

I. DIFFERENTIATED TEACHING HIERARCHY.

8

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

We live in a time where the only constant factor is change. McGeorge Bundy recently stated: "We are in a grave and deepening crisis in public education. The burden of proof is not on those who urge change. The burden of proof is on those who do not urge change."¹

One of the most important changes taking place in the field of education today is the growing movement toward teacher professionalism. With the movement comes a militancy and a strain upon the traditional organizational structure as teachers are no longer satisfied with their roles as mere implementors of administrative decisions. The educational system in which the teacher of today finds himself assumes that all teachers are paid equally to facilitate administration of salary schedules. He does not often participate in the decision making process, nor does he set the standards; these are set for him by the administrative staff. Promotion and higher pay are to be found outside the field

¹National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiated Teaching Roles," National Education Association, 1968, p. 84.

of teaching.²

Many of the most talented teachers annually leave the ranks by accepting positions outside the classroom where they receive more status and money. Others find outlets that enable them to utilize better their talents and enthusiasm. It is not only the profession that is hurt by this action but the student.³

Merit pay (teachers have the same responsibilities but receive different compensation) has been suggested as a means of retaining talented individuals in the classroom. It has its weaknesses: namely, a lack of recognized criteria in the selection of the "superior teacher," a lack of altering the decision-making structure of the present teacher-administrator organization as found in the majority of secondary schools.

Differentiated staffing is a recent innovation which has appeared on the educational scene. It is a radical departure from the traditional organization found in the field today. It can be defined as a division and extension of the role of the teacher through the creation of a teacher

²M. John Rand and Fenwick W. English, "Towards a Differentiated Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), p. 264.

³Arthur P. Little, Inc., Teacher Supply and Demand in California, 1965-75. A Report to the State Board of Education from the Teacher Supply and Study Committee in California, 1967, p. 25.

hierarchy with job responsibilities that are commensurate with a range of pay. (See pages 7 and 8 in this chapter.) Its primary attraction is that it offers teachers increased status and advancement opportunities within the field of teaching.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Although differentiated staffing is in operation in several school districts, notably Temple City Unified, Temple City, California, and Beaverton Schools in Beaverton, Oregon; few, if any, attempts have been made to measure the attitudes produced by this innovation as it affects teachers and administrators. The attitudes of teachers and administrators who have participated in differentiated staffing have not been determined.

This study directs itself to the problem of surveying the attitudes of teachers and administrators toward differentiated staffing and its acceptance at the secondary level.

Related to the problem are the following purposes:

1. To identify the degree of acceptability of differentiated staffing among secondary personnel who are currently working in a staffing pattern of this type.
2. To develop a possible acceptable staffing plan for a specific high school.

Importance of the Problem

Since 1960, knowledge in the various disciplines of education has greatly increased. There is little defense for continuing to do things in the same manner. With no change a school system will decay; with random change some survival will occur; with systematic change it will be able to meet current needs.⁴

A dramatic change in the accepted pattern of school organization was taken by the Temple City Unified School District in Los Angeles County, California. Aided by a \$41,840 Kettering Foundation Grant, this district has implemented a totally new staffing pattern.

Commenting on this type of change, Sharpes writes that a "differentiated staffing plan will improve the teaching profession and thus increase the effectiveness of instruction."⁵

Rand and English in speaking of change state:

The most difficult barrier of all is not physical or financial, but the subtle limitations in our vision, attitudes, and expectations, conditioned by one organizational structure for over 100 years. The validity of this structure may have been eroded, but its form has been firmly implanted in our psyches. The ability to rise above our own conditioning and previous expectancy levels is the most difficult problem, for solutions cannot be devised until

⁴"Relevant Change and Educational Direction," (unpublished brochure), Temple City, California (July, 1969), p. 2.

⁵Donald K. Sharpes, "Differentiated Teaching Personnel: A Model for the Secondary School." (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1969), p. 33.

problems are accurately perceived. Perception is limited when assumptions cannot be questioned. Our inability to see that some of our frustrations stem from traditional assumptions is a tragic dilemma.⁶

Differentiated staffing has the wherewithal to terminate automatic promotions, encourage talented teachers to move toward higher salary aims and different roles, and provide greater flexibility and much better use of teacher time, talent, and school facilities. It recognizes competence and relates it to responsibility and salary, allows for more individualized instruction, and provides for greater job satisfaction, thus increasing the stature of the teacher.⁷

Differentiated staffing is a step toward breaking the century-old traditional school staffing pattern. At present, the teaching profession loses a number of its members to positions outside the field of classroom teaching.⁸ There is little or no provision made to enable these people to use their initiative and creativity in professionalizing their vocation and speeding their advancement within the structure as it exists today. With the exit of good teachers, instruction suffers and students lose the

⁶M. John Rand and Fenwick W. English, "Toward A Differentiated Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), p. 268.

⁷N.E.A., Division of Press, Radio, and Television Relations, "Staff Differentiation," CTA Journal, LXV (January, 1969), p. 1.

⁸Arthur P. Little, Inc., Teacher Supply and Demand in California, 1965-75. A Report to the State Board of Education, 1967.

close personal contact that a teacher offers--a contact which plays a critical role in the development of our youth. In short, differentiated staffing offers teachers an opportunity to become instrumental in enhancing their status and profession.

II. PROCEDURE

This study involves participants from the level of secondary education. Secondary personnel who have had experience with differentiated staffing, and those who have not, were asked to participate in a questionnaire study which attempted to measure their attitudes about this type of staffing.

The questionnaire was developed by the writer, and the items for it were selected from an extensive examination of the literature related to differentiated staffing and from models in the field. The writer also interviewed the project director of the Temple City Unified School District, Fenwick W. English, who was responsible for implementing this type of staffing pattern within that district.

The questionnaire was reviewed by graduate students in the field of education as well as by teachers. Suggestions from these participants resulted in revision of items, unnecessary repetitions, and semantic error. A pilot study was also conducted at California State University, San Jose.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The following definitions of terms have been utilized in this study:

1. Differentiated Staffing: A division and extension of the role of the teacher through the creation of a teacher hierarchy with job responsibilities that are commensurate with a range of pay.⁹ (A diagram appears on the following page.)
2. Associate Teacher: A first-year teacher with full-time teaching responsibilities, but with a lighter and less demanding load than that of the staff teacher. This person would hold a bachelor's degree, but would be less experienced in methodology and pupil diagnosis than any other staff member. The salary for this position would be the lowest in the hierarchy.¹⁰
3. Staff Teacher: A highly experienced classroom teacher and an expert in at least one of several learning modes (e.g., small group instruction). He would teach full time, diagnose basic learning problems and have tenure.¹¹

⁹Fenwick W. English, Differentiated Staffing: Giving Teaching a Chance to Improve Learning, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Florida State Department of Education. Tallahassee, Florida, (January, 1968), p. 1. (Monograph)

¹⁰Michael Stover, "New Careers in Teaching: Differentiated Staffing," Temple City, California, 1969, p. 2.

¹¹Ibid., p. 3.

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHING HIERARCHY

TENURE	NON-TENURE*	NON-TENURE*
10 month work year	11 month work year	12 month work year
B.S. or B.A. and Credential	M.A. M.S. or equivalent and Credential	Doctorate or equivalent and Credential
100% Teaching	60% Teaching	40% Teaching
\$9,000-16,000	\$16,000-19,000	\$19,000-25,000
STAFF TEACHER	SENIOR TEACHER	MASTER TEACHER

*Teachers serving in these positions may have tenure as Staff Teacher. They do not have tenure as Senior Teacher or Master Teacher.

This category compares with a fully credentialed teacher as we know that position today.

4. Senior Teacher: A master practitioner in his subject area. His primary responsibility is the application of curricular innovations to the classroom. His position is non-tenured, and he teaches approximately 60 percent of the time. His work year is extended to 11 months, and his salary ranges from \$2,000 to \$3,000 above that of the maximum step of the teachers' salary schedule.¹²

5. Master Teacher: An effective classroom teacher and a scholar in his assigned subject area. He possesses a doctorate or its equivalent, and his teaching responsibility is approximately 40 percent of that of the staff teacher. He establishes and maintains a continual program of research and evaluation of his area of curriculum development, is non-tenured in this position, and works a 12-month year. He has prior experience in research and curriculum design, as well as their application and measurement. He can earn up to \$25,000 per year, and his position is viewed as comparable to that of an assistant superintendent.¹³

¹²Ibid., p. 3.

¹³Loc. cit.

IV. HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the status of teachers.

Hypothesis 2

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the staffing of teachers.

Hypothesis 3

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the salaries of teachers.

Hypothesis 4

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the role of the administration.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to secondary school personnel

from the Beaverton School District 48, Beaverton, Oregon, the Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California, and the Milpitas Unified School District, Milpitas, California. The last district mentioned had not participated in differentiated staffing as opposed to the other two who have had that experience.

VI. SUMMARY

In the first chapter of this report are found:

(1) the introduction to the study, (2) the problem and the importance of the problem, (3) the procedure, (4) the significant terms used in the study, (5) states the hypotheses, and (6) the limitations on which the research has been based.

Four additional chapters complete the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature related to differentiated staffing in terms of the status of teachers, the staffing of teachers, the salary of teachers, and the role of administration. The research design is presented in Chapter 3. A thorough discussion of the subjects and the test instrument is provided. Chapter 4 includes the results of the study with a discussion of each hypothesis. Chapter 5, which completes the study, provides the conclusions based upon the investigation and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of literature related to this study is presented here in four main divisions:

1. The status of teachers
 - A. Roles and competency in classroom related to instruction.
 - B. Decision making related to instruction.
2. The staffing of teachers
3. The salaries of teachers
4. The role of the administration

I. THE STATUS OF TEACHERS

Roles and Competency in Classroom Related to Instruction

Schools exist so that students may have the opportunity to learn. Within the school, the teacher is the cardinal person in the instructional program, and what he does with his time at school seriously influences the learning opportunities of his students.¹

Assuming teachers are qualified by reason of their

¹Rodney Smith, "A Teacher is a Teacher is a Teacher?" Florida Schools, XXX (September-October, 1969), 2-6.

education and credentials, there is little consideration of other variables or factors. Donald Sharpes writes that each teacher is considered equally competent in the skills of teaching, as well as in subject matter, since there are equal class loads per teacher. He further states that since there is no vertical level of responsibility there is no incentive to improve instructional techniques.²

Advocates of differentiated staffing find that teacher abilities, skills, or differences in training and background are of small consequence in assigning teachers responsibilities.

Kevin Ryan³ and John Goodlad⁴ elaborate on this by stating that in spite of the immense range in teacher abilities, differing capacities of leadership, professional growth, variety of skills, and the mastery of subject matter, teachers are treated as interchangeable parts by being given the same duties and responsibilities.

²Donald K. Sharpes, "Differentiated Teaching Personnel: A Model for the Secondary School." (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1969), p. 8.

³Kevin A. Ryan, "A Plan for a New Type of Professional Training for a New Type of Teaching Staff," The Teacher and His Staff, Occasional Papers No. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, February, 1968, p. 9.

⁴John Goodlad and Robert H. Anderson, The Non-Graded Elementary School: (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963), p. 124.

Fenwick English,⁵ Roy Edelfelt,⁶ and Rozanne Weisman⁷ report little variety and no promotion in the field of teaching. The teacher's job responsibilities are similar whether he teaches for two years or twenty.

The Association of Classroom Teachers of the N.E.A.⁸ discloses that the needs of today's youth cannot be met by continuing with the traditional staffing patterns found in most schools. Furthermore, if individual differences are to be met, then the individual abilities, talents and interests of teachers will have to be utilized.

Fenwick W. English,⁹ one of the leading exponents of

⁵Fenwick W. English, "Et Tu, Educator, Differentiated Staffing?" Rationale and Model for a Differentiated Teaching Staff. TEPS Write in Papers on Flexible Staffing Patterns No. 4. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, August, 1969, p. 4.

⁶Roy A. Edelfelt, "Differentiated Staffing: Interpersonal Relationships and the Changing Education Community." A Speech presented at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Supervisors Conference, Daytona Beach, Florida, October, 1968, p. 3.

⁷Rozanne Weisman, "Pros and Cons on Differentiated Staffing--A New Way of Reorganizing Schools," Maine Teacher, XXIX (March, 1969), p. 268.

⁸Association of Classroom Teachers, Classroom Teachers Speak on Differentiated Teaching Assignments. Report of the Classroom Teachers National Study Conference on Differentiated Teaching Assignments for Classroom Teachers. Washington, D.C., p. 15.

⁹Fenwick W. English, Differentiated Staffing: Giving Teachers a Chance to Improve Learning, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida. (September, 1968), p. 3. (Monograph.)

differentiated staffing, states that in order for teachers to receive a promotion they would have to leave the classroom and move to counseling, consultant work, supervisory responsibility, or administration. Furthermore, he feels that teachers are considered less than professional in that they have to be told what to do and when to do it. He goes on to say that teaching is not an attractive career and does not offer status, prestige, or financial remuneration which could compare with other graduates from colleges and universities who are considering a life's vocation. He contrasts the changing posture and image of the classroom teacher by comparing a placid pedagogue with no more than a ninth grade education at the turn of the century, to a highly trained and knowledgeable five-year matriculated professional with an advanced degree that one finds in the classroom today.

English¹⁰ writes that within the field of education, the experienced teacher finds himself in a role which does not compete with school administration, either in salary or status.

Dwight W. Allen,¹¹ Dean of the School of Education

¹⁰Fenwick W. English, "Differentiated Staffing: Refinement, Reform or Revolution? ISR Journal, I, No. 4 (Fall, 1967), p. 225.

¹¹Dwight W. Allen, "A Differentiated Staff: Putting Teaching Talent to Work." Kansas Teacher, LXXVII (February, 1969), p. 21.

at the University of Massachusetts, notes that a high number of the most talented teachers either quit teaching or accept promotions away from students in order to obtain more money, or to find an outlet for their talent and enthusiasm. He finds that teaching talent and professional ability are being wasted by doing jobs such as monitoring lunchrooms, taking roll, and doing other duties that do not require professional ability.

An N.E.A. paper on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS)¹² discloses that teachers are involved in tasks that decrease their professional stature and waste their energies--energies that can be directed toward interaction with students rather than fund-collecting, hall-monitoring, and other less professional activities.

A report by the Arthur P. Little¹³ Corporation states that one of the primary reasons given for the loss of teachers to other careers is that teaching is ranked low in status and prestige.

As Decision Makers Related to Instruction

With the increase of specialization in the field and

¹²National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) A Position Statement on the Concept of Differentiated Staffing, (National Education Association, May 11, 1969), p. 4.

¹³Arthur P. Little, Inc., Teacher Supply and Demand in California, 1965-75. A Report to the State Board of Education, 1967, p. 25.

with the quality of people now being trained, teachers are becoming more dependent on one another, thereby involving themselves in group decisions rather than simply accepting them from a higher authority.

John Rand and Fenwick English¹⁴ note that with the increase in technical competence on the part of teachers, their subordinate position to the hierarchy of administration which rests on traditional and arbitrary distinctions, becomes unacceptable. They are no longer content to be implementors of administrative fiat. They are demanding to be included in the decision-making machinery of education.

Rand¹⁵ remarks that demands for decentralized decision-making on the part of teachers have caused a re-thinking with respect to who is most competent to make instructional decisions.

English¹⁶ and Allen¹⁷ state that teachers should be involved with administrators in the decision-making process. English¹⁸ suggests that an academic senate be formed at the

¹⁴M. John Rand and Fenwick W. English, "Toward a Differentiated Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), p. 268.

¹⁵John Rand, "A Case for Differentiated Staffing," CTA Journal, LXV (March, 1969), p. 29.

¹⁶English, "Et Tu, Educator," op. cit., p. 4.

¹⁷Dwight W. Allen, "A Differentiated Staff:" op. cit. p. 22.

¹⁸English, "Et Tu, Educator," op. cit., p. 18.

school level and supplemented by an academic coordinating council at the district level to resolve disagreements incapable of being solved at the school level. The coordinating council would be composed of both principals and teachers from within the district. He further urges that teachers define good practice by some regulatory means or face the possibility that others less qualified, and with different purposes, will do it for them. He concludes that differentiated staffing offers teachers a new structure, advancement within the teaching field, and an active part in organizational decision-making.

Bernard McKenna¹⁹ advocates that it is time that teachers have something to do with the "governance of the profession and the determination of professional matters." He cites NCTEPS' position which concludes that the delegation of a right is not the relinquishment of it but rather the fixing of responsibility on those best qualified to make expert judgments.

II. THE STAFFING OF TEACHERS

Kevin A. Ryan, Director, Master of Arts in Teaching Program at the University of Chicago, states:

¹⁹Bernard McKenna, School Staffing Patterns and Pupil Inter-Personal Behavior: Implications for Teacher Education. (Burlingame: California Teachers Association, 1967), pp. 13-18.

We give a freshly certified 21-year old the awesome responsibility for the teaching of large numbers of children for an entire year. We expect him to be highly skilled in all aspects of teaching, from control of content to human relations, from motivation to evaluation, and then we expect him to spend the forty years of his life carrying out essentially the same responsibilities. This seems to be an unrealistic demand on the beginner and a deadening prospect for the experienced teacher.²⁰

Edelfelt²¹ advocates a career pattern to encourage those who wish to remain in the classroom to do so but adds that variety in assignment should offer the excitement of new experiences during the teacher's working years. He feels confident that differentiated staffing will provide alternatives in teaching roles and offer opportunities for advancement in the field of teaching. He states that teachers need to be involved in this type of innovation, inasmuch as their tasks are those to be differentiated; therefore, their participation will contribute as to how this can best be done.

Edelfelt²² approaches the problem of what is wrong

²⁰Kevin A. Ryan, "Where Are We Going and How Can We Get There?" National Education Association. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles. Report of the 1968 Regional TEPS Conferences, Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1969, pp. 78-9.

²¹Roy A. Edelfelt, "The Teacher and His Staff," Paper distributed at the California Teachers Association Conference on School Staffing held in Millbrae, California, April, 1970, p. 3.

²²Edelfelt, "Differentiated Staffing," op. cit., pp. 3-6.

with present staffing by stating that there is not enough variety for the teacher. There is little or no time for a teacher to think, because of the confinement to routine, rigid schedule, busy work, clerical chores, and non-teaching duties. There is no provision in the structure for non-teaching duties. There is no provision in the structure for individual teacher differences. He suggests re-making the school and the teaching profession--a break of the lock-step pattern of one teacher to thirty students. He urges a differentiation of teacher roles, employment of non-professionals to help in running the school, and more flexibility regarding the use of time, space, and resources.

His rationale^{22a} for differentiating the staff covers four points: (1) Improvement of Instruction. There will be more individual instruction because time and personnel will function towards diagnosing learning problems and evaluating student progress. (2) Improvement of the Educational Profession. The promotion of greater responsibility and status within teaching can be accomplished by taking advantage of the use of teacher talents, the use of individuality, the use of autonomy, and the use of responsible governance by professionals. (3) Provision of a Career Ladder. Presently there is only one entry and re-entry point in teaching. All teachers, new or experienced, are expected to get into the full swing of professional responsibility.

^{22a}Ibid., pp. 3-6.

immediately upon entering the field. With differentiated staffing, a variety of positions might satisfy personnel at different points of their professional life and correspond with their job desires at the same time. (4) Establishment of Training Models for Personnel Development.

This encompasses the use of criteria in establishing teaching positions. Training, skill, performance, interest and desire will be financially remunerative in terms of the nature and difficulty of the responsibility the teacher is willing to assume.

Presently teachers are expected to be all things to all students. Macdonald's comments offer an interesting analysis of the current expectations of teachers. He writes:

Teachers are now invited to refer themselves to an omniscient model, at once intelligent and affectively warm, knowledgeable and tolerant, articulate and patient, efficient and gentle, morally committed and sympathetic, scholarly and practical, socially conscious and dedicated to personal development, fearless and responsible. They are told that they must be specialists in an academic discipline, masters of techniques of presentation, adept class managers, artful motivators, skillful diagnosticians, ingenious remedial workers, imaginative curriculum designers, eager inquirers, efficient administrators, helpful colleagues, widely interested citizens and loving human beings (the last being a new and very modish injunction.)²³

²³John Macdonald, "Teacher Education: Analysis and Recommendations," National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiated Teaching Roles. Report of the 1968 Regional TEPS Conference. Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1969, p. 4.

He goes on to say that since these standards are impossible to attain, they naturally lead to frustration and disillusion and then to indifference and inactivity. He concludes by stating,

The ideal of the omnicapable teacher is now a piece of outworn idealogical baggage which has to be left behind if schools are to exemplify that efficiency . . . which is the authentic voice of contemporary society."²⁴

Macdonald²⁵ feels that teachers should be singularly employed using the talents for which they appear to be suited by preparation, endowment, and personal preference. They might find satisfaction with individualized instruction, with small tutorial groups, with large tutorial groups, with seminar classes, with large classes, or with a mass-presentation assembly situation. Their preference might lead them to diagnose, counsel, specialize in remedial teaching, carry out formal instruction, or become involved in other tasks now left to the traditional teacher. They can be associated with teams representing different specialties, and they will be responsible for the general guidance and direction of instruction.

Don Barbee²⁶ emphasizes that teachers and others in

²⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 6.

²⁶ Don Barbee, "Differentiated Staffing: Expectations and Pitfalls," TEPS Write-In Papers on Flexible Staffing Patterns No. 1. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, March, 1969, pp. 1-6.

the field should assume different responsibilities which can be based on descriptions of the variety of tasks and services performed by teachers. It is his feeling that teachers should be able to cultivate their individuality along routes which can be of some profit to students and staff. He further states that differentiated staffing is a promising approach for dealing with needed changes in education.

Alvin Lierheimer²⁷ suggests that the role of the teacher in many schools is in need of re-examination because the diversity of competencies and tasks expected in today's world is beyond the grasp of a single person, certainly beyond the grasp of the beginning teacher. The advantages of differentiating the roles of teachers are beneficial not only for the teachers themselves, but also for the students and the community as well.

He goes on to say that the community also profits in the use of outside talent in the schools; that is, using persons with specialized talents but who do not have preparation for teaching. Teachers realize job satisfaction when they perform at levels and in roles that meet their desires and use their talents.^{27a}

²⁷ Alvin P. Lierheimer, "An Anchor to Windward," TEPS Write-In Papers No. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, April, 1969, pp. 4-5.

^{27a} Ibid., p. 5.

Ryan²⁸ is critical of the present staffing pattern in that it does not aid the teacher's mastery or development of specialized competencies and requires him to be a jack-of-all-trades. He reports that with a differentiated staff the teacher with talent is able to influence his colleagues as well as his students. It allows the less talented teacher to contribute more in keeping with his strengths. The more talented teacher can be given different levels of responsibility, duties and specialties. In effect, there will be different categories of teachers.

Sharpes²⁹ reports that the educational system should be characterized by professional teachers expressing themselves in different roles. The lack of role differentiation, the lack of advancement opportunities, and the absence of systematic institutional process for change are manifest in the profession today. Staffing patterns should enable exceptional teachers to remain in the classroom with the opportunity to influence large numbers of students.

The Association of Classroom Teachers³⁰ states that differentiated staffing will aid teachers to individualize instruction to a much higher degree than at present.

²⁸Ryan, "Plan for Professional Training," op. cit. pp. 9-10.

²⁹Sharpes, "Differentiated Teaching Personnel," op. cit., pp. 21-3.

³⁰Association of Classroom Teachers, "Differentiated Teaching Assignments," op. cit., p. 15.

Allen³¹ recommends abandonment of the present manner of staffing schools because it is wasteful and does not make sense. He proposes a four-level structure in which teaching responsibilities are allotted and rewarded in keeping with known educational functions and professional needs. He suggests that the structure should be one that includes levels of responsibility in a teaching organization that determines the present and future educational needs in a given school. Qualified teachers will be responsible for the tasks identified. Unless some degree of differentiation takes place, he predicts that the present format in use at schools will eventually fail, as a result of its built-in inadequacies and the demands for better education. He states that change in education, necessitated by pressure from society, rouses teachers to accept more responsibility and the obligation to build a professional teaching staff, which insures that learning will take place other than by accident.

McKenna³² emphasizes that differentiated staffing is an assuring possibility for strengthening career patterns by keeping talent in the field of teaching. He notes

³¹Dwight W. Allen, "A Differentiated Staff:" op. cit., pp. 21-3.

³²Bernard McKenna, "A Proposal for Redesigning the Education Professions," Paper distributed at the California Teachers Association Conference on School Staffing held in Millbrae, California, April, 1970, pp. 3-7.

that teachers can become leaders to junior members of the profession, that teachers can influence new members of the profession, that teachers can determine the governance of their profession, and that teachers can continue to work with students by diagnosing learning disabilities and planning strategies for correcting them.

Rand³³ discusses the willingness of teachers to assume additional responsibilities concurrent with the status and salary equal to some administrators and higher than that of other administrators. He notes that the differentiated position of Senior and Master teachers is viewed not as supervisory but as service positions. The services will be evaluated by the recipients and successful service will insure retention in the position.

English³⁴ shows that within the differentiated staff there exists a new career pattern for teachers which establishes a vertical mobility within the ranks of a teaching faculty as opposed to the monolithic structure which presently operates. He assumes that if the teacher has an opportunity to use his time and talent, he will facilitate learning beyond the methods currently available by reason of being able to diagnose and prescribe unique experiences for the student. Only when students and teachers can

³³Rand, "Differentiated Staffing," op. cit., pp. 30-32.

³⁴English, "Et Tu, Educator," op. cit., pp. 9-21.

exhibit their vast differences will individual needs on the part of both be met.

English³⁵ notes that there is no significant relationship between pupil achievement and class size after four decades of educational research. With all the educational research and psychological testing on hand, the structure of education remains virtually the same. Teachers are made aware of pupils' differences but forced to carry on the status quo of their roles in a structure organized on the principles that such differences do not exist between children.

He further states that there is an inevitable conflict in the attempt to reconcile individualizing instruction and the current structure of staffing in the public schools. The present rationale is to strive for a lower group size. This is impervious to the inequalities of both student and teacher because the structure remains the same, and teachers are hamstrung in their efforts to help students on an individual basis while they are locked into the present structure of the school. The uniformity of time, which is parcelled out by periods, insures a permanency to the present role of the classroom teacher. An effort has to be made to consider alternatives. The teaching tasks need to be separated and distributed among teacher

³⁵ Fenwick W. English, "Differentiated What?", Unpublished Position Paper for the Mesa Public Schools Conference on Differentiated Staffing, Mesa, Arizona, 1970, p. 1.

specialists, each with a range of pay commensurate with his responsibility. Differentiated staffing will be the vehicle by which individual needs of the students can be met by varying the types of roles teachers will assume.

English³⁶ suggests that in order to have differences recognized, teachers will have to differentiate their responsibilities so that their image as interchangeable and docile employees within the educational structure is changed.

III. THE SALARIES OF TEACHERS

The Little Report³⁷ discloses that the single most outstanding reason given by males who left teaching is inadequate salary. The report also states that teaching is not viewed favorably by college men as a career because of its poor financial incentives.

Weisman³⁸ notes that a teacher with a doctorate holds less prestige than an administrator and cannot double his salary during his teaching career.

Rand and English³⁹ remark that some teachers, by

³⁶English, "Differentiated Staffing--Florida State Department of Education," op. cit., p. 7.

³⁷Little, Inc., "Teacher Supply," op. cit., p. 10.

³⁸Weisman, "Pros and Cons," op. cit., p. 26.

³⁹Rand and English, "Differentiated Teaching Staff," op. cit., pp. 264-5.

reason of their willingness to accept more professional responsibility, a longer work year, and a change in role, should be entitled to earn upwards of \$20,000 per year. These teachers will not be paid more simply for continuing to perform identical functions. Their selection for higher positions will be based on their experience and qualifications, as determined by a professional panel, and they will be able to function adequately in their assigned role.

Edelfelt⁴⁰ reports that teachers willing to assume roles which are differentiated as to degree of difficulty and responsibility will be able to realize up to three and one-half times the salary of beginning teachers.

Macdonald⁴¹ notes the need for better teachers and the establishment of some means of insuring quality among teachers. A new career status encourages excellent teachers to remain in the classroom. In addition, it provides a sound basis for putting these teachers on a level equal to that of a principal.

Rand,⁴² in an attempt to clarify the point of

⁴⁰ Roy A. Edelfelt, "A Possible Dream: A New Education and New Models of Teachers," National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles. Report of the 1968 Regional TEPS Conferences. Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1969, p. 118.

⁴¹ Macdonald, "Teacher Education," op. cit., p. 6.

⁴² Rand, "Differentiated Staffing," op. cit., p. 31.

different responsibilities and levels of pay, cites the example of a staff that is found in a dental office. He shows that in a dental office one finds a dentist, a dental hygienist, a dental assistant, and a receptionist. Each of these people performs a different job demanding a different level of training and in turn a different rate of pay.

English⁴³ asserts that present salary schedules for teachers do much to curb excellence and initiative within the teaching ranks. He finds that time on the job is the predominant criterion for advancement in the field. The salary schedule, with its annual increments, assumes that teachers grow equally in expertise based on a given sum of course credits. He concludes it is the most innocuous means of remuneration used, and, in fact, avoids the whole issue of contributing effectual encouragement for teachers to remain in the classroom.

English writes:

If one were to seek deliberately to devise a system recruiting and paying teachers calculated to repel the imaginative and daring and self-confident and to attract the mediocre and uninspiring, he could hardly do better than imitate the system of requiring teaching certificates and enforcing standard salary structures that has developed in the large city and state-wide systems. Our problem today is not to enforce conformity;

⁴³English, "Et Tu, Educator," op. cit., p. 7.

it is that we are threatened with an excess of conformity.⁴⁴ Our problem is to foster diversity. . . .

Critics of the differentiated staffing concept frequently allude to labelling this innovation another "merit pay" system. English⁴⁵ states that in merit pay the criteria is decided by some group or an individual by which one teacher is judged to be better than another and is paid accordingly. There is no responsibility factor involved in merit pay.

McKenna explains the difference between merit pay and differentiated staffing when he states:

The traditional merit-pay issue would be avoided in that school staffs would be paid differently for assuming different responsibilities as compared to being paid differently because they were judged to be performing similar tasks at different levels of quality.⁴⁶

Edelfelt⁴⁷ emphasizes that in the differentiation of the staff there will be prior agreement on the various degrees of responsibility and this will not permit the

⁴⁴English, "Teacher May I? Take Three Giant Steps. The Differentiated Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, LI, Number 4 (December, 1969), p. 211, quoting Capitalism and Freedom, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 96-97.

⁴⁵English, "Differentiated Staffing--Florida State Department of Education," op. cit., pp. 3-5.

⁴⁶Bernard McKenna, "A Proposal for Redesigning the Education Professions." op. cit., p. 2.

⁴⁷Roy A. Edelfelt, "Is Differentiated Staffing Worth Risking?" Paper presented to National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association (no date given).

question of merit pay to raise a problem.

IV. THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATION

English⁴⁸ states that administration is the sign of success and the "high road" in the field of education. He ponders the loss of creative and dedicated teaching professionals to the fields of business, industry, and administration. He states that the problem of widening differences between teachers and administrators is characterized by administrative negativism, and a retreat to the policies, authority, and leadership of the past. The problem tends to magnify itself when teachers ascribe to administrators their autocratically authoritative position while seeing themselves in a subservient role. English^{48a} further states that the result of this myopic view produces fear on the part of administrators in extending any decision-making authority to the teachers, because to do so would bring on a possible loss of power. The administrative position thus insures a segregation and a relinquishing of leadership, plus an unwillingness to approve of the new teacher as a professional colleague or peer. The net result of this is an increase in hostility and mistrust. To cling to the past, to "hold the line," and to refuse to

⁴⁸English, "Differentiated Staffing--Florida State Department of Education," op. cit., pp. 3-5.

^{48a}Ibid., p. 4.

consider fresh innovative relationships with teachers all tend to reinforce the status quo, thereby forcing the teacher into the role of the change agent.

English⁴⁹ asserts that the claim for professional responsibility on the part of the teacher must be recognized as the way towards maturity and professional stature, rather than a retreat. Administrators should sustain the teacher's request, not restrict and encumber him in his efforts to find the key to help himself, his students, and the instructional program. When teacher roles are separated and career advancements are offered, teachers will remain in classrooms as professionals and gain equal, if not greater, prestige and influence in the organization. Differentiated staffing is one way to bring in an incentive system that rewards teaching for itself and not at the expense of administration. Teachers must be involved in the decision-making process with administrators as formal partners.

Restructuring of the profession will bring to an end the sacrosanct notion that administrators are "instructional experts."

English states:

The administrator is a generalist, one who enhances and promotes the career of the specialist. . . . If teaching and learning are the heart

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 5.

of the school, a differentiated teaching staff must capture and hold the resources of the organization to this purpose.⁵⁰

The Association of Classroom Teachers⁵¹ states that if a pattern of staffing schools is to create new roles for teachers then the roles and responsibilities of principals and supervisors will also be affected.

McKenna⁵² suggests that the role of the principalship might be changed to cover a management and coordinate function not unlike that of a hospital administrator which in itself is a full profession, but quite apart and different from that of the field of medical practice.

Rand⁵³ notes that with differentiated staffing changing the structure, the eliminating and superimposing of new roles on an archaic structure, might refine it. The creation of decision-making groups comprised of teachers and administrators will incorporate the body of expertise of experienced teachers with that of the equivalent managerial branch of the organization.

Rand and English⁵⁴ present a position called the

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 11

⁵¹ Association of Classroom Teachers, "Differentiated Teaching Assignments," op. cit., p. 18.

⁵² McKenna, "A Proposal for Redesigning the Education Professions," op. cit., pp. 7-8.

⁵³ Rand, "Differentiated Staffing," op. cit., p. 32.

⁵⁴ Rand and English, "Differentiated Teaching Staff," op. cit., p. 266.

school manager. This position will assume implementation for the business functions of school operation. They further state that the creation of this position will give the principal an opportunity to teach as well as become involved in the instructional program. The alliance of teacher-specialists and administrator-generalist will enable the school to utilize a host of professionals in the development of a dynamic program. The role of the teacher will be heightened by reason of his participation in how the instructional program should be improved, and the role of the principal will be fortified through the expertise of his senior teachers who would be used in hiring and evaluating the instructional staff.

V. SUMMARY

In this chapter, it was demonstrated that there are no vertical levels of responsibility for the classroom teacher and there is little incentive to improve instructional techniques. Advocates of differentiated staffing find that teacher abilities, skills, or differences in training and background are of small consequence in assigning teachers responsibilities in the field. Teachers are for the most part utilized in exactly the same manner, whether they have taught twenty years or two years. The literature indicates that all promotions lead away from

the classroom. At present, the experienced teacher finds himself in a role which does not compete with the school administrator either in salary or status.

The literature verifies that there is no career progression or promotion in classroom teaching. Furthermore, there appears to be a lack of alternatives in teaching roles and opportunities for advancement.

The present single salary structure for all teachers tends to curb incentive and assumes all teachers grow in exact annual equivalents. Differentiated staffing offers higher salaries commensurate with performance and responsibility. Automatic promotion regardless of competence is eliminated.

The literature discloses that differentiated staffing brings into being a structural incentive system that rewards classroom teaching and gives teachers an opportunity to develop in a true professional sense by giving the teacher prestige and influence in professional decision-making affecting him and his profession.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

In Chapter 3 the following information pertaining to this study is presented as follows:

1. Sources of Data
2. Instrument for the Study
3. Administration of the Instrument
4. Treatment of Data
5. Summary

I. SOURCES OF DATA

The sample for this study consisted of 161 secondary school teachers and administrators having staff assignments in grades seven through twelve. Sixty-five were from schools which had a differentiated staffing pattern and 96 were from non-differentiated staffs.

Two differentiated staffing groups were surveyed in this study. One was from Temple City High School, Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California. The other was from the Mountain View School, Beaverton, Oregon.

The non-differentiated participants were drawn from the Milpitas Unified School District, Milpitas, California.

Since differentiated staffing is an innovation

there were very few schools from which to choose and even fewer were willing to cooperate in the study. Their reluctance was attributed to the fact that they were "surveyed to death." A copy of the letter of invitation to participate in the study appears in Appendix A.

II. THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument used in this study was designed to identify the participant's attitude toward differentiated staffing. From a review of the literature, an interview with Fenwick W. English, then Project Director, Differentiated Staffing, at Temple City Unified School District, and a faculty member in the field of educational administration at the University of the Pacific, a questionnaire was developed to gather the data for this study. The items in it are categorized into four areas including the status of teachers, the staffing of teachers, the salaries of teachers, and the role of the administration. Several authors suggest¹ that the instrument should be relatively brief, semi-structured, and provide some standardization of language but allow some freedom of expression.

The questionnaire utilizes a summated scale, referred

¹David J. Fox, The Research Process in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp. 524-569; Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates, Methods of Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp. 604-645; Clair Seltiz, et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (rev. Ed.: New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 236-268.

to as a Likert-type scale, which is used most frequently in the study of social attitudes. This type of scale asks the subjects to respond to each item in terms of several degrees of agreement or disagreement. No attempt was made to include items that might be distributed evenly over a scale of favorableness-unfavorableness. An effort was made to select items that seem to be either definitely favorable or unfavorable to the study.

The procedures for constructing a Likert-type scale follow: (1) The investigator assembles a large number of items considered relevant to the attitude under investigation; (2) These items are given to subjects representative of those with whom the study is concerned; (3) The responses to the various items are scored in such a way as to indicate a response of the most favorable attitude as having a value of 1; (4) A response with the least favorable attitude is given a score of 5; (5) The responses are scored consistently in terms of the attitudinal direction they indicate.

Some advantages of the Likert-type scale are: (1) It is simple to construct; (2) It is reliable; (3) It permits a range that is more precise about an individual's opinion on the issue that refers to a given item; and (4) It makes possible the ranking of individuals in terms of favorableness of their attitude toward a given object.²

²Clair Seltiz, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. 368-9.

A disadvantage of the Likert-type scale is that while it makes possible the ranking of individuals in terms of the favorableness of their attitude toward a given object, it does not provide a basis for saying how much more favorable one is than another, nor for measuring the amount of change after some experience. Pragmatically the scores on the Likert-type questionnaire often provide the basis for a rough ordering of people on the characteristic being measured.³

The first draft of the instrument contained approximately 65 items. These were eventually reduced to 38 after a number of revisions resulting from a pilot study involving 32 graduate students in education at California State University, San Jose. The revisions clarify items, remove duplicity, and minimize ambiguity.

The questionnaire describes a differentiated teaching hierarchy and defines each of the positions within a differentiated staff. The first eight questions refer to the years of experience of the participant, present assignment, sex, and school level at which he is employed. The remaining 38 items are categorized into the four areas as given on pages 41 and 42. The major areas of the questionnaire are described briefly in the next section. The items and form in which they are presented can be found in Appendix B.

³Ibid., pp. 368-9.

The Status of Teachers

This section contains 12 items which relate to instructional responsibilities and professional relationships. Among the items covered are: job satisfaction, non-professional duties of teachers, the "equality" of teachers based on similar instructional responsibilities, the authority of master teachers, the evaluation of teacher performance by senior teachers, the status of teachers as they compare with other professions, the inclusions of teachers in the decision-making process related to curriculum matters, and teachers leaving the classroom to seek promotion.

The Staffing of Teachers

This section contains ten items which relate to teacher assignments and staffing patterns. The following areas are considered: the involvement of teachers in staff selection, the evaluation of services provided by senior and master teachers, the variety of assignments teaching offers, the differentiated degrees of difficulty of the teaching task, a career pattern which would encourage teachers to remain in the classroom, and a teaching assignment that should be made essentially on the ability and responsibility of each teacher.

The Salaries of Teachers

This section contains nine items which focus on the

single salary schedule, years of service, longer work year, automatic promotion, increase of pay for increase of responsibilities, and the failure of the single salary schedule to provide incentive for teachers to remain in the classroom.

The Role of the Administration

This section contains seven items, each pertaining to the school principal. The items relate to the principal and the improvement of instruction.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire was mailed to each participant accompanied by an IBM answer card. The participant was required to evaluate, on a five point scale, each of the items in the questionnaire. He was required to mark the appropriate space on the answer card that represented his evaluation. The questionnaire has the following response categories: A Strongly Agree, B Agree, C Uncertain, D Disagree, E Strongly Disagree.

A stamped self-addressed envelope was enclosed for the return of the card.

Participants were assured of anonymity in that no names are asked to be placed on the answer cards. Participants were informed that the general aim of the study was to determine their attitude about differentiated staffing.

IV. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

After the answer cards were received they were checked to ensure that each response had only one pencilled mark to prevent any invalidations. These marks were then punched into the IBM cards to prepare them for use in the computer.

The data were subject to a Fortran Program on a Burroughs 3500 computer.

The "t" test which allows for comparison of the difference between means was used to determine if specific differences exist between the groups under examination. The "t" ration is defined as "a deviation divided by a standard deviation; the difference between the means is the deviation and the standard error of the difference between the means is the standard deviation."⁴

Each of the 38 variables was subjected to a "t" test. For the purpose of this study the ninety-five percent level of confidence (.95) was selected as significant although all levels are reported.

V. SUMMARY

Chapter 3 describes the procedure of the study. Participants are secondary teachers and administrators from two

⁴N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 138.

types of staffs: those involved in a differentiated staffing pattern and those serving in a traditional staffing pattern.

A questionnaire containing items related to the status of teachers, the staffing of teachers, the salaries of teachers, and the role of the administration was used to identify the attitudes of the participants regarding differentiated staffing. The procedure for the administration of the instrument and the treatment of the data was discussed. Chapter 4 will present the data collected and the interpretations.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The data collected in this study is presented to answer four questions: (1) Do secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing perceive the status of teachers to be different from that of those who have not participated? (2) Do secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing perceive the staffing of teachers to be different from that of those who have not participated? (3) Do secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing perceive the salaries of teachers to be different from that of those who have not participated? (4) Do secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing perceive the role of the administration to be different from that of those who have not participated?

The Status of Teachers

Roles and competency in classroom related to instruction. In the consideration of teacher roles and competency in the classroom, such factors as abilities, skills, and differences in training are of little consequence. The teacher's job responsibilities are similar whether he

teaches for two years or twenty years. Teachers may be considered less professional to the degree that they must be told what to do. Teaching as a career lacks prestige because of lesser professional duties that are required such as hall monitoring and fund collecting. As cited before in the Arthur P. Little Study, teaching ranks low in status and prestige as compared to other careers.¹

Decision-making related to instruction. The traditional position of the teacher as being subordinate to the administrator has now become unacceptable. Teachers demand to be included in the decision-making machinery of education. Teachers have become involved in decisions regarding curriculum because of their increased technical competency, better education, and interest in upgrading their professional status.

Teacher Staffing

Present staffing patterns offer little variety in assignment, little flexibility and a lock-step pattern of one teacher to thirty students. Lierheimer² states that the diversity of competencies expected in today's teacher is beyond the grasp of the novice entering the field. The present staffing pattern does not aid the teacher's

¹Little, op. cit.

²Lierheimer, op. cit.

development of specialized competencies because it requires him to fulfill repetitive assignments.

Teacher Salaries

Present salary schedules curb initiative within the teaching profession because time on the job is the predominate criterion for advancement. Salary schedules assume that teachers grow equally in competency as a result of taking courses and obtaining credits. This system appears to be an innocuous means of remuneration, and consideration should be given to replace it with a pay scale based on responsibility factors.

Role of Administration

The administrator enjoys prestigious status and salary. The administrator is to direct and supervise the instructional program and serve as a leader in the field of curriculum. Administrators have little time for leadership in the area of curriculum because of the additional responsibilities placed upon them in the management of their schools. Although it is difficult to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas, the principal's responsibilities should be revised to include more time for instructional leadership.

I. HYPOTHESIS I: STATUS OF TEACHERS

The purpose of this hypothesis is to compare the

differences between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not participated relative to their perception of the status of teachers. Some of the general areas to be considered are (1) job satisfaction, (2) non-professional duties, (3) authority of master teachers within their subject matter areas, (4) evaluation of teacher performance by senior teachers, (5) teacher promotion, (6) job responsibilities, and (7) traditional teaching assignments.

Presentation of the findings for Hypothesis I follows.

Hypothesis I:

The perceptions of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the status of teachers.

In the questionnaire, three of the 12 areas surveyed demonstrate a statistically significant difference at the .02 levels in the responses between the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Discussion of these three significant variables is presented below:

Variable 12

The authority of master teachers within their subject matter areas should surpass that of administrators as far as decisions related to curriculum and instruction are concerned.

The non-differentiated staff differed significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The findings of the non-differentiated staff indicate that decisions relating to curriculum and instruction should not

be solely the authority of master teachers. The differentiated staff agrees that the authority of the master teacher surpasses that of the administrator with respect to decisions being made concerning the master teacher's subject matter areas.

TABLE I
VARIABLE 12: AUTHORITY OF THE MASTER TEACHER

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	2.046	1.014	159	2.606	.01
Non-Differentiated	96	2.500	1.118			

Discussion of Variable 12: The master teacher is a scholar in his field. He possesses a doctorate or the equivalent in his area and maintains a continual program of research and evaluation. His primary responsibility is to introduce new concepts into schools through the use of research methodology and evaluation of instruction. He translates research into a practical teaching application at the school level. As such his expertise in that curricular area surpasses that of the principal and other staff members. Therefore, the differentiated staff member views the master teacher as being the curriculum leader instead of the administrator.

The non-differentiated staff traditionally views the

administrator as the instructional leader in the school. Despite the difficulty of an administrator being "expert" in all subject areas this responsibility is an assigned part of his role. As a result of the recent knowledge explosion, curriculum areas are extended considerably, so much so that the principal finds it difficult to keep abreast of recent innovations and discoveries in the subject matter field.

It is logical that the non-differentiated staff would view the principal as the instructional leader, thus the one having the authority to implement curricular change. The differentiated staff, as part of the differentiation of roles, views the master teacher as the curriculum leader and refers to this teacher all matters of curriculum development. They do not view the principal as the curriculum leader and his role does not include innovation in the subject matter area.

Variable 17:

Teachers seeking promotion in a traditional system have had to leave the classroom.

The non-differentiated staff differed significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The non-differentiated staff interpreted promotions to mean movement to counsellor, dean, vice-principal, coordinator, supervisor, and principal. All of these positions are found outside the classroom setting.

The differentiated staff indicate they could obtain

promotion as teachers and remain in the classroom because under a differentiated staffing pattern there are vertical levels of responsibility in the teacher's role.

TABLE II
VARIABLE 17: TEACHER PROMOTIONS

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	2.185	1.251	159	2.446	.02
Non-Differentiated	96	1.760	.933			

Discussion of Variable 17: In a traditional secondary system promotions occur for a teacher in various stages. The most common way is for him to begin as a teacher and advance to the role of counsellor. This is followed by advancement to dean, vice-principal and eventually, a promotion to principal. Of necessity, this means that teachers have to leave the classroom in seeking advancement under a traditional system. The non-differentiated staff views promotion as a change in role from that of classroom teacher, thus necessitating leaving the classroom.

The differentiated staff member views promotion in an entirely different manner because of the options open to him in a differentiated staff. All promotions in teaching within a differentiated staff envisage a classroom teacher to remain in the classroom as part of his new role.

Under a differentiated staff a classroom teacher is advanced to the position of senior teacher, the next vertical level of responsibility, where he is required to teach approximately sixty percent of the time. This position is non-tenured. His salary can be increased above that of the maximum step of the teacher's salary schedule. His increased responsibility is centered on the application of curricular and instructional innovations to the classroom. New methodologies, learning and teaching strategies, and new media applications to classroom teaching are his forte. He would advise or head a subject area group and would share with the principal the selection and evaluation of teachers in his subject area specialty.

A step above the senior teacher is the master teacher, which is the top of the career ladder in the field of teaching. This position is viewed by a differentiated staff as the ultimate of professional achievement. The master teacher works a twelve-month work year and can earn a much higher salary commensurate with his responsibilities. It is a position that is comparable in status and prestige with that of an assistant superintendent. The master teacher spends the majority of his time maintaining a continual program of research in and evaluation of curriculum design. He teaches approximately forty percent of the time. The master teacher's position is non-tenured.

Thus the differentiated staff member sees promotion

in an entirely different manner than does the non-differentiated staff member. Promotion for the differentiated teacher does not mean that he must leave the classroom.

Variable 18

It is common to find the ten-year professional with the same instructional duties he had the day he began his career.

The non-differentiated staff differs significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The non-differentiated staff agrees with the variable because it is consistent with their experience. The differentiated staff indicates that while instructional duties could be repetitive there are other avenues of interest and duties available to them within their teaching career.

TABLE III

VARIABLE 18: INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	2.123	1.196	159	2.384	.02
Non-Differentiated	96	1.740	.832			

Discussion of Variable 18: The non-differentiated staff agrees with the variable which states that the ten-year professional has the same instructional duties he had the day he began his teaching career. In a traditional

structure--in spite of the immense range of teacher abilities, variety of skills, and mastery of the subject matter--teachers are treated as interchangeable parts by being given the same duties and responsibilities year after year. Individuals who come into teaching bring with them a divergence of talents, interests, and weaknesses. They come to teaching with widely different intellectual, emotional, and experiential backgrounds. They have a wide spectrum of goals and interests as well as capacities for leadership. In spite of the great diversity there is, within the profession, an insistence that all teachers must be all things to all children. Therefore, instead of tailoring teaching assignments to individuals, there is a tendency to force all teachers into the same mold by giving them essentially the same duties and responsibilities.

With the emphasis on meeting individual differences with students it should follow that individual abilities of teachers ought to be utilized. Under a differentiated staffing pattern the teacher has the option of fulfilling a variety of roles. To facilitate this, teaching staffs could be grouped according to different duties, different specialties, and different levels of responsibility. Thus teachers might work with individual students, small groups, seminar classes, or in a mass presentation situation. They could diagnose, counsel, or specialize in the preparation of teaching materials. They could be part of a team

membership representing different specialties that would be responsible for the general management of instruction.

Nonsignificant Variables: The Status of Teachers

Variables 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20 showed no significant difference between differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with the statements presented in these variables.

Discussion of nonsignificant variables: The results in Table IV, pages 58 and 59, indicate that no significant differences exist between the staffs of the differentiated and non-differentiated groups. Each of the variables is discussed individually as follows:

In Variable 9 there appears to be agreement between the differentiated and the non-differentiated staffs that job satisfaction is more likely to be realized when teachers perform at levels and in roles that are in keeping with their talents and desires. It appears logical that teachers would agree with this premise which stresses individual differences among teachers.

It was stated in Variable 10 that teachers should be relieved of non-professional and clerical duties by aides and para-professionals. Both groups express some difficulties in deciding whether they should agree or disagree. They tend to choose the undecided category. It is possible

that the teachers perceive the additional teacher aid as an intrusion in their classroom and too time consuming to direct additional personnel.

Variable 11 notes that teachers are equal in the sense that they have the same instructional responsibilities with about the same number of pupils. Both groups express agreement because public secondary school staffs tend to be organized around a pupil-teacher ratio of approximately thirty to one.

Variable 13 states that senior teachers should evaluate their departmental colleagues. Both groups agree that teacher evaluation would be appropriate by senior teachers from within their own departmental area.

Variable 14 indicates teacher resentment of the low status they hold as compared with other professions equivalent in training requisites. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with this concern. Both are sensitive to their status relative to other professions requiring similar training.

Variable 15 notes that teachers desire to be included in the decision-making process on matters of curriculum and instruction. Both groups strongly agree that they wish to be included and considered regarding making decisions rather than accepting them from a "higher" authority.

Variable 16 considers the question of teachers

governing their own ranks when as a group they assume responsibility for their performance. Strong agreement is noted in both types of staffs surveyed. Teachers appear ready to assume responsibility and feel well qualified to make judgments on professional performance.

Variable 19 states that traditional teaching assignments tend to limit career and promotional incentives. Differentiated and non-differentiated teachers strongly agree that in the traditional teaching position there is little or no room for advancement or variation of duties. Teachers tend to teach the same courses each year with little opportunity to vary their assignments in instructional areas.

Variable 20 indicates teachers are more inclined to improve instructional techniques if opportunities are present for advancement. Both groups indicate that such opportunities would encourage them to improve their instructional programs. Very little variation is noted in the response to this item indicating strong agreement.

Summary of Hypothesis I: The Status of Teachers

Although various factors are considered regarding the status of teachers only three of the twelve areas indicate significantly different responses from the two groups. Differences center around (1) the authority of the master teacher, (2) teacher promotions, and (3) instructional duties.

TABLE IV

NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE STATUS OF TEACHERS

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 9</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.400	.740	159	1.777	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.313	.666			
<u>Variable 10</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.769	1.345	159	1.842	.10
Non-Differentiated	96	3.167	1.328			
<u>Variable 11</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.323	1.204	159	1.114	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.115	1.126			
<u>Variable 13</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.215	1.222	159	.530	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.115	1.144			
<u>Variable 14</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.492	.825	159	1.365	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.333	.640			
<u>Variable 15</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.985	.969	159	.957	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.844	.870			

TABLE IV (continued)

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 16</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.908	.988	159	.756	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.792	.923			
<u>Variable 19</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.938	1.021	159	.762	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.823	.878			
<u>Variable 20</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.615	.836	159	.530	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.688	.845			

II. HYPOTHESIS II: STAFFING OF TEACHERS

The purpose of this hypothesis is to compare the differences between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not participated relative to their perception of the staffing of teachers. Some of the general areas to be considered are (1) teacher involvement in the selection of staff, (2) inflexibility of the school day, (3) use of non-credentialed personnel, (4) variation of assignments, (5) differentiation of the teaching task, (6) career patterns, and (7) teaching assignments based on responsibility.

Presentation of the findings for Hypothesis II follows.

Hypothesis II:

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the staffing of teachers.

One of the ten areas surveyed in the questionnaire demonstrates a significant difference in the response between the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Discussion of this variable follows.

Variable 22

Traditional staffing patterns with their constant number of periods per day inhibit the effective utilization of teacher talent.

The non-differentiated staff differs significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The

non-differentiated staff agrees with the variable because it expresses the fact that teachers are locked into an inflexible school day. The differentiated staff indicates that traditional staffing patterns, with their inflexible schedule inhibit the effective utilization of teacher talent because they give teachers little or no choice in staffing patterns.

TABLE V
VARIABLE 22: INFLEXIBILITY OF THE SCHOOL DAY

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	1.446	.724	159	3.410	.01
Non-Differentiated	96	1.927	.960			

Discussion of Variable 22: Non-differentiated teachers in a traditional staffing pattern, regardless of motivation, environment, or other variables, are put through the same schedule, same size instructional groups for the same periods of time year after year. There is little or no flexibility for a teacher to spend time with a student under a rigidly constructed time schedule, thus preventing both from effectively utilizing their talents to the maximum.

The differentiated staff strongly agrees with this

variable. Differentiated staffing bestows on the teacher an individuality within an organizational context. It makes the teacher the most important factor in that he facilitates and monitors the learning process which can be fostered in a better manner than that of a thirty-to-one relationship confined to a locked-in, seven-period day.

Nonsignificant Variables: The Staffing of Teachers

Variables 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 show no statistically significant difference between differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with the statements presented in variables numbered 19, 20, 23, 24, 29, and 30. Both staffs agree with the remaining variables.

Discussion of nonsignificant variables: The results of Table VI, pages 65 and 66, indicate that no significant differences exist between the staffs of the differentiated and non-differentiated schools. Each of the variables is discussed individually as follows:

Variable 21 discloses that teachers working with administrators should assume responsibility for the selection of teachers when considering staffing needs. Both staffs agree that teachers should be more actively considered and play some role in the selection of incoming teachers.

Variable 23 notes that staff teachers would evaluate

the services provided by their senior and master teachers. It was interesting to find strong agreement on the part of both staffs in as much as the non-differentiated staff did not have positions either of senior or master teacher. Both groups indicate that teachers should be evaluated by their professional peers since they were knowledgeable in their fields.

Variable 24 states that non-credentialed persons with highly qualified talents should be used for specialized instruction in certain areas of the curriculum. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with this variable. Both groups feel that something could be gained from "outside experts."

Variable 25 discloses that classroom teachers should have the option of a variety of assignments offering new experiences throughout their careers. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs agree with this variable. It is possible for any person functioning in a situation with little or no change or incentive to vary his work to eventually reach a plateau of limited growth and of stagnation.

Variable 26 asserts that senior teachers responsible for the application of curricular innovations would improve traditional staffing. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs agree with this variable. The senior teacher's position is one of service to his curricular area. It is a non-tenured position subject to the approval of the

teachers with whom he works.

Variable 27 declares that master teachers responsible for a continual program of research, evaluation, and investigation of new modes of learning would improve traditional staffing. Both differentiated and non-differentiated teachers agree with this variable. The position of master teacher, with its added responsibilities and financial remuneration would enhance the traditional staff, and would bring to the teaching profession some vertical structure and added status.

Variable 28 states that teaching can be differentiated by degrees of difficulty of the teaching task, and teachers could be assigned appropriately. The differentiated and non-differentiated staffs agree with this variable. Schools are re-examining the role of the teacher and finding that the complexity of the tasks and variety of competencies expected are beyond the grasp of a single person and certainly beyond the grasp of the beginning teacher. Staff differentiation could be a means of resolving the difficulty of the teaching task.

Variable 29 notes that a career pattern found in differentiated staffing would encourage teachers to remain in the classroom. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with this variable. The education profession has not achieved a career pattern on a par with other senior professions. This lack of a career pattern

TABLE VI
 NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE STAFFING OF TEACHERS

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 21</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.200	1.166	159	.161	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.229	1.085			
<u>Variable 23</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.785	1.088	159	.726	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.906	1.001			
<u>Variable 24</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.615	.738	159	.975	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.510	.612			
<u>Variable 25</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.200	1.026	159	.493	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.225	.881			
<u>Variable 26</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.262	1.071	159	1.026	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.094	.969			
<u>Variable 27</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.446	1.124	159	.106	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.427	1.106			

TABLE VI (continued)

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 28</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.262	1.027	159	.007	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.260	.927			
<u>Variable 29</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.754	.745	159	.541	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.688	.768			
<u>Variable 30</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.815	.802	159	.964	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.688	.833			

results in teachers leaving for positions outside the classroom where they feel that advancement, prestige, and high material rewards are available.

Variable 30 considers that teaching assignments should be made essentially on ability and responsibility. Both differentiated and non-differentiated teachers strongly agree with this variable. If schools are to provide an educational program that meets individual differences, they should likewise utilize the individual abilities, interests, and talents of teachers.

Summary of Hypothesis II: The Staffing of Teachers

Ten factors are considered with respect to the staffing of teachers. One brought a statistically significant response at the .01 level of confidence. This difference focuses on the inflexibility of the school day. The other variables were not statistically significant.

III. HYPOTHESIS III: SALARIES OF TEACHERS

The purpose of this hypothesis is to compare the differences between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not participated as regarding their perception of the salaries of teachers. Some of the general areas to be considered are (1) years of service, (2) teacher growth, (3) longer work year, (4) incentive failure of the single salary schedule,

(5) longevity and automatic promotion, and (6) increased responsibility for teachers.

Presentation of the findings for hypothesis III follows.

Hypothesis III:

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the salaries of teachers.

Of the nine areas surveyed in the questionnaire only one demonstrates a statistically significant difference in response between the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Discussion of this variable follows.

Variable 39

The single salary schedule avoids the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement.

The non-differentiated staff differs significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The non-differentiated staff strongly agrees with the variable because under a non-differentiated staffing pattern there is no responsibility factor involved. The differentiated staff holds that the single salary schedule does not consider responsibility in the remuneration of teachers.

TABLE VII
VARIABLE 39: THE SINGLE SALARY SCHEDULE

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	2.123	1.103	159	2.550	.02
Non-Differentiated	96	1.698	.980			

Discussion on Variable 39: Under the single salary schedule non-differentiated teachers are paid according to their placement on the salary schedule. Two factors determine placement: time in the school district where one is employed, and the number of graduate units accumulated through the years. There is no provision made for responsibility as a factor in determining salary. This type of schedule fails to face the issue of providing adequate incentives for teachers to remain in the classroom. Ambitious, aggressive, promotional minded teachers leave the classroom for school administration and other areas that enable them to accept more responsibility and with it more remuneration for their efforts.

The differentiated staff agrees with this variable. Under a differentiated staff structure a salary schedule exists but in addition to it there is the added factor of responsibility. With the establishment of the senior and master teacher categories there is increased responsibility

as a method of advancement.

Nonsignificant Variables: The Salaries of Teachers

Variables 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38 show no significant difference between differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Both staffs strongly agree with the statements presented in variables numbered 31, 32, 33, 34, and 37. Variables 35, 36, and 38 registered in the "agree" category by both staffs.

Discussion of nonsignificant variables: The results of Table VIII, pages 73 and 74, indicate that no significant differences exist between the staffs of the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Each of the variables is discussed individually as follows:

Variable 31 states that under the present teaching structure, years of service and graduate units are the major criteria for advancement on the salary schedule. There is strong agreement between the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs on this variable. Time and units are the primary measures for advancement under the present educational system. There is little or no variety in salary structures within the secondary system.

Variable 32 notes that present salary schedules assume that all teachers grow in exact annual equivalents. Both groups strongly agree with this variable. It is likely that the non-differentiated staff feels that salary

schedules are a necessary product of the system in rewarding teachers for time on the job and the accumulation of graduate units. The differentiated staff, however, has the added incentive of offering teachers a quantum jump in professional salaries by establishing the senior and master teacher positions.

Variable 33 discloses that teachers willing to assume a longer work year with more responsibility should receive higher salaries. There is strong agreement on this variable by both the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Apparently the staffs feel that teachers who are willing to accept more professional responsibility and work an 11- or 12-month work year are entitled to earn upwards of \$20,000.00 per annum.

Variable 34 states that the single salary schedule fails to provide incentives for teachers to remain in the classroom. The differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with this variable. The lack of an incentive system in the public schools does not reinforce teaching as a career.

Variable 35 states there is at present little or no equivalent financial compensation in classroom teaching that compares with salaries received by administrators. Both staffs agree with this variable. Within the differentiated staff one finds provisions which allow for an increase of two to three thousand dollars in the salary of

senior and master teachers. The master teacher's salary is placed well within the salary range of administrators on the principal and assistant superintendent level.

Variable 36 asserts that the present salary structure is based on longevity and automatic promotion practices and should be abandoned. There is agreement on this variable by both groups. The longevity factor in salary schedules does not give ambitious, talented teachers proper reinforcement to remain in the classroom.

Variable 37 notes that annual salary increments assume that teachers grow equally in performance. There is strong agreement on this variable by both groups. Since all teachers receive annual salary increments simply by reason of being in the district they are all put in the position of being "equal."

Variable 38 states that teaching tasks need to be differentiated and assigned with a range of pay commensurate with responsibility. Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs agree with this variable. While the differentiation of pay by job responsibility is not new to other professions it is relatively unheard of in the field of secondary teaching.

Summary of Hypothesis III: The Salaries of Teachers

Nine factors are considered with respect to the salaries of teachers. One of these brought a statistically

TABLE VIII
 NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE SALARIES OF TEACHERS

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 31</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.815	.943	159	.566	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.729	.941			
<u>Variable 32</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.246	.583	159	1.412	.10
Non-Differentiated	96	1.406	.772			
<u>Variable 33</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.954	1.221	159	.635	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.844	.961			
<u>Variable 34</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.662	.809	159	.811	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.552	.852			
<u>Variable 35</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.677	1.314	159	.101	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	2.656	1.223			
<u>Variable 36</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.062	.959	159	.568	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.969	1.045			

TABLE VIII (continued)

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 37</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.908	1.019	159	.256	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.948	.940			
<u>Variable 38</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.015	1.015	159	1.739	.10
Non-Differentiated	96	1.760	.826			

significant response at the .05 level of confidence. This difference is centered on the single salary schedule which avoids the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement for teachers. The other variables were not statistically significant.

IV. HYPOTHESIS IV: THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION

The purpose of this hypothesis is to compare the differences between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not participated regarding their perception of the role of the administration. Some of the general areas to be considered are (1) time factor of principal in the improvement of instruction, (2) knowledgeability of the principal in all curriculum areas, (3) revision of principal's job, (4) provision of common planning time, and (5) administrator as "instructional expert."

Presentation of findings for hypothesis IV follows.

Hypothesis IV:

The perception of secondary school personnel who have participated in differentiated staffing is different than that of the personnel who have not participated relative to the role of the administration.

There are seven areas in the questionnaire that pertain to this section. Only one establishes a statistically significant difference in the responses between the two staffs. Discussion of that variable follows.

Variable 41

It is difficult for the principal to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas.

The non-differentiated staff differs significantly from the differentiated staff on this variable. The non-differentiated staff strongly agree with the variable because working within a traditional system they see the principal as the instructional leader of the school. This position has traditionally been held as one which reflects knowledge of curriculum and final decisions regarding curricular matters.

The differentiated staff indicates less agreement with this variable than does the non-differentiated staff. Under the differentiated structure the principal shares his knowledgeability with respect to curricular decisions with senior teachers in each of the curricular areas commonly found at the secondary level. Thus he is able to provide direction regarding decisions concerning curricular matters.

TABLE IX

VARIABLE 41: KNOWLEDGEABILITY OF THE
PRINCIPAL IN ALL CURRICULAR AREAS

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
Differentiated	65	2.415	1.162	159	2.870	.01
Non-Differentiated	96	1.106	1.052			

Discussion of Variable 41: To a non-differentiated staff the principal is traditionally held as the instructional leader in his school. As such he is looked upon to provide leadership in curricular matters. This is what one expects, but given the proliferation of knowledge and new disciplines within already existing disciplines, the secondary principal cannot fulfill that premise. Principals have been flooded by problems that deal with other aspects of the school that have little relation to curriculum or instruction. At best the principal is a generalist, one who is knowledgeable about a great many aspects of the curriculum but not prone to any great depth in most areas.

The differentiated staff accepts the principal as a participator in curricular and instructional problems. He functions as interpreter and communicator to the public. He is looked upon as having ultimate legal responsibility for the program; however, he is part of a decision-making group which passes judgment on various aspects of the instructional program. His knowledge is now of a coordinate nature and one which deals largely with communication skills. His knowledge is redirected towards organization necessary for instruction rather than solely being involved in instruction. In combination with the technical competence of teachers in advanced positions (senior and master teachers) the principal's competence in managerial and coordinate

functions provide for a better-run school.

Nonsignificant Variables: The Role of the Administration

Variables 40, 42, 43, 44, and 45 show no significant differences between differentiated and non-differentiated staffs. Both staffs strongly agree with all the variables in this section.

Discussion of nonsignificant variables: The results of Table X, page 80, indicate that no significant differences exist between the staffs of the differentiated and the non-differentiated staffs. Each of the variables will be discussed individually as follows:

Variable 40 states that the school principal today has less time to devote to the improvement of instruction due to the additional responsibilities being placed upon him. There is strong agreement between differentiated and non-differentiated staffs on this variable.

Variable 42 notes that the principal's job should be revised to include more time for instructional leadership. Both school staffs strongly agree with this variable. Differentiated and non-differentiated personnel feel that the principal, in spite of the variety of his activities, is held to be the leader. The differentiated staff feels that a revision of the principal's job description which gives him assistance in the form of an additional person--a school manager--could be put into effect. This would enable him

to have more time to attend to the instructional program.

Variable 43 discloses that administrators should provide common planning time for teachers in the same department in order to improve instruction. Both differentiated and non-differentiated groups agree that common planning time for teachers will enable them to better plan for the improvement of instruction. It could also enable them to use an inter-disciplinary approach to the development of the curriculum.

Variable 44 specifies that most administrators are not "instructional experts." Both differentiated and non-differentiated staffs strongly agree with this variable. What the principal lacks in the area of expertise as far as specifics of the curriculum are concerned is made up for by his accepting final responsibility for the quality of the total school program.

Variable 45 expresses that administration should be a support system for the improvement of instruction. Both staffs strongly agree with this variable. The principal can either lend his support to an instructional program or he can retreat behind policies, authority, and a "hold-the-line" mentality.

Summary of Hypothesis IV: The Role of the Administration

Six factors are considered in this section on the role of the administration. One of these demonstrates a

TABLE X
 NONSIGNIFICANT VARIABLES: THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Group	N	Mean	Sd	df	t	Level
<u>Variable 40</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.738	.828	159	.278	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.698	.948			
<u>Variable 42</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.738	.750	159	1.506	.10
Non-Differentiated	96	1.563	.704			
<u>Variable 43</u>						
Differentiated	65	2.000	.992	159	1.393	.10
Non-Differentiated	96	1.792	.877			
<u>Variable 44</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.462	.658	159	.663	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.542	.803			
<u>Variable 45</u>						
Differentiated	65	1.954	1.073	159	.583	ns
Non-Differentiated	96	1.844	1.228			

statistically significant response at the .01 level of confidence. This difference focuses on the difficulty of the principal to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas. The other variables are not statistically significant.

V. SUMMARY

In Chapter 4 the data relative to the four hypotheses is presented.

Hypothesis I compares the difference between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not relative to their perception of the status of teachers. The differentiated staff differs from the non-differentiated staff in that the former held that the authority of the master teacher should surpass that of the principal with respect to decisions being made in the subject matter area of the master teacher.

The differentiated staff differs from the non-differentiated staff regarding teacher promotions in that non-differentiated staff members must seek promotion outside the classroom. Differentiated staff members need not leave the classroom.

The differentiated staff differs from the non-differentiated staff in the area of instructional duties in that non-differentiated staffs are given the same duties and responsibilities year after year in their teaching careers.

Differentiated staff members have options available to them depending on their qualifications and ability to meet requirements of the senior and master teacher positions.

Hypothesis II compares the difference between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not relative to their perception of the staffing of teachers. Differentiated staffs differ from non-differentiated staffs on the inflexibility of the school day and its consequent inhibition of the effective utilization of teacher talent. The non-differentiated staff is limited to a traditional staffing pattern, with the same schedule, same size instructional group for the same periods of time during the school day for year after year. The differentiated staff does not function within these limitations.

Hypothesis III compares the difference between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not relative to their perception of the salaries of teachers. Differentiated staffs differ from non-differentiated staffs on the single salary schedule and its avoidance of the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement for teachers in that the non-differentiated staff member is paid according to his placement on the salary schedule. The differentiated staff member is paid on a salary schedule but is given additional pay for assuming increased responsibilities in the

instructional program while still remaining a classroom teacher.

Hypothesis IV compares the difference between teachers who have participated in differentiated staffing and those who have not relative to their perception of the role of the administration. Differentiated staffs differ from non-differentiated staffs on the ability of the principal to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas in that the non-differentiated staff feel that the principal is the final authority while the differentiated staff feel that the principal provides direction concerning curricular matters.

The conclusions based upon the investigation and possible recommendations for future research follow in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study utilizes a questionnaire to survey the attitudes of secondary school teachers and administrators with respect to differentiated staffing and its acceptance at the secondary level. Data is analyzed for the purpose of comparing differentiated staff members with non-differentiated staff members in the following areas:

(1) the status of teachers, (2) the staffing of teachers, (3) the salaries of teachers, and (4) the role of the administration.

The Status of Teachers

The differentiated staff members are compared with the non-differentiated staff members to determine if differences exist between the two groups regarding the status of teachers. The study demonstrates that statistically significant differences exist at the .01 and .02 level of confidence in three of the twelve variables found in this section. Differences as noted in Chapter 4 were found in the authority of the master teacher, teacher promotions, and in the area of instructional needs. In the remaining nine

variables there is agreement on the part of both groups regarding the variables under consideration. These will be presented in the Conclusions section of this chapter.

The Staffing of Teachers

A comparison of the differentiated and non-differentiated staffs shows only one variable to be statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence. That variable concerns itself with the inflexibility of the school day. The remaining nine variables show agreement on the part of both staffs.

The Salaries of Teachers

Of the nine variables in this section, only one is statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. That variable deals with the single salary schedule and the avoidance of payment for an increase in responsibility. The staffs in the study are in agreement with the remaining variables in this area.

The Role of the Administration

Of the six variables under study in this section only one demonstrates a statistically significant response at the .01 level of confidence. That variable concerns itself with the difficulty of the principal to be knowledgeable in all curriculum areas. Both staffs agree with the remaining variables in this section.

I. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions based upon the results of the study are presented under four categories--the status of teachers, the staffing of teachers, the salaries of teachers, and the role of the administration.

The Status of Teachers

Differentiated staff members feel quite strongly that the authority of the master teacher should surpass that of the principal in dealing with decisions in curriculum within a subject matter field. Their experience in working with this type of staffing pattern has given them an opportunity to have an expert on hand with whom they could consult to solve instructional problems facing them. The fact that a master teacher is an expert in his field and is paid a salary approximately equal to some district-wide administrators lends considerable prestige to the position. This position, with its ensuing responsibilities, can raise the status of teachers and lends itself towards changing the image of the classroom teacher.

Differentiated staff members do not have to leave the teaching ranks in order to seek promotion. They have the option of remaining teachers but advancing to the position of senior or master teacher while remaining in the classroom. These levels within the teaching ranks lend status to the classroom teacher without forcing him to seek promotion

outside the classroom where promotions are traditionally found.

The non-differentiated staff strongly agree that a teacher can have the same instructional duties ten years after he begins his teaching career. This type of assignment does little to advance his status. The differentiated staff member has other avenues or options available to him within the teaching ranks. He might diagnose, counsel, or specialize in the preparation of teaching materials. These avenues lend themselves toward enhancing the profession and in turn give teachers a status that is not found in a traditional non-differentiated staffing pattern. Both groups agree on: the importance of job satisfaction in the teaching role; the use of para-professionals for clerical duties; the use of senior teachers in evaluation of teachers; the resentment of the low status teachers as compared with other professions equivalent in training requisites; the desire of teachers to be included in decisions on matters of curriculum; and the responsibility of the teachers to govern their own ranks.

The Staffing of Teachers

Both groups in the study agree with the fact that a non-differentiated staff member has few or no options available to him in staffing. Both groups agree that in the traditional non-differentiated structure, teacher time and talent are not utilized most effectively or to the fullest

degree possible. Furthermore, traditional staffing patterns with their inflexible schedule of locking teachers into a fixed six or seven period day inhibit the effective utilization of teacher talent as teachers are given no choice or alternative in which to work. The differentiated staff member has a better opportunity to spend time with a student as he is not locked into a thirty-to-one ration or a seven-period day. His schedule is flexible and he can function more advantageously as a teacher. He usually has individual time to spend with students outside the classroom setting during the school day.

Under differentiated staffing classroom teachers have the option of a variety of assignments offering new experiences throughout their careers. They may function as senior teachers who are responsible for the application of curricular innovations or they may serve as master teachers responsible for a continual program of research, evaluation, and investigation of new modes of learning. Thus a career pattern found in differentiated staffing would encourage teachers to remain in the classroom. Both groups agree that since the senior teacher is viewed as an excellent practitioner in his subject area traditional non-differentiated staffing would be improved by giving teachers an opportunity to advance professionally as classroom teachers.

Staff positions could be identified and assigned on

the basis of ability and responsibility. A differentiated staffing plan could delineate more in terms of the complexity of the teaching task and the level of responsibility required to fulfill it. The teaching task could then be distributed among teachers based on their interests, specialization and talents. Both groups agree on the following: that teachers working with administrators should be responsible for the selection of staff; that classroom teachers should evaluate services provided by senior teachers; that non-credentialed persons with highly qualified talents could be used for specialized instruction in certain areas of the curriculum; that a career pattern found in differentiated staffing would encourage teachers to remain in the classroom; and that teaching assignments should be made essentially on ability and responsibility.

The Salaries of Teachers

The differentiated staff members agree more strongly than the non-differentiated staff that the single salary schedule avoids the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement. Under a traditional non-differentiated staffing pattern the salary schedule is used to pay teachers on straight units-per-dollars and experience basis which clearly avoids the question of responsibility. With the establishment of senior and master teacher positions there is an increased responsibility factor for the

teacher, accompanied by a financial increase.

Time and units are the primary measures for advancement under the present educational system. There is little or no variety in salary structures within the secondary system. A good deal of them use this "time and units" criteria as the means for advancement for their staffs. As long as time and units are supreme as the basis of rewarding a teacher's competence there will be no flexibility to offer any kind of incentive or promotion for a teacher. The differentiated staff member would be paid more for added responsibility by assuming roles which were differentiated as to degree of difficulty. This would require that certain prerequisites be met prior to being appointed to that level of responsibility with its succeeding additional compensation. This would break the assumption that teachers grow in exact annual equivalents by remaining within the district another year and gaining their salary increment. The fact that teachers can earn graduate credits as a means of advancement on salary schedules is assumed to mean that they have developed an expertise in the area of study and this effort should be rewarded by paying them more is questionable. Under the present structure there is no way to recognize unusual talent, or to extend its influence to benefit more students. Therefore, teachers willing to assume additional leadership roles in the area of curriculum and instruction should be paid more for their efforts. Thus master teachers

with a doctorate or its equivalent dealing with scholarly research and applying it to classroom practice should earn a salary commensurate with that of administrators. Likewise, school staff members who extend their contractual period of employment for 11 or 12 months in various capacities should also be remunerated for their efforts. Both groups agree on the fact that there is at present little or no equivalent financial compensation in classroom teaching that compares with salaries received by administrators; the fact that the present salary structure is based on longevity and automatic promotion practices should be abandoned; the fact that annual salary increments assume that teachers grow equally in performance; and the fact that teaching tasks need to be differentiated and assigned with a range of pay commensurate with responsibility.

The Role of the Administration

The differentiated staff's attitude differs from the non-differentiated staff concerning the principal as being knowledgeable in all curricular areas. The non-differentiated staff looks upon the principal as the authority figure in change and/or innovation. The differentiated staff looks upon the principal more as a member of a decision-making group composed of himself and the senior and master teachers of his staff.

Principals today have less time to devote to the

improvement of instruction due to additional responsibilities that face them on the job. They must translate the school's financial needs to the district office. They are involved with projects and foundations incorporating governmental agencies. Schools continue to have the usual problems of discipline, transportation, student body activities, attendance, guidance, management of the office, operation of the cafeteria, public relations, supervision, and evaluation of classified and certificated personnel. As a result there is little time open for the improvement of instruction which of itself is a time consuming but nonetheless important function. In spite of its importance, the principal is held accountable for all the other duties and responsibilities mentioned and consequently his time is limited when it comes to instructional matters.

The differentiated staff feel that a revision of the principal's job description by giving him additional assistance in the form of a school manager would enable him to have some time to attend to the instructional program and leave the routine business of the school to the school manager. Both groups agree that the administrator should provide common planning time for teachers in the same department in order to improve instruction; that administrators are not "instructional experts" and that administration should be a support system for the improvement of instruction.

Characteristics of a Differentiated Staffing Plan for a Specific High School

From this study it was determined that a plan for a specific high school would incorporate the following:

1. A three-level distribution of hierarchy of teaching ranks would be developed at which teachers would perform in keeping with their abilities and talents. The three levels in question could be staff teacher, senior teacher, and master teacher. It does not matter how these levels are categorized or labelled; however, there should be at least three levels in which teachers could operate.
2. Each level would have requirements established by teachers and administrators within the school district. This would be accomplished by working jointly in an effort to obtain a clear-cut position description with accompanying responsibilities.
3. Teachers would be involved with administrators in seeking the best possible candidates for the fulfillment of the requisites associated with a particular position, be it staff teacher, senior teacher, or master teacher.
4. The last two levels of positions in the structure would be non-tenured positions and would involve teacher evaluation, curriculum development, research within specific subject matter fields, as well as classroom teaching for part of the school day. These positions would provide extra compensation for the added responsibility associated with

the position plus a longer work year.

5. Senior and master teachers could aid staff teachers in the development of teacher competency by observing teacher performance in the classroom, and by counseling and offering constructive criticism with the object of improving classroom performance.

6. A modular or flexibly scheduled day with variables in teacher periods would be used to facilitate maximum use of teacher time and talent.

7. Classroom teachers would have a variety of assignments offering new experiences throughout their teaching career.

8. Staff teachers would evaluate the services provided them by senior and master teachers.

9. A salary schedule based on increased responsibility would be used as a means of advancement and not the number of years taught within the system. Automatic salary increments would be inadvisable and salary increases based upon acquired graduate credits would be closely scrutinized.

10. Curriculum decisions would be made by senior and master teachers working with the principal in committee.

11. There would be common planning and preparation time for each department so they could meet and feel free to spend time on curriculum development without the pressure of working a longer day.

12. Non-credentialled persons with special talents

would be employed in the teaching program.

In summary, there is a need to think differently about staffing, teaching, learning and the school; to develop roles that are satisfying, effective and productive; to discover means of providing more individualized instruction and much greater flexibility in the manner that pupils are grouped and scheduled; and to increase the staff through the use of a wider range of people, places and things.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. The assessment of career aspirations and levels of responsibility that teachers are willing to accept should be studied.

2. The relationship of status in teaching and financial reward based on the complexity and intensity of the assignment the teacher chose to prepare for should be investigated.

3. The duties and functions of senior and master teachers to determine what their effect would be on the improvement of instruction should be explored.

4. The compensation of teachers for their time and talents other than by straight payment for graduate units and time spent in service should be examined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

Brown, George Issac. Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

Bush, Robert N., and Dwight W. Allen. A New Design for High School Education: Assuming a Flexible Schedule. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

The Columbia Encyclopedia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Downie, N. M., and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. Second Edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Fiorino, John A. Differentiated Staffing: A Flexible Instructional Organization. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, Inc., 1969.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. Sixth Edition. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.

Glaser, William. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

_____. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Good, Carter V., and Douglas E. Scales. Methods of Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Goodlad, John, and Robert H. Anderson. The Non-Graded Elementary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963.

Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. Third Edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.

Seltiz, Clair, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Trump, Lloyd J., and Dorsey Bayhan. Focus on Change, Guide to Better Schools. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1961.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Thesis, and Dissertations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1971.

Wiley, Deane W., and Lloyd K. Bishop. The Flexibly Scheduled High School. New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1968.

B. PERIODICALS

Allen, Dwight W. "A Differentiated Staff: Putting Teaching Talent to Work," Kansas Teacher, LXXVII (February, 1969), 28-36.

Association of Classroom Teachers, "ACT Viewpoints," NEA Journal, LVIII (March, 1969), 60-61.

Beaubier, Edward, and Donald Hair. "Experiences with Differentiated Staffing," Today's Education, LVII (March, 1969), 56-58.

Clements, Millard H. "Failing Students and Failing Schools," Educational Technology, VII (March, 1967), 1-5.

Conte, Joseph M., and Fenwick W. English. "The Impact of Technology on Staff Differentiation," Audiovisual Instruction, XIV (May, 1969), 108.

English, Fenwick W. "The Ailing Principalship," Phi Delta Kappan, L (November, 1968), 158-161.

_____. "Questions and Answers on Differentiated Staffing." Today's Education, LVIII (March, 1969), 53-54.

_____. "Differentiated Staffing: Refinement, Reform, or Revolution?" ISR Journal, I, No. 4 (Fall, 1967), 220-234.

_____. "Teacher May I? Take Three Giant Steps! The Differentiated Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, LI (December, 1969), 211-214.

_____. "The Differentiated Staff: Education's Techno-structure," Educational Technology, X, No. 2 (February, 1970), 24-27.

Fondy, Albert. "21 Reasons Why," Changing Education, IV (Spring, 1969), 30.

McKenna, Bernard H. "Patterns of School Staffing," CTA Journal, LXIV (March, 1968), 34-38.

Mitchell, Anne, "The Crux of the Matter," Saturday Review, XLIV (January, 1966) 66.

NEA, Division of Press, Radio and Television Relations. "Staff Differentiation: An Answer to Merit Pay," CTA Journal, LXV (January, 1969), 40-45.

Rand, John J. "A Case for Differentiated Staffing," CTA Journal, LXV (March, 1969), 29-33.

Rand, John M., and Fenwick W. English. "Towards a Differentiated Teaching Staff," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968) 264-268.

Silberman, Charles. "Technology is Knocking at the School House Door," Fortune, LXXIV (August, 1966) 120-126

Trump, Lloyd J. "New Direction in Scheduling and Use of Staff in the High School," California Journal of Secondary Education. XXXIII (October, 1958) 363.

Weissman, Rozanne. "Pros and Cons on Differentiated Staffing--A New Way of Organizing Schools," Maine Teacher, XXIX (March, 1969), 26-28.

C. REPORTS/PAMPHLETS

Allen, Dwight W. A Differentiated Staff: Putting Teaching Talent To Work. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1967.

- Association of Classroom Teachers. Classroom Teachers Speak on Differentiated Teaching Assignments. National Education Association. 1969.
- Barbee, Don. Differentiated Staffing: Expectations and Pitfalls. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1969.
- Edelfelt, Roy A. A Possible Dream: A New Education and New Models for Teachers. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1968.
- _____. Redesigning the Education Profession. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1967.
- _____. The Teacher and His Staff. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1967.
- English, Fenwick W. Et Tu Educator, Differentiated Staffing? NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1969.
- Joyce, Bruce R. The Teacher and His Staff, Man, Media, and Machines. National Education Association. 1967.
- Lierheimer, Alvin P. An Anchor To Windward. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1969.
- Little, Arthur P. Teacher Supply and Demand in California, 1965-1975. A Report to the State Board of Education. California State Department of Education. 1967.
- Macdonald, John. Teacher Education: Analysis and Recommendations. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1967.
- McKenna, Bernard H. School Staffing Patterns and Pupil Interpersonal Behavior: Implications for Teacher Education. National Education Association. 1967.
- National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. A Position Statement on the Concept of Differentiated Staffing. National Education Association. 1969.
- _____. Remaking the World of the Career Teacher. National Education Association. 1966.
- _____. The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiating Teaching Roles. National Education Association. 1968.

Ryan, Kevin A. A Plan for a New Type of Professional Training for a New Type of Teaching Staff. NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1968.

_____. Where Are We Going and How Can We Get There? NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1969.

Stover, Michael (ed.). New Careers in Teaching: Differentiated Staffing. Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California. 1969.

Trump, Lloyd D. Images of the Future. National Association of the Secondary School Principals. National Education Association. 1959.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Allen, Dwight W., "A Differentiated Staff," Stanford University, California, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Edelfelt, Roy A., "Differentiated Staffing: Interpersonal Relationships and the Changing Educational Community," Paper presented at the Florida Twenty-Fourth Annual Supervisors Conference. Florida, 1968.

_____. "Is Differentiated Staffing Worth Risking?" NCTEPS--National Education Association. 1968. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "The Teacher and His Staff: Differentiated Roles for School Personnel," Paper presented at the Fourteenth Annual State TEPS Chairman and Consultants Meeting in Miami Beach, Florida. 1966.

English, Fenwick W., "Differentiated Staffing: Giving Teaching a Chance to Improve Learning," Monograph prepared in cooperation with the Curriculum and Instruction Division of the Florida State Department of Education. Florida, 1968.

_____. "Differentiated What?" Unpublished Position. Paper for the Mesa Public Schools Conference, Mesa, Arizona, 1970.

McKenna, Bernard H., "A Proposal for Redesigning the Education Professions," NCTEPS--National Education Association, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Ohanion, Arthur L., "The Role of the High School Principal in the Improvement of Instruction," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967.

Sharpes, Donald K., "Differentiated Teaching Personnel: A Model for the Secondary School," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1969.

Smith, Rodney, "A Teacher is a Teacher is a Teacher?" State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Temple City Unified School District. "Relevant Change and Educational Direction," Temple City, California, 1969.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

17421 Paseo Carmelo
Los Gatos, California 95030
June 5, 1972

Mr. Harold Wik
Box 200
Beaverton Schools
Beaverton, Oregon 97005

Dear Mr. Wik:

Enclosed please find a sample questionnaire that I will be using in my dissertation which is being written in the area of Differentiated Staffing. I would like you to know that this is not an academic exercise but a serious attempt to uncover some of the attitudes held by experienced staff members in the area.

One of the related purposes of my study is to identify a possible acceptable staffing plan for a future secondary school.

Inasmuch as differentiated staffing is relatively new on the educational scene, I need all the experienced help I can obtain. My positive, strong feelings, good intentions, and determination will do something to get our board of education to think about it. What I need is some good solid, hard evidence. Won't you please offer your help?

Please accept my most sincere thanks for whatever time and effort you take to aid me in my work.

Cordially,

Nick Noskowski

June 12, 1972

Dear Educator:

At the suggestion of your principal, Mr. Wes Bossun, I am taking the liberty to write you at home in hopes that you will grant me twenty minutes of your time.

I have long been an advocate of differentiated staffing and my research has led me to develop a questionnaire which I am presently using to obtain a measure of attitudes on the part of teachers who have experienced this type of staffing. It is my hope to implement this type of staffing in our school district in the very near future.

I am fully aware of the fact that you have been surveyed to death and you might be reluctant to complete still another survey. However, I am asking you to do just that because I need your help.

My positive, strong feelings, good intentions and determination will influence our board of education to some degree...but the information received from partictioners in the field will carry much more weight. Won't you please offer your help by completing the questionnaire answer card and mailing it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Please accept my most sincere thanks for your time and effort in promoting differentiated staffing, as well as aiding me in my work. I sincerely hope your summer will be a long and pleasant one and may you have a good day.

Cordially,

/s/ A. N. Noskowski
A. N. Noskowski
Director, Calaveras Hills
High School

Dear Colleague:

Ayer High School is part of the control group that I will be using in my doctoral dissertation which is being written in the area of differentiated staffing. I would like you to know that this is not an academic exercise but a serious attempt to uncover some of the attitudes held by you as an experienced staff member.

One of the related purposes of my study is to identify a possible acceptable staffing plan for a future secondary school.

In as much as differentiated staffing is relatively new on the educational scene, I need all the help I can obtain. Won't you please take a few moments of your time and help me by completing the answer card which you will find accompanying the questionnaire.

Feel free to keep the questionnaire but please return the answer card to the principal's secretary on or before Thursday June 8, 1972.

Please accept my most sincere thanks for your time and effort in aiding me in my work.

Cordially,

/s/ Nick
Nick Noskowski

Director, Continuation Education
Milpitas Unified School District

Dear Colleague:

Milpitas High School is the control group that I will be using in my doctoral dissertation which is being written in the area of differentiated staffing. I would like you to know that this is not an academic exercise but a serious attempt to uncover some of the attitudes held by you as an experienced staff member.

One of the related purposes of my study is to identify a possible acceptable staffing plan for a future secondary school.

In as much as differentiated staffing is relatively new on the educational scene, I need all the help I can obtain. Won't you please take a few moments of your time and help me by completing the answer card which you will find accompanying the questionnaire.

Feel free to keep the questionnaire but please return the answer card to the principal's secretary on or before June 8, 1972.

Please accept my most sincere thanks for your time and effort in aiding me in my work.

Cordially,

/s/ Nick
Nick Noskowski

Director, Continuation Education
Milpitas Unified School District

APPENDIX B

Please read this and the following page before answering the questionnaire.

DIFFERENTIATED TEACHING HIERARCHY

STAFF TEACHER	SENIOR TEACHER	MASTER TEACHER
TENURE	NON-TENURE*	NON-TENURE*
B.S. or B.A. and Credential	M.A. or M.S. or equivalent and Credential	Doctorate or equivalent and Credential
100% Teaching	60% Teaching	40% Teaching
10 month work year	11 month work year	12 month work year
\$8,000-16,000	\$16,000-19,000	\$19,000-25,000

*Teachers serving in these positions may have tenure as Staff Teacher. They do not have tenure as Senior Teacher or Master Teacher.

Definitions appear on the following page.

Differentiated Staffing

A division and extension of the role of the teacher through the creation of a teacher hierarchy with job responsibilities that are commensurate with a range of pay.

Staff Teacher*

A highly competent and experienced classroom teacher and an expert in at least one of several learning modes (e.g., large group instruction, small tutorial groups, seminar classes). He would teach full time, diagnose basic learning problems and would be protected by tenure laws. This category compares with a fully credentialed teacher as we know it today.

Senior Teacher*

This person is an expert practitioner in his subject area. His primary responsibility is the application of curricular innovations to the classroom. His position is non-tenured (although he may hold tenure as a staff teacher). He teaches approximately 60 percent of the time and his work year is extended to 11 months. His salary would range from \$2,000 to \$3,000 above that of the maximum step on the salary schedule. He would have an M.A., M.S. or its equivalent in experience pertinent to his professional assignment.

Master Teacher*

A skilled classroom teacher and a scholar in his assigned subject field. He possesses a doctorate or its equivalent and his teaching responsibility is approximately 40 percent of that of the full time teacher. He establishes and maintains a continual program of research and evaluation of his area of curriculum development, is non-tenured in this position, and works a 12 month work year. He has had prior experience in research and curriculum design as well as their application and measurement. He can earn up to \$25,000 per year and his position is viewed as being comparable to that of an assistant superintendent.

*These descriptions have been taken from a brochure published by the Temple City Unified School District, Temple City, California.

QUESTIONNAIRE

This instrument was designed to determine your attitude about differentiated staffing. Using a pencil, please complete the following statements by marking the appropriate space on the answer card provided.

1. Number of years' teaching experience you have had in public or private schools:

A	B	C	D	E
1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13 or more

2. Number of years' experience you have had teaching with differentiated staffing:

A	B	C	D	E
1	2	3	4	5 or more

3. Number of years' experience you have had as an administrator in public or private schools:

A	B	C	D	E
1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13 or more

4. Number of years' experience you have had as an administrator with differentiated staffing:

A	B	C	D	E
1	2	3	4	5 or more

5. Your present teaching assignment:

A	Teacher
B	Department Head
C	Senior Teacher serving on a differentiated staff
D	Master Teacher serving on a differentiated staff

6. Your present administrative assignment:

- A Principal
- B Vice Principal
- C Dean
- D Counselor

7. Sex:

- A Male
- B Female

8. Current assignment:

- A Senior High School (9-12)
- B Junior High School (7-9)
- C Intermediate School (7-8)
- D Elementary School (K-8)

The following statements are to be evaluated by you on a five point scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Please mark the answer card as follows:

- A Strongly Agree
- B Agree
- C Uncertain
- D Disagree
- E Strongly Disagree

The Status of Teachers

- 9. Job satisfaction is more likely to be realized when teachers perform at levels and in roles in keeping with their talents and desires.
- 10. Teachers should be relieved of non-professional and clerical duties by aides and para-professionals.
- 11. Teachers are equal in the sense that they have the same instructional responsibilities with about the same number of pupils.

12. The authority of master teachers within their subject-matter areas should surpass that of administrators as far as decisions related to curriculum and instruction are concerned.
13. Senior teachers should evaluate their departmental colleagues.
14. Teachers resent the low status they hold as compared with other professions equivalent in training requisites.
15. Teachers desire to be included in the decision-making process on matters of curriculum and instruction.
16. Teachers can govern their own ranks when as a group they assume responsibility for their performances.
17. Teachers seeking promotion in a traditional system have had to leave the classroom.
18. It is common to find a ten-year professional with the same instructional duties he had the day he began his career.
19. Traditional teaching assignments tend to limit career and promotional incentives.
20. Teachers would be more inclined to improve instructional techniques if opportunities were present for advancement.

The Staffing of Teachers

21. Teachers, with administrators, should assume responsibility for the selection of teachers in staffing schools.
22. Traditional staffing patterns with their constant number of periods per day inhibit the effective utilization of teacher talent.
23. Staff teachers would evaluate the services provided by their senior and master teachers.
24. Non-credentialed persons with highly-qualified talents should be used for specialized instruction in certain courses.
25. Classroom teachers should have the option of a variety of assignments offering new experiences throughout their careers.

26. Senior teachers responsible for the application of curricular innovations would improve traditional staffing.
27. Master teachers responsible for a continual program of research, evaluation and investigation of new modes of learning would improve traditional staffing.
28. Teaching can be differentiated by degrees of difficulty of the teaching task, and teachers could be assigned appropriately.
29. A career pattern found in differentiated staffing would encourage teachers to remain in the classrooms.
30. Teaching assignments should be made essentially on ability and responsibility.

The Salaries of Teachers

31. Under the present teaching structure, years of service is the central criterion for advancement on the salary schedule.
32. Present salary schedules assume that all teachers grow in exact annual equivalents.
33. Teachers willing to assume a longer work year with more responsibility should receive higher salaries.
34. The single salary schedule fails to provide incentives for teachers to remain in the classroom.
35. There is at present little or no equivalent financial compensation in classroom teaching that compares with salaries received by administrators.
36. The present salary structure based on longevity and automatic promotion practices should be abandoned.
37. Annual salary increments assume that teachers grow equally in performance.
38. Teaching tasks need to be differentiated and assigned with a range of pay commensurate with responsibility.
39. The single salary schedule avoids the question of increased responsibility as a method of advancement.

The Role of Administration

40. The school principal today has less time to devote to the improvement of instruction due to the additional responsibilities being placed upon him.
41. It is difficult for the principal to be knowledgeable in all curricular areas.
42. The principal's job should be revised to include more time for instructional leadership.
43. Administrators should provide common planning time for teachers in order to improve instruction.
44. Most administrators are not "instructional experts."
45. Administration should be a support system for the improvement of instruction.
46. Principals should refurbish their image as teachers by assuming some direct teaching responsibility.