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ABSTRACT

TEACHER ROLES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

James Charles Onderdonk, Jr.
Old Dominion University, 1995
Director: Dr. Dwight W. Allen

This dissertation employs a case study methodology to examine the perceptions of discrete groups of educational stakeholders about the roles of teachers in two temporal conditions: the present and the future. The study proceeded in two steps: a series of structured interviews and a card sort. Members of nine different groups with varying perspectives on education were interviewed to validate the selection of teacher roles to be used in the card sort and to generate new roles to include in the study. Initially roles were identified through a literature review, brainstorming with practitioners and consulting colleagues. Interviews included both focused and unfocused sections and four additional roles were added to the list as a result of the interviews.

For the second step, 35 teacher roles were printed on cards and presented to respondents for rank ordering in two different temporal conditions, the present and the future. In addition, respondents classified the roles as important or less important.

Data were analyzed statistically and by examining frequencies of response, both weighted and non-weighted. No significant interaction between demographic variables and respondents' rankings of roles was observed suggesting general agreement by disparate groups about teacher roles perceived as important or less important. Analysis of frequencies of response indicated broad general agreement about roles perceived as important both for the present and for the future and consensus about the large number of teacher roles classified as important. Roles perceived as more important tended to be those which were process or pedagogically oriented rather than those which were content oriented.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine the perception of teacher roles held by a variety of educational stakeholders who have varying perspectives on education. Role perceptions are examined in two temporal conditions: real, i.e., present; and ideal, i.e., future. Both quantitative and qualitative methods are employed to identify components of teacher roles necessary to meet the demands of the 21st century. A case study research approach is used to address this question because, as Yin (1984) states:

in general, case studies are the preferred strategy when "how" or "why" questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context (p. 13).

Yin (1984) later adds that case studies may be characterized by multiple sources of data and are "preferred in examining contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviors cannot be manipulated" (p. 19).

Teacher roles are examined because of the importance they assume within the two major themes which emerged from educational reform efforts of the late 1980's: the movement to professionalize teaching and school restructuring.
Significance of the Study

In order for research efforts to be considered of significance they must satisfy several criteria. Yin (1989) argues (in terms of case studies) that research studies should be of general public interest and should reveal underlying issues of national importance. If either or both of these conditions are met, a study may be considered significant. Quade (1982), in his work at the Rand Corporation, cites education as a field of national importance which is particularly amenable to research efforts to develop feasible courses of action and to improve public decision making. Scriven (1991) argues that educational research should devote more effort to defining and identifying the components of good teaching. He maintains that, in the broadest sense, his own field, evaluation, should include "basically research in or connected to criteria for good teaching" (p. 38).

Shulman (1986) summarizes the general etiology for educational research as well as the specific rationale for this study when he states that:

We conduct research in a field to make sense of it, to get smarter about it, perhaps to learn how to perform more adeptly within it. Those who investigate teaching are involved in concerted attempts to understand the phenomena of teaching, to learn how to improve its performance, to discover better ways of preparing individuals who wish to teach (p. 3).

Improving the performance of teachers is a recurring theme in the commission reports of the last decade which either sound the alarm about the decline of American education, offer suggestions for improvement of education or both. Chief among suggestions for improvement of education has been that the professionalization of teaching--increasing its prestige and stature as a career, imposing more rigorous entrance standards, developing professional board
certification for practitioners and raising salaries in concert with the imposition of some sort of objective measurement of teacher performance—would result in improved academic performance of pupils.

As Shulman (1987) points out, the argument for professionalization of teaching as a strategy for improving education rests squarely on the premise that the standards by which teachers are to be judged are not only known but can be clearly articulated. The assumption that this knowledge base for teaching is clearly defined is at the heart of recommendations by two well respected education reform commissions of the late 1980's: the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching As A Profession, which published, in 1986, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Despite the efforts of these groups, Shulman (1987) remains skeptical:

The rhetoric regarding the knowledge base, however, rarely specifies the character of such knowledge. It does not say what teachers should know, do, understand, or profess that will render teaching more than a form of individual labor, let alone be considered among the learned professions (p. 4).

Shulman's concerns are shared by other researchers. Lieberman and Miller (1990), for example, observe that "the knowledge base in teaching is weak; there is simply no consensus (as there is in medicine and law) about what is basic to the practice of the profession" (p. 154).

The second major theme which emerged from commission studies of the last decade is that of reform through school restructuring. Restructuring is part of what some reformers call the "second wave" of educational reforms; reforms initially generated by the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983. The philosophical basis of this second wave is, simply put, power sharing (Association
for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986). The sharing of power within the school and, to a lesser extent, between the school and its constituencies will, school restructuring advocates believe, empower teachers to perform more effectively on the job. The relationship between power sharing and performance is assumed to be linear; improved teacher performance is, moreover, expected to result in improved student achievement (Murphy, 1992).

One urban school superintendent stated that "it is clear that restructuring is becoming one of the cornerstones of educational reform for the 1990s" (Payzant, 1992, p. 79). School restructuring efforts include systematic changes in work roles for faculty and administration, creation of new role definitions which are more flexible, and role definitions which stress competence in needed tasks (Murphy, 1992).

Changed role definitions, which are critical for successful restructuring efforts (Task Force on High School Restructuring, 1993), dovetail with efforts at professionalization of teaching. A common component of both reform efforts (restructuring and professionalization) is a new conception of teacher roles. Consequently, the identification of teacher roles meets Yin's (1989) test for research significance by satisfying both his criteria. Reform of education (and improved teacher performance is repeatedly identified by major commissions as essential for reform) is on the national agenda and is of pressing national importance. Quade (1982) and Scriven (1991) cite educational reform and the identification of the components of good teaching, respectively, as significant avenues for research efforts.
As well as meeting the criteria for a significant inquiry, this study may be important for its potential applicability to the movement to professionalize teaching. A necessary precondition for teacher accountability to professional boards or to state and local government entities is a clear expression of what teachers are asked to do and how they are asked to do it (Allen, 1992).

A belief that changed teacher roles will impact education in a positive way is widespread and is held by policy making groups outside the formal structure of education. As some critics of American education have observed, "We recommend nothing less than a revolution in the role of the teacher and the management of schools in order to upgrade the quality and professionalism of the U.S. teacher work force" (Committee for Economic Development, quoted in Murphy, 1992, p. 7).

In addition to meshing with the concerns of professionalization of teaching and school restructuring, this study has implications for public policy decision making.

One major school of policy science identifies five intellectual tasks as central to decision-making: (a) clarification of goals, (b) historical trend analysis, (c) identification and clarification of controlling conditions, (d) trend projection, and (e) creation of alternatives (Brown, personal communication, November 6, 1994). This study has additional application to two of the aspects of policy science: trend projection and creation of alternatives.

In policy science, trend projection refers to identification of predominant roles in a foreseeable future. The implications of this study for trend projection are clear: if teacher roles are changing or evolving, in what direction is this
evolution headed? This question is commingled with the last task, creation of alternatives. The study seeks to discover not only those roles that will predominate but also those which are desirable to meet the challenges of the next century. The identification of a desirable future role for teachers should satisfy Patton's (1990) criteria for research to "inform action, enhance decision making, and apply knowledge to solve human and societal problems" (p. 12).

**Research Questions**

The basic research question addressed by this study is: What roles must teachers adopt in order to improve American education to meet the challenge of the 21st century? As Shulman (1987) pointed out, the knowledge base regarding teaching is not specific about how teacher roles must change in the future: guideposts for change are necessary. The basic research question of this study is, by necessity, fluid, identifying the parameters of the phenomenon to be studied and attempting to articulate the components of professional roles. This approach is consistent with Yin's (1984) description of case studies as "generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes" (p. 21).

Flowing from this general research question are other, narrower concerns:

1. Do groups of stakeholders have a consensus regarding the roles played by classroom teachers?

2. Do groups of stakeholders believe that the roles of teachers must change to meet the demands of the 21st century?

3. Can the roles of teachers be classified in terms of relevant categories or properties and once so organized be used to provide an initial direction in which to move to reconceptualize teacher roles?
4. Do stakeholders perceive a difference between teacher roles today and a desirable set of teacher roles for the future?

Limitations of the Study

The participants in the study are all drawn from core urban areas in the American Southeast. Perceptions of teacher roles may be quite different in rural areas or in more heavily urbanized areas. Virginia is a right-to-work state where public employees are forbidden to organize unions and where a tradition of unionization, even in the private sector, does not exist. In areas where teachers are unionized, perceptions of their roles may differ markedly from those expressed by participants in this study.

The number of subjects who participated in the study is relatively small (179). They were selected based on two criteria: the face validity of the subjects as stakeholders in education and access. Face validity here refers to the subjects' membership in a group identified as comprising the broad constituencies of education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 1992; Murphy, 1992). These constituent groups include teachers, school administrators, school board members, business people, parents, students, preservice teachers and community leaders. As the primary goal of this study is to identify the components of teacher's roles, limitations imposed by sample selection may be inconsequential. As Yin (1984) argues, "the case study . . . does not represent a 'sample', and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization)" (p. 21).
Access includes two considerations: (1) the subject was willing to participate (they were not volunteers in the strictest sense of the word, but when approached with an explanation of the study's topic they agreed to participate), and (2) not only were the participants members of a designated constituent group and willing to participate in the study, but they could participate in it. That is, given time and funding constraints, it proved logistically possible to include them. Given these two conditions for inclusion it is possible that the perceptions of the participants are not representative of the population as a whole.

Definition of Terms

1. School restructuring: "Ways of altering educational administration to encourage flexibility and professionalism" (Martin, 1992, p. viii), including systematic change in work rules, differentiated roles for teachers and significantly different ways of organizing the work performed by teachers (Murphy, 1992).

2. Role: "Patterned sequence of learned actions performed by an individual in an interaction situation" (Borgatta, 1992, p. 1678); for the purpose of this study, role refers to activities associated with a particular position in a task oriented, hierarchial system, i.e., a school.

3. Stakeholder: Individuals who have "substantial ego, credibility, power, futures or other capital invested" (Scriven, 1991, p. 334) in a particular program; for the purpose of this study, stakeholder includes those with an interest in education either from an insider perspective (that is, actively employed in a school system) or an outsider perspective (that is, having a direct interest in the school system--like parents or employers--but not
employed within the system).

4. Professionalization of teaching: The movement in education to create a mechanism so that the profession itself can pronounce its members as fully competent to discharge their responsibilities in accordance with high professional standards; professionalism implies existence of a structure of knowledge and expertise necessary for practitioners in a particular field (Caldwell, 1986).
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Numerous observers have criticized the performance of the American school (and, by implication, the American teacher) in the last decade. The most pointed criticism began in 1983 with the National Commission on Education's report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, and continued throughout the decade. Sikula (1990) reviewed no less than 24 major reports of national commissions, task forces and projects in the 1980's which focused on educational reform. He noted that a change in emphasis took place as the decade progressed; reports for the latter half of the 1980's focused primarily on the need for the improvement of teacher skills. The presumption of these studies was linear. The academic achievement of American students could be increased by improving the skills and redefining the roles of America's teaching force, by increasing teaching's stature as a career, by imposing more rigorous entrance standards and by development of professional board standards for teachers (Payzant, 1987; Pelton, 1987).

Although a consensus about the specific direction of reform efforts is not clear (Sikula, 1987), major reform efforts seem to have coalesced around two major strategies to improve American education: the professionalization of teaching and school restructuring (Murphy, 1990; Reavis & Griffith, 1992).
Indeed, the two most influential reports of the late 1980's, the Holmes Group's report, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986) and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986), identified these two mutually dependent strategies as the sine qua non of educational reform. Each strategy has important implications for a changed role for teachers, whether implicitly or explicitly stated in the documentation of their proponents; each strategy will be examined to determine the character of these implications.

The proposition that reform of education can be facilitated by altering the roles of teachers through professionalization of the field is not new (Lortie, 1975; Waller 1932a/1970); there seems little question, at least among educators, that teachers are professionals. The fundamental inquiry is, rather, how the professionalism of teachers may be improved (Clark & Yinzer, 1987).

Several approaches are evident in discussions about improving the professionalization of teaching. Chief among these are suggestions to improve the preparation of teachers, to create credentialling programs more in line with the requirements of a profession, to define new standards of entry into the profession (Holmes Group, 1986), to create an ascending hierarchy of responsibility and financial reward (Goodlad, 1976), to improve methods of inducting new practitioners into the profession (Lortie, 1975) and to create a professional environment in the schools (Carnegie Forum on Education, 1986; Sarason, 1990).

The movement for the reform of teacher preparation programs is led by the Holmes Group, a consortium of deans and academic officers drawn from research institutions throughout the United States. Unequivocally, they link the
performance of students to the performance of teachers—"American students' performance will not improve much if the quality of teaching is not much improved" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 3)—and advocate improved teacher education programs as the key to school reform. Although their main focus is on teacher education, the Holmes Group's goals and recommendations directly impact a changed definition of the role of the classroom teacher; explicit in basic changes to teacher education are basic changes in teacher roles. The Holmes Group has, in fact, concluded that restrictive definitions of teacher roles may be responsible for the loss, to teaching, of some of its best practitioners: "We must counteract the confining role definition for teachers that discourages many effective practitioners from remaining in the classroom" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 36). They have advanced the idea that current teacher roles actually discourage improvement in education because teachers do not have the opportunity to organize their professional work (through staff development activities or curriculum revision efforts, for example) to improve school effectiveness; in particular, for them, one aspect of the reality of schools which militates against effective school reform is that teacher (and, in some cases, school) role definitions date from the 19th century: "the jobs we assign to teachers have remained very nearly the same as they were before these intellectual revolutions [in science, social science and the humanities] began" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 7).

Among the Holmes Group's best known recommendations is the establishment of a three-tiered system of teacher licensing, each tier reflecting a distinct role related to performance. Although the boundaries of these roles have been clearly delineated, the skills which define each role and contribute to a
definition of professional competence have yet to be outlined. A useful definition of roles seems a prerequisite to development of assessment and certification of teachers in accordance with this proposed tier system.

This three-tiered system echoes Goodlad's (1976) suggestion that teaching be recognized in a hierarchy (teacher aide - intern - resident - teacher) through which a neophyte would progress before reaching professional maturation. Goodlad's strategy included a clinical component to teacher training and preparation of modules on different aspects of teaching rather than a set sequence of courses.

The Holmes Group's description of the entry level certification is particularly germane to this study. The first tier is labeled Instructor and is built upon the subject matter expert model for teachers. Instructors must have, at minimum, an undergraduate degree but since "[t]aking and even passing college and university courses is no guarantee that the material has been learned" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 20), persons wishing to be certified as instructors must pass a written test in the subject they propose to teach as well as general tests of reading and writing ability. Rudimentary knowledge of pedagogy is also required but specification of necessary pedagogical skills is vague. Curiously enough, although passing scores on subject matter standardized tests are required for entry into the profession, the Holmes Group has conceded that this is an inadequate measure of teaching ability: "candidate's performance on such tests are very poor predictors of their capacity to teach these things well" (p. 21).

As well as proposals from the Holmes Group and Goodlad, other approaches have been advanced to improve the credentialling process for
teachers. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has proposed improving the performance of America's teachers through the development of accreditation standards for institutions that prepare teachers. These accreditation standards are, in some instances, related to the professional practice of teachers. The definition of NCATE's mission includes the statement "to require a level of quality in professional education that fosters competent practice of graduates" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 1992, p. 1), succinctly stating their belief in the connection between preparation and practice.

NCATE has developed five categories, 18 standards and 94 criteria that are used to evaluate institutions that voluntarily seek NCATE accreditation. Many of the standards apply only to the structure of the institution itself (e.g., faculty load, governance and evaluation). One category--Knowledge Bases for Professional Education--is singularly applicable to the present discussion.

This category relates the requirements of professional education to the classroom and stipulates a broad knowledge base for potential teachers. The NCATE criteria for this category include statements confirming the importance of the "development of independent thinking . . . the making of relevant judgments . . . and the discrimination of values in the educational arena" (NCATE, 1992, p. 50); all aspects, arguably, of a new role for teachers. These "criteria for compliance" explicitly indicate a change in the perception of the role of teachers. What, one might reasonably ask, are the implications for the role of the classroom teacher latent in the criterion that teachers have "knowledge about and appropriate skills in . . . classrooms and schools as social systems" (NCATE, 1992,
NCATE's own national poll (Wise, 1993) revealed that the public overwhelmingly believes that teachers need to meet higher professional standards; indeed, two-thirds of the respondents believed that student performance was dependent upon how well the teacher does his or her job and 75% agreed with the statements that teachers were "only partially" or "not adequately" trained to improve student performance. Wise's (1993) analysis of the poll led him to conclude that teachers must change the ways they operate in the classroom and that teacher educators must "change expectations for those who want to enter teaching" (p. 2). Wise (1993) concluded by saying: "The poll results therefore reveal a large gap between the current practice in how we prepare teachers and what the public expects and desires in terms of their preparation" (p. 2, emphasis in original). New role definitions have thus become an essential component of efforts to improve teacher performance.

Jean Miller, who directs the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium at the Council of Chief State School Officers, writing in the NCATE newsletter, describes the evolution of teacher licensing as moving to a performance-based orientation. This "new science", as she terms it, means that new roles for teachers must be developed if performance-based licensing is to play a meaningful role in education reform (Miller, 1993, p. 7).

Observations such as Miller's are being codified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Like NCATE, NBPTS sees creation of national performance standards as central to educational reform. Unlike NCATE, with its focus on institutional accreditation, NBPTS is developing a
series of statements which describe accomplished practice in English language arts and science for adolescence and young adulthood, and art for early adolescence through young adulthood. Standards have been developed and published for English language arts for early adolescence (ages 11 through 15) (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS], 1993) and for early adolescence/generalists (middle school teachers for ages 11-15) (NBPTS, 1994). NBPTS efforts certainly represent the most current attempt at developing credentialing standards which also purport to measure teacher effectiveness.

In the case of the Early Adolescence/Generalist teacher, the NBPTS has defined 11 standards which are among the "identifiable commonalities characteriz[ing] the many styles of accomplished practice generalists employ in teaching young adolescents" (NBPTS, 1994, p. 6). The 11 standards used to evaluate teachers for board certification all have implications for changed teacher roles.

Standard I: Knowledge of Young Adolescents, for instance, states that teachers must "frame their practice equitably to meet the common and unique needs of each of their students" (NBPTS, 1994, p. 10). To do this, the NBPTS has suggested that teachers "make themselves available to counsel and advise students on a wide range of issues from academic progress to peer relationships to extra-curricular opportunities" (p. 9); that they develop understandings of students' needs based on discussions with parents or other caregivers; and that teachers be alert "to the various sources of individual student differences such as culture, language, socioeconomic status, ethnicity and gender, along with variations in knowledge, skills, interests, aspirations and values" (p. 9).
Some standards seem almost unachievable. For example, Standard II: Knowledge of Subject Matter lists skills and abilities for highly accomplished generalists, skills which each teacher should possess, to at least some degree, in each area. In English language arts, board certification requires a solid grounding in the important ideas, concepts and strategies that are central to developing expertise in English language arts—reading, writing and oral discourse. They understand how students learn language; how they use language; and how they interact with text (NBPTS, 1994, p. 12).

In addition to this competence, history and social studies teachers should have a foundation of knowledge in history and the social sciences including geography, political science and economics. They know world and United States history and geography; the major systems of governments that exist throughout the world and how they operate; the different economic systems and the principles of thought underlying them; the key demographic concepts and their implications; the important domestic and international political concerns; the fundamental tensions that surround contemporary issues; and the varying belief structures of different cultures and religions (NBPTS, 1994, p. 14).

This same teacher, proficient in language arts and the social sciences, must also be knowledgeable in mathematics, science and the arts. In mathematics, the highly accomplished generalist is knowledgeable about the foundations of mathematics, including algebra, geometry, statistics, probability, functions, the study of patterns, and number sense. They possess the ability to use numbers in a variety of settings . . . and to understand mathematics well enough to use it as a form and subject of communication (p. 15).

Suffice it to say that the standards for science and the arts are of a similarly comprehensive nature and that they apply no; to several different specialists in the schools but to a single individual defined as a generalist.

The credentialling program advanced by the NBPTS is designed to provide practitioner-controlled standards for professionalism of teaching, to revise practice and to provide a rationale for improved financial incentives for teachers (NBPTS,
Field tests of the certification process have begun and in January, 1995 NBPTS announced that 81 of the first 289 teachers who completed the Early Adolescence/Generalist certificate field test were named National Board Certified Teachers (NBPTS, 1995).

The NBPTS credentialling program stresses the importance of developing a consensus about what teachers are and should be as a prerequisite to developing standards to measure effectiveness. Their core propositions about what the roles of teachers are assume that teachers impart learning, that they define new roles for themselves and that accomplished practitioners can identify and explain the reasons for their pedagogical behaviors.

In addition to revamping teacher preparation and credentialling programs, advocates of increasing the professionalization of teaching also advocate altering the standards that control entry into teaching (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; Lortie, 1975). The assumptions behind this approach are that adding preservice requirements, requiring bachelor's degrees in the liberal arts (instead of in education), and requiring master's degrees for all new teachers will lead to the entry of higher-quality individuals into teaching and will, by extension, result in better teachers (Evertson, Hawley & Zlotnik, 1985). Roth and Pipko (1990) point out that raising standards without a corresponding structural change in the conditions of teaching is unlikely to produce the desired result (better teachers) and, in fact, may be counter-productive. Role perception becomes critical in the calculus of the labor market: "the distribution of potential teachers' motives can change, and this happens in response to changes in the value of a role by the society . . ." (Roth & Pipko, 1990, p. 120). In economic terms, if the
standards for entry to a profession (the costs) are increased without a corresponding rise in the benefits associated with membership in that profession, the overall quality of the candidate pool will decline (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple & Olsen, 1991).

Concomitant with revised teacher preparation programs, expanded credentialling efforts, and higher standards of entry, the expansion of both responsibilities and financial rewards are advocated as ways to improve the professionalization of teaching. Expanded responsibilities, differentiated staffing patterns, the use of what Goodlad (1976) calls teacher "equivalents" to diffuse some of the tasks of teachers to other qualified personnel, and tiered career paths are all also advanced as ways to improve professionalization (Allen, 1992; Carnegie Forum, 1986; Goodlad, 1976; Sarason, 1990). What these many initiatives have in common is the implication of changed teacher roles (Murphy, 1991).

Commentators who advocate expanded responsibilities for teachers are referring to expanding opportunities for professional activity, not a simple aggregation of tasks. Circumscription of the freedom to act as professionals leads to routinization of teaching; teaching becomes a task which can be done day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out without any decrease in motivation or change in style, satisfaction, patience, sensitivity, and sense of challenge. And this can apparently be done by all teachers (Sarason, 1990, p. 140).

Sizer (1984) laments the "mediocre sameness" (p. 6) of American high schools, a condition wrought by the lack of professionalism in teaching. Later Sizer (1992) writes, "most barriers to [effective schools] are more personal" (p. 42)
than technical; "we know far more about the stunningly complex processes of learning and teaching than we did ninety years ago, but the template of American secondary education that was struck then is very much in place" (p. 84). This is what Barzun (1991) refers to as a recurrent hardening of the educational arteries. Goodlad (1984) observed the same regularities in teachers' roles. In a study of 13 communities in seven different geographic areas of the country (which included 38 schools and 1,000 classrooms, as well as 8,624 parents, 1,350 teachers and 17,163 students), he found a "continuation of school and classroom conditions that drain physical and emotional energy and tend to promote routine rather than sustained creative teaching" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 196). Goodlad (1984), like, Sizer, found an "extraordinary sameness of instructional practice in the more than 1,000 classrooms observed" (p. 241).

Goodlad (1984) advises changing the structure of the classroom and responsibilities of the teacher. "Mere refinement of conventional practice is not sufficient. We will only begin to get evidence of the potential power of pedagogy when we dare to risk and support markedly deviant classroom procedures" (p. 249). He specifically recommends differential staffing patterns and responsibilities, using as an example elementary schools organized with a nucleus of qualified teachers, some of whom have had additional preparation in subject areas like math, science, music or art. These teachers would serve as subject matter resources in specific areas to the rest of the staff and, as vacancies occur at the schools, a concerted effort would be made to balance staff skills with particular hiring decisions.

The arguments for changed responsibilities for teachers also regard as
axiomatic changed roles for teachers. Most proponents for altering the professional responsibilities of teachers also support increased salaries as a way of attracting what Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple and Olsen (1991) call the most "academically able potential students" (p. 46) to teaching as a career. Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple and Olsen (1991) concede that, laudable as the movement to raise teachers' salaries may be, it is unlikely to increase salaries enough to attract the very brightest college graduates into the field. In the short run, the best that can be hoped from this initiative is that it will improve the pool of potential teachers. Yet even this modest proposal has encountered opposition. Op-ed writers (Morse, 1994, is a typical example) even maintain that teaching can be professionalized without raising pay scales. Likewise, conventional school improvement efforts in the last decade have frequently touted strategies whose chief feature is that they do not require additional expenditures. Above all, increasing salaries, as important as it is, will probably not directly affect the classroom behaviors of most teachers.

Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple and Olsen's (1991) analysis is devastatingly critical of most in-service teacher education programs as methods to improve teaching. They suggest that using conventional master's degree programs to improve teacher performance is particularly ineffective. Since most school systems award higher pay to teachers with master's degrees, they argue, an incentive is created for teachers to enroll in the most non-demanding programs they can find. Concomitantly, schools of education are provided with a powerful incentive to offer programs whose chief feature is attracting high numbers of enrollments. Murnane's point is not that critical skills for teachers should not or
cannot be taught but rather that the current approach to improvement of teacher skills actually operates as a disincentive to improve the practice of teaching. His position is buttressed by the work of Hanushek (1986), who reviewed 106 studies examining the effectiveness of teachers with master's degrees, compared with those who held only bachelor's degrees. Of the total, only six studies indicated that teachers who held master's degrees were more effective in the classroom than their bachelor-degreed peers, using student gains on standardized tests as the standard of comparison. These analyses indicate that some popular, conventional approaches to the improvement of teacher skills (raising salaries, standardized examinations for potential teachers and increasing educational requirements for practitioners) have had limited success (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Allen (1992) argues that this is so because we have failed to examine the fundamental condition of the utilization of teachers: the roles they are called upon to perform.

Lortie (1975) believes that the uncertainty in granting teaching full status as a profession derives in part from the ease of entry of neophytes into teaching. He contrasts teaching with other professions (law and medicine) and notes that the ordeals and experiences which create a professional identity in other fields are lacking in education—the "functions of shared ordeal in academia--assisting occupational identity formation, encouraging collegial patterns of behavior, fostering generational trust, and enhancing self-esteem" (pp. 160-161) are absent in the induction of new members into teaching. Goodlad (1990) makes essentially the same observation 15 years after Lortie when he notes that generally there is no process in teacher preparation which socializes prospective teachers into the demands of the profession and no cohort group for support or validation of
professional expectations. Welker (1992) argues that the confirmation of teaching's status as a profession is hindered not only by the ease of entry but also by its structure as an individualistic and idiosyncratic undertaking. This characteristic of teaching inhibits development of a shared technical culture necessary for establishment of a profession.

Changes in methods of inducting new members into the profession will have implications for changed roles for teachers. It will require behavioral changes which will impact teachers' pedagogical relationships with their pupils if for no reason other than that they will model new roles of collegiality, self-direction and mentoring for students (Busching & Rawls, 1985; Finch & Tom, 1978).

The second major reform initiative (characterized as Wave 2 reforms by Murphy, 1992) is school restructuring. Like the approaches to professionalize teaching, restructuring will have profound effects on the roles of teachers.

Whereas the work of the Holmes Group focused on the professionalization of teaching by revamping teacher preparation, a report issued at virtually the same time by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) stressed restructuring of schools and redefining teacher roles as the conditions necessary to improve American education and the performance of America's students.

Historically, educational reform movements in the United States have been precipitated by perceived external political or economic threats (Berube, 1991) and this tocsin sounded by the Carnegie Forum is no different. A Nation at Risk (1983) called for the mobilization of the educational system to prepare our citizens to compete globally. The Carnegie Forum, and its report A Nation
Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986), went farther in maintaining that improved educational performance is essential to ensure a "vibrant democracy . . . [to] avert the growth of a permanent underclass . . . [to] have a high wage economy" and to maintain our standard of living (p. 21). The Forum was established to emphasize the link between a country's economic growth and the skills and abilities of its citizenry and to develop educational policies to meet economic challenges.

The Carnegie plan to restructure schools has several components, some of which overlap with initiatives aimed at improving the professionalization of teaching. It was the Carnegie Forum which proposed the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and outlined its mandate; the Board "should determine what teachers need to know and what they should be able to do" (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986, p. 62).

In an odd gesture to local control, the board, although it will certify teachers, does not propose to define a national curriculum for teachers, preferring to leave that task to states or even, by default, to teacher training institutions. The Board's major function appears to be political. It establishes an external mechanism to recognize teacher competence and anticipates that such recognition will be employed to justify suitably adjusted salary schedules and the granting of full professional status to teaching.

In addition to the NBPTS, the Carnegie Forum plan proposes more stringent entrance requirements for candidates for teacher training, abandonment of undergraduate teacher training programs in favor of a Master in Teaching degree, improved compensation scales, differentiated staffing with new categories
of teachers (e.g., Lead Teachers) and creation of a professional environment where teachers can exercise professional judgment as to how best to meet clearly articulated educational goals developed by political consensus. Taken in toto, the Carnegie proposals constitute an approach to reform which is known under the general rubric of restructuring.

Restructuring is the general term applied to recent reform efforts aimed at developing not only new approaches to school governance and organization but also and "particularly [to] the work performed by teachers and the teaching-learning process unfolding in classrooms" (Murphy, 1992, p. 3). It implies a paradigm shift in our approach to education and to the roles of teachers (Allen, 1992).

Recent reviews of Wave 2 reform efforts have attempted to summarize the parameters of restructuring. Although an unambiguous definition of restructuring does not seem to exist and while there may be politically expedient reasons for this (Mitchell & Beach, 1991, cited by Murphy, 1993, p. 2), most restructuring efforts share certain characteristics. Restructuring generally includes site based decision making in areas like curriculum, staffing and budget, increased use of technology, changes in instructional techniques, curriculum revision, adoption of authentic assessments, differentiated staffing, privatization of education, and role redefinition (Chubb & Moe, 1992; Murphy, 1993; Reavis & Griffith, 1992; Schlecty, 1990).

The implications for changed teacher roles in restructuring plans are clear. Part of the change is impelled by global economic demands American students now confront.
The students . . . must be active learners, busily engaged in the process of bringing new knowledge and new ways of knowing to bear on a widening range of increasingly difficult problems. The focus of schooling must shift from teaching to learning, from the passive acquisition of facts and routines to the active application of ideas to problems. That transition makes the role of the teacher more important, not less (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 25).

The changed expectations for students derive from changed expectations for teachers.

They [teachers] must be able to learn all the time, as the knowledge required to do their work twists and turns with new challenges and the progress of science and technology. Teachers will not come to the school knowing all they have to know, but knowing how to figure out what they need to know, where to get it, and how to help others make meaning out of it (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p. 25).

Site-based management, which breaks down hierarchial bureaucratic structures, devolves authority to the local level and empowers teachers and principals to make decisions which are, presumably, more responsive to the needs of the community they serve. It also removes layers of bureaucracy through structural decentralization, following corporate models which maintain strategic control at the center of the enterprise but which delegate freedom of action to operating units (Reich, 1992). One assumption of restructuring is that teacher empowerment should result in greater professionalization of their work.

Recent reform efforts in education, then, tend to focus on two major strategies: professionalization of teaching and school restructuring. Both strategies include development of professional standards, standards which apply not only to individual teachers but also to the institutions which prepare teachers. And this creation of national standards for individuals and institutions implies new roles for teachers.

Both strategies are susceptible to the criticism that they inadequately
address exactly what those implications mean, referring readers instead to the knowledge base which informs the practice of teaching. As Shulman (1987) has pointed out, "The rhetoric regarding the knowledge base, however, rarely specifies the character of such knowledge. It does not say what teachers should know, do, understand, or profess that will render teaching more than a form of individual labor . . ." (p. 4).

Shulman's critique of the new reform movement continues with an analysis of the knowledge base and its sources. One of the sources he identifies ("the wisdom of practice") has particular applicability to this study. According to Shulman, this area is the least researched and he believes that it should be a research priority to "develop codified representations of the practical pedagogical wisdom of able teachers" (Shulman, 1987, p. 11). One approach he suggests is to "infer principles of good practice [from] highly contextualized" accounts of teaching (Shulman, 1987, p. 11). This study suggests that one approach to this problem is to advance and attempt to verify a consensus on new roles for teachers, testing elements drawn not only from literature reviews but also from interviews with practitioners and other educational stakeholders. These are the avenues of inquiry this study follows.

Evidence that teacher roles determine teacher behavior occurs in the literature of both art and science. In The Rainbow, Lawrence (1915/1961) describes the psychological and emotional ontogeny of a young woman, Ursula Brangwen, who takes up teaching, not only to establish her independence from an oppressive household and to demonstrate her own worth but also to be of service and use to the children of her community. Her assignment is to a squalid, inner
city school populated by the children of England's industrial proletariat.

She dreamed how she would make the little, ugly children love her. She would be so personal. Teachers were always so hard and impersonal. She would make everything personal and vivid, she would give herself, she would give, give, give all her great stories of wealth to her children, she would make them so happy . . . (Lawrence, 1915/1961, p. 367).

Ursula soon finds herself at odds with the role the school and the other teachers demand of her. "Miss Harley was a splendid teacher. She could keep order and inflict knowledge on a class with remarkable efficiency" (Lawrence, 1915/1961, p. 385). Ursula is determined not to surrender to the demands the school and particularly the martinet Mr. Harby, the headmaster, wish to impose upon her. Worn down by the school, her resolve erodes.

Only in her soul a change took place. Never more, and never more would she give herself as individual to her class . . . she would be Standard Five teacher, as far away personally from her class as if she had never set foot in St. Philip's school. She would . . . keep herself apart . . . . She had become hard and impersonal (Lawrence, 1915/1961, pp. 395-396).

Ursula finally succumbs to the school's ethic and canes one of her students in an attempt to establish the kind of order valued by the school.

But she paid a great price out of her own soul, to do this. It seemed as if a great flame had gone through her and burnt her sensitive tissue. She who shrank from the thought of physical suffering in any form, had been forced to fight and beat with a cane and rouse all her instincts to hurt . . . . Bitterly she repented having got beside herself . . . . Yet it had to be so. She did not want to do it. Yet she had to. Oh, why, why had she leagued herself to this evil system where she must brutalize herself to live? Why had she become a school-teacher, why, why (Lawrence, 1915/1961, pp. 405-406)?

Ursula is hopelessly trapped in a role which not only circumscribes her behavior but compromises her most intimate beliefs. Lawrence's dramatic portrayal of a teacher confined by role expectations is more ingenuously reflected in the literature of science.
Shulman offers a vignette in his work which is particularly relevant to this argument. He quotes at length a study by Grossman which includes a description of a young English teacher whose style of teaching literature is characterized by inventiveness, creativity and student interaction. Grossman has described her as resourceful and engaging in the classroom and her students responded with participation described as "active and hearty". When Grossman observed a grammar lesson, however, a marked change took place.

Colleen looked like a different teacher during that lesson. Her interactive style evaporated. In its place was a highly didactic, teacher-directed, swiftly paced combination of lecture and tightly-controlled recitation. . . . Students were not given opportunities to raise questions or offer alternative views. After the session, she confessed to the observer that she had actively avoided making eye contact with one particular student in the front row because that youngster always had good questions or ideas and in this particular lesson Colleen really didn't want to encourage either, because she wasn't sure of the answers. She was uncertain about the content and adapted her instructional style to allay her anxiety (Grossman, 1985, quoted by Shulman, 1987, p. 18).

A parsimonious explanation for this changed behavior is that the teacher is trapped in an outmoded role--she had been socialized into the role of teacher as expert--and that her behavior was circumscribed by that obsolete role. She had no resources with which to subvert the role; she was obviously a content expert, at least as well as two university degrees in English could make her. She took pains to hide her ignorance of the subject from her students because, as a teacher, she felt that she had to know her subject. Like Lawrence's Ursula, her role and her performance were inextricably intertwined.

Similarly, Tom (1984) quotes a teacher who has participated in an innovative master's degree program and who developed science materials for five year olds:
During my first year of teaching at the kindergarten level, I realized that children at this developmental stage felt no fear whatsoever towards their environment nor the lessons to be learned from exploring the world around them. My fears alone [about not knowing enough about science] were standing in the way of progress as far as a science curriculum was concerned. Realizing now that the fear of science felt by myself was not shared by the children made the pursuit of this project a rational idea . . . (p. 158).

Sizer (1992) reports on a conversation with a tearful chemistry teacher whose students have such poor math skills that they seem incapable of learning to balance equations. Her distress is founded in her admission that she cannot teach them math because she is a chemistry teacher, not a math teacher.

These examples illustrate how teachers can be trapped in outmoded roles; three of them specifically illustrate the restrictions imposed by the model which specifies the teacher's role as that of subject matter expert. As Goodlad (1990) observes, "there is not in our society the kind of consensus regarding the need for teachers to know how to teach that there is regarding their need to know what to teach" (p. 22, emphasis in original).

As has been discussed above, the moves to improve the professionalization of teaching and to restructure schools require changes in teacher roles.

If it is to accomplish its objective of improving the performance of American students, educational reform must be based upon the reconceptualization of such roles. Sarason (1990) addresses this concern directly when he metaphorically describes conventional school reforms as a "law and order" approach with its emphasis on treating symptoms and not causes. Sarason argues that the issue is not law and order but rather how laws (rules and standards of conduct) in the classroom are experienced and formulated and how
the process of developing laws and experiencing order can facilitate learning on the part of both teacher and pupil. In short, he argues that the preconceived role of the teacher (as sheriff, if you will) inhibits teachers from involving students in the construction and ratification of classroom standards (what he calls the classroom "constitution"), which can positively alter the climate for learning.

The development of professional standards for teachers, like those proposed by NBPTS, compels a reexamination of teacher roles. If licensing requirements are to be based on specific teacher behaviors, then a careful analysis of roles is imperative to avoid merely a codification of roles which have failed in the past. Thus the conceptual framework of this study is that movements to professionalize teaching and to develop standards to accredit both teachers and the institutions which prepare them imply changes in the roles teachers perform. A new description of those roles should be undertaken because our "educational system reflects unrealistic and outdated assumptions about the roles of teachers, students and classroom structures" (Allen, 1992, p. 99).

Teacher Roles

Teacher roles for inclusion in this study were identified by two methods: (a) a review of the literature, and (b) a pilot study interviewing educational stakeholders using focused and unfocused approaches. Since the latter approach will be summarized in a later section, the discussion here is limited to literature citations which support the inclusion of specific roles in the study. A list of the roles is attached in Appendix A.

Subject Matter Expert. The literature on teaching is replete with references to teachers as subject matter experts; it is perhaps the dominant model
for thinking about teacher roles. Schon (1983) points out that schools are built around a concept of privileged knowledge and that "teachers are seen as technical experts who impart privileged knowledge to students" (p. 320). Cuban (1984) observes that the idea of the teacher's authority being rooted in knowledge is part of a value structure in education which has persisted for nearly a century and which accounts for "practices [such] as reliance upon textbooks, little student movement, and a concern for tranquil classrooms marked by the 'hum of knowledge'" (p. 245). Historically, this approach has been described as that of the "Intellectual Overseer" (Finkelstein, 1970, cited in Cuban, 1984, p. 19).

Other writers have observed the primacy of the teacher's role as expert in reviews of the perceptions of teachers (Fischer & Kiefer, 1994), in a survey of teachers of the year regarding the characteristics of effective teachers (Steffans, 1990), and in a study of teachers' self-perceptions as professionals (Davidson, 1974). Goodlad (1984) and Sizer (1992) both observe that the teacher as subject matter expert metaphor exerts a powerful, albeit limiting, control over pedagogical practice; Jackson (1986) questions the value of the expert metaphor when he asks rhetorically if knowledge of a teachable subject implies pedagogical knowledge as well. Tom (1984) acknowledges the pervasiveness of the metaphor but also questions its utility. Welker (1992) critiques the teacher as expert metaphor and points out some of its shortcomings when he notes that "the idea of the teacher as expert, dependent on authoritative answers rather than questions, does not provide a good model for how the teacher must consider learning difficulties in the classroom" (p. 100). Waller (1932a/1970) deplores the confining nature of the subject matter expert role for teachers when he observes that "one who has taught
long may wax unenthusiastic on any subject under the sun" (p. 288).


Guide or Facilitator of Learning. A change in the role of teacher to that of guide or coach in learning is at the heart of Sizer's (1984) Coalition for Effective Schools. He maintains that information is plentiful and the fundamental challenge of education is in helping students to employ information in learning to solve problems; the function of teachers should be one of guiding or coaching students. He is unequivocal about the importance of the teacher as a coach; in his description of the restructured school he states flatly that "a prominent pedagogy will be coaching" (Sizer, 1992, p. 208).

Jackson (1986) identifies two metaphors which he believes are useful to the present conception of teaching. One metaphor he calls the knowledge reproduction or warehouse concept; the other he labels as knowledge transformation. The former metaphor derives from the metaphor of a cistern used earlier by Dewey (1933). Each metaphor has implications for teacher behavior.

Under the warehouse concept, knowledge is viewed as a commodity to be deposited, by the teacher, and retrieved, by the student. The stored knowledge retains its original form and teachers ask questions to determine if the knowledge shipped (taught) is the same as the knowledge received. The very art of questioning by the teacher ("Did you understand?" "Yes." "Then prove it by
answering this set of questions.") reveals the nature of the learning.

In the knowledge transformation metaphor, the teacher's role changes dramatically. Here the object is for the learner to assimilate knowledge into the learner's perspective; the questions posed by the teacher change in character. Now what is important is how new knowledge is applied to novel situations and how it is integrated into judgment and understanding. The teacher is no longer concerned if the product shipped is identical to the product received. Knowledge applied does not necessarily have the same shape as the knowledge transmitted. The teacher's role becomes that of guide rather than expert; the teacher's approach must be exploratory and open ended, and the teacher becomes a searcher not only for answers but also, and most importantly, for appropriate questions (Jackson, 1986).

Jackson goes on to reflect that Socrates, arguably the greatest teacher in history, was not a subject matter expert. Socrates professed to know only three things, one of which was a negative. Socrates knew: (a) only that he did not know, (b) what kind of knowledge to seek, and (c) how to seek it. Socrates's role in the agora was that of guide or facilitator of knowledge.

Advocates of restructuring cite the new role of teacher as guide or facilitator as an essential component of restructuring (Milstein, 1993; Murphy, 1992; Spady, 1988). Schon (1983) sees the professional acting as a guide for students by reframing problems, asking pertinent questions and constructing a framework for students to use in an experimental approach to problem solving. Rosenshine (1987) argues that one important role of a teacher is to provide guided practice to students. Guided practice involves the teacher asking a
structured series of leading questions and providing students with the opportunity to rephrase and summarize information presented in this fashion. This role sets the stage for development of independent practice by students. Brown, Collins and Duguid (1989) describe the teacher's role in what they term a "cognitive apprenticeship" (p. 40) as that of a guide who leads students through a complex web of "social interaction, [a] social construction of knowledge and collaboration" (p. 40). The Accelerated Schools Project unequivocally advocates the teacher's role as one of facilitator of learning: "teachers serve as facilitator of student activities rather than as sole givers of knowledge" (Hopfenberg, 1991, p. 5).

**Leader in the school.** Most proponents of restructuring schools hold that teachers must assume leadership roles in the schools for restructuring initiatives to succeed; "teachers participate in decisions affecting the entire school and frequently perform leadership tasks" (Murphy, 1991, p. 32). The teacher as leader is a central role in Murphy's (1993) conceptual framework of restructuring (p. 8); successful reform efforts in Chicago (Hess, 1992) and San Diego (Payzant, 1992) have relied on teacher leadership to facilitate school improvement. Other researchers have identified the teacher's leadership role as important in general educational reform (Pierce, 1978), as a critical feature of modeling pedagogical excellence (Busching & Rawls, 1985), and as necessary to articulate staff development needs and foster self-improvement (Busching & Rawls, 1985; Dillon-Peterson, 1986). Teachers themselves described leadership as an essential function of a professional (Davidson, 1974). The conviction is that one role of the teacher is that of leader in the school.

Dewey expounded this theme much earlier when he characterized a good
teacher as a leader and not as an instructor (Dewey & Dewey, 1915, p. 40). Dewey (1933) employs the role of teacher as leader in a less political and more academic sense when he says of the teacher: "he is a leader, not in virtue of official position, but because of wider and deeper knowledge and matured experience" (p. 273). Waller (1932/1970) gives a compelling analysis of the two types of leadership he found extant in the schools: institutional and personal. Institutional leadership is a formal outgrowth of a predetermined social pattern, tends to be inflexible, depends on authority vested in an office and appears arbitrary to many observers. Personal leadership, by contrast, is situational, is determined by the personalities involved and is a reflection of social interaction. Personal leadership tends to supplant institutional leadership in times of crisis. Waller's analysis makes it clear that he believes teaching suffers from an excess of institutional leadership.

Educational policy maker. In their analysis of restructuring, Reavis and Griffith (1992) maintain that teachers should have a role in policy making, especially as it impacts curriculum, instructional concerns and the general culture of the school. McCarthy and Still (1992) report that empowerment requires teachers to take an active role in policy decisions. This role of teachers is noted in descriptions of restructuring projects (Murphy, 1992); Milstein (1993) states that teachers must share in policy making because this role insures that the opportunity for all stakeholders to discuss mission, goals, curriculum and instructional delivery methods is provided. Griffin (1986) observes that the teacher's role in policy making will lead to a more professional view of teaching, providing a frame of reference for teachers to talk about their work with
colleagues; as policy makers, teachers will be more responsive "to change, experimentation and taking chances" (p. 110). Sarason (1990) also identifies the policy making role as one which teachers want to exercise and which will lead to the beginnings of profound changes in school organization.

Aikin (1942), in his evaluation of the Eight Year Study, discerned an institutional and personal character to the teacher's exercise of a policy making role. When teachers acted as policy makers, the institution benefited through the generation of a comprehensive, definite goal for the school and the teacher benefited from professional growth. He noted that "this more extensive participation in curriculum building, policy making, and school management adds to teacher's loads, but they testify that it is worth much more in growth than it costs in time and energy" (p. 42).

Disciplinarian. The teacher's role of disciplinarian has a long history (Cuban, 1984) and is still considered an essential part of the skill required to create an environment conducive to learning (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994). In Goodlad's (1984) extensive study of schooling, schools which were perceived as less successful also scored high on indices of student misbehavior indicative of a relationship between satisfaction with schools and teachers' disciplinary skills. In the same study, teachers reported that establishing control and maintaining order in the classroom were important preconditions for learning. They acknowledged, however, that over-reliance on discipline encouraged students to become passive (Goodlad, 1984, p. 191).

Lortie (1975) reports that teachers felt their role as disciplinarians led to role conflict. Teachers recognized the need to elicit work from pupils who were
immature and whose emotional needs could be mercurial. Teachers felt that considerable classroom management and disciplinary expertise were required to balance the need for task accomplishment with the pupils' emotional needs. Lortie also cites a study that estimated that 40% of teacher activity was directed toward maintaining order (Hughes, 1959, cited by Lortie, 1975, p. 154).

Non-instructional duties, parent surrogate, provider of child care, referee and social worker. Jackson (1968) reports in his study of teacher roles that teachers engaged in a thousand interpersonal exchanges daily and he describes many teacher roles as that of "supply sergeant" (p. 12), "official timekeeper . . . combination traffic cop, and judge" (p. 13). He further observes that the teacher's day is so consumed with non-instructional duties that the casual observer might question whether a teacher's primary job was teaching. In the decades since Jackson's study, this feeling has not abated (Moughon & Gay, 1988). In his study, Goodlad (1984) reports that senior high school teachers spent 20% of their time in duties classified as non-instructional; Lortie (1975) had earlier found in interviews with teachers that their number one complaint was about the clerical, monitoring and non-instructional tasks required of them. Lortie terms this time (along with time devoted to external interruptions to the classroom) as "inert time" (p. 176), time when the potential for learning and teaching was absent. He contrasts inert time with "potentially productive time" (p. 176), which he defines as time devoted to direct activity or a related academic activity. Lortie concludes that the emphasis on the non-instructional role of teachers symbolizes a general lack of regard by the institution for the core functions, or roles, of teachers.

Ravitch (1983) notes that it is a peculiarly American belief that the public...
schools can cure society's problems. She maintains that Americans have believed that public education could

preserve democracy, eliminate poverty, lower the crime rate, enrich the common culture, reduce unemployment, ease the assimilation of immigrants to the culture, overcome differences between ethnic groups, advance scientific and technological progress, prevent traffic accidents, raise health standards, refine moral character, and guide young people into useful occupations (p. xii).

Ravitch's history illustrates the proliferation of roles for the American teachers. Whereas Jackson's work does not comment directly upon the whether a teacher should fulfill these myriad roles and Ravitch's work does, both authors observe that the requirement for and discharge of these roles has a profound impact on what transpires in the classroom.

Personal counselor/friend. Louis & King (1993) report on the assumption of counseling roles by teachers in two attempts to create student-focused schools; in their conclusion to the report, they state that all "members of the school community--teachers, administrators, parents, and students--must consciously come together and work to develop trusting relationships" (p. 247). Certainly, acting as personal counselors and as friends to students are viable methods to develop trusting relationships. Grumet (1988) maintains that the personal aspects of teaching--including acting as a friend and counselor--are essential for building a climate of trust in the classroom. For her "... increasingly mechanized and impersonal, most of our classrooms cannot sustain human relationships of sufficient intimacy to support the risks, the trust, and the expression that learning requires" (p. 56).

Gage (1972) describes teaching as a "uniquely human function" (p. 190)
where teachers are called upon to supply an affective component to improve student's self-esteem and creativity. Teacher characteristics, which Gage labels "warmth," are positively correlated with favorable assessments of teachers by students and with pupils' scores on achievement tests (p. 34). He defines warmth as "the tendency of the teacher to be approving, provide emotional support, express a sympathetic attitude, and accept the feelings of pupils" (Gage, 1965, p. 88). Teachers who are warm behave "approvingly, acceptantly and supportively; they tend to speak well of their own students, students in general, and people in general. They tend to like and trust rather than fear other people of all kinds" (Gage, 1972, p. 35).

Students believe effective teachers are warm and friendly towards them (Weinstein, 1983); the classrooms of effective teachers "are friendly and convivial" (Brophy, 1982, p. 529); teachers faced with students with chronic personal or adjustment problems were more successful when they built a personal relationship with the student in question (Porter & Brophy, 1988).

Goodlad's (1984) study finds that positive evaluation of schools by parents is strongly related to the amount of personal attention they (the parents) felt their child received at school; both students and parents wanted the school to see students as individuals and to provide a nurturing environment. This feeling represented an implicit assumption that a school (during the school day) should be what a good home was the rest of the time. Goodlad finds that teachers want to emphasize their personal role in teaching but felt some trepidation in exercising such a role. They acknowledged an essential personal facet to the "awareness, diagnosis and remediation of individual students' difficulties" (p. 89) and believed
that personal attention was necessary for instruction. They felt discomfort, however, when they had to demarcate the roles of substitute parent and caring professional. Lortie (1975) reports that when teachers were asked to describe outstanding teachers, their responses were dichotomized between instructional and relational modalities. Instructional modalities were conventional pedagogical approaches to teaching; relational modalities referred to interpersonal transactions which established preconditions for effective teaching and included reciprocal feelings of affection and respect. When probed about the qualities of outstanding teaching, teachers reported that the biggest mistakes they made on the job were interactional and emotional. Lortie's informants consistently stressed the relational over the pedagogical aspects of their jobs. He observes that other helping professionals (such as social workers or therapists) are trained to account for their own personalities in their work with clients; this analytic orientation is missing in teacher training. Lortie further reports that teachers identified role conflicts when they described the affective component of education. Although the expressive, affective side of the teacher's role was considered paramount, it was frequently placed in apposition, using the conjunction "but" or "yet" with the task accomplishment responsibilities of teachers; from Lortie's sociological perspective, this choice of words signified oppositional states and not ones of consonance.

Wallace (1990) analyzes student perceptions of teacher behaviors, and finds that behaviors identified as improving student performance were almost all affective in nature. Teacher characteristics like friendliness, expressions of caring, positive attitudes and willingness to talk to students on a personal level correlated with improved student performance. Cruickshank (1986) profiled 14 different
major studies of teacher effectiveness and concludes that teachers needed to be, in the affective dimension, "friendly and warm, encouraging and supportive, attentive, accepting and tolerant" (p. 86).

Curriculum developer. Numerous researchers have identified the role of curriculum developer as one consonant with a teacher's professional responsibilities. Howey (1983) identifies "skills in collaborative curriculum design" (p. 10) as essential for professionalization of teacher roles; Reavis and Griffith (1992) suggest that a coordinated approach to curriculum, instruction and discipline which includes an expanded role for teachers is necessary to avoid confusion over the professional status of teachers. Indeed, Elam (1989) observes that over half of the teachers surveyed by Phi Delta Kappa reported that they had no substantial role in curriculum development. Jackson (1968) had found twenty years earlier precisely what the Phi Delta Kappa poll reveals: teachers want the freedom to determine the curriculum they teach. They want this informed autonomy for two reasons. If the curriculum were imposed upon them, they felt it ran the risk of being too restrictive and of destroying classroom spontaneity. More importantly, the teachers in his study felt that the imposition of curriculum implied a lack of trust by the larger society in the teacher's professional judgment.

In another review of studies of student attention in class, Jackson (1968) also noted that varying the appropriateness of the curriculum was one of two strategies employed by teachers to keep students academically engaged. The Carnegie Forum (1986) also calls for teachers to assume responsibility for curriculum development as part of restructuring efforts.

In her feminist critique of teacher roles, Grumet (1988) argues that the
teacher's role as a curriculum developer has been hamstrung because curriculum
innovation occurred outside the political and ideological mainstream dominated
by patriarchal metaphors borrowed from business and industry. She argues that
such ideas as active exploration, group process and teamwork flounder and
disappear because "the innovations in curriculum often stopped at the classroom
door and did not penetrate programs of evaluation or credentialling" (p. 24).

Mentor. The role of teacher as mentor is two-fold: as mentor to new
teachers (Murphy, 1991; Shulman, St. Clair & Little, 1984) and as mentor to

Murphy (1992) reports on research where teachers assume responsibility
for "the mentoring and supervision of their peers--especially beginning teachers--
evaluating the work of principals, [and] providing professional development" (p.
30). Shulman, St. Clair and Little (1984) reported on the California Mentor
Teacher Program, which provided mentor teachers to new teachers; in addition,
mentor teachers developed new curricula and provided staff development
activities. According to their report, more than half of California school districts
used mentor teachers; most administrators (52%) viewed the mentor program in a
positive light.

Allen (1992) views both aspects of mentorship as essential for school
improvement. Accomplished teachers not only have a responsibility to assist in
the induction of new colleagues but also have a responsibility to foster learning on
a personal level with their pupils.

Fischetti, Dittmer and Kyle (1992) see the teacher's role as mentor as
fundamental to the establishment of a new educational paradigm based on a
constructivist view of knowledge. Fischetti, Ditmer and Kyle’s analysis is built upon the work of Dewey, Piaget and Vygotsky, all of whom focused on the construction of experience as fundamental to learning. Berscheid (1985) sees the construction of experience occurring within the context of our relationships with other people. For Berscheid, the personal aspect of learning is critical, for “much of this knowledge [about how to reconstruct experience] . . . [is] obtained within the individual’s actual ongoing personal relationships rather than through formal instruction” (p. 61). She continues, “the second major route to ‘knowing’ [interpersonal knowledge] is through actual observance of the specific other’s behavior and the context in which it occurs in order to arrive at one’s own dispositional conclusions” (p. 68); many children have no “secure base from which to develop social intelligence and competence. Thus, as they have in so many other cases of default in socialization by the family and community, many now look to the formal educational system to help compensate” (p. 71). Consequently, teachers are called upon to fulfill, in some instances, the role of mentor. As Peterson, Benet and Sherman (1991) observe in their study of successful urban teachers: “[t]eachers readily side-coach students for more successful schoolwork, interpersonal relations, and social skills. They give direct advice on personal behavior and problems” (pp. 182-183).

Legitimacy of diverse responses. Banks (1988) succinctly states the teacher’s responsibility in this area when he writes “[t]he classroom should be a forum of open inquiry, where diverse points of view and perspectives are shared and analyzed reflectively” (p. 166). Banks sees the teacher’s role as one of actively promoting social justice because “it is individual teachers—and not schools
per se—who can and do help students develop the ideals, knowledge and skills needed to reform society" (p. 168) within the context of democratic values. Banks further elucidates the teacher's role by noting that "[t]eachers, while respecting the beliefs and diversity of their students and helping them develop social science inquiry skills, can support democracy, equality, and the empowerment of victimized racial and ethnic groups" (p. 168). Banks' position is echoed by other researchers who see the teachers as playing an important role in creating "a better future" based upon "involvement, action, contribution, and responsibility" (Howard, 1993) and for "meeting the educational mission of the school in ways that do not totally compromise or ignore the cultural heritage and ethnic identity" (Gilbert & Gay, 1985, p. 136) of non-Anglo children. Manning (1993) specifically suggests that teachers "recognize learners of a particular culture may react differently to a given situation due to acculturation, social class, generalization, and developmental differences" (p. 16). Martin adds "gender sensitive" approaches to the recognition of diversity in American education (Martin, 1984 cited in Tozer, Violas & Senese, 1993).

**Fostering intellectual curiosity.** Dewey (1933) remarks that with respect, then to curiosity, the teacher has usually more to learn than to teach ... his province is rather to provide the materials and conditions by which original curiosity will be directed into investigations that have an aim ... an ability to ask of books as well as of persons (p. 40).

Dewey believes that the teacher's role must be to foster doubt, hesitation and perplexity which are essential components of wonder--to Dewey another form of intellectual curiosity. Earlier Dewey (1910) had defined this ineffable quality of human endeavor, intellectual curiosity, as "active, persistent, and careful
consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends" (p. 6).

Dewey clearly believes that developing intellectual curiosity is an important role for teachers and schools. Belth (1965) echoes Dewey's philosophy when he argues that the concern of teachers should be to develop intelligence within the context of freedom to think and to act; that is, to produce self-directed individuals who can make their own inquiries and arrive at their own independent decisions (pp. 9-11). The essence of the teacher's role is not to foster absorption but rather to promote inquiry. For Belth (1965), stimulating the development of intellectual curiosity in students is an essential role for teachers because it leads to intellectual liberation which in turn means "that no . . . derived or inherited system of beliefs is beyond further inquiry. To remove it from investigation is almost certainly to transform a model originally designed creatively for purposes of freedom into a doctrine of restraint" (p. 41).

**Exercising professional judgment.** The literature is replete with references to a teacher's responsibility to exercise professional judgment. Sizer (1984) describes judgment as "the heart of teaching" (p. 3); it is the key characteristic of a good teacher because judgment fosters adaptability, permitting teachers to tailor their instruction to individual students. Goodlad (1990) calls upon teachers to make policy decisions for their schools and to bear the "burden of judgment" (p. 5). Grimmett and Mackinnon (1992) see judgment as the glue that holds all professional knowledge bases together (p. 387). Jackson (1968) reports that teachers engage in a thousand interpersonal interchanges every day and that judgment plays a critical role in instructional decisions. As Jackson (1968)
given the complexity of his work, the teacher must learn to tolerate a high degree of uncertainty and ambiguity. He must be content with doing not what he knows is right, but what he thinks or feels is the most appropriate action (p. 167, emphasis in original).

Berliner (1987) also notes the importance of judgment in the teacher's role. To him, teaching requires "complex decision making about the application of many principles" (p. 24).

Celebrating error in the learning process. Many observers have noted the importance of error in learning. Good (1987) stresses the importance of determining the character of the errors students make. In studies of teacher questioning behaviors he states that "[i]t is vital that teachers consider the quality of errors" (p. 188, emphasis in original). He delineates five possible types of errors and concludes that high quality errors—for example, reasoning based on sound logic with a plausible but faulty rationale—may actually be pedagogically acceptable. Such errors can advance the lesson if the teacher recognizes them and employs them to correct misunderstandings. He advances his argument by noting that teacher recognition of high quality errors by low achieving students is particularly crucial. Detection of such errors gives the teacher the opportunity to elicit further responses and to present challenging material. Sizer (1984) somewhat glubly announces that "[g]ood schools promote displays of incompetence . . . in order to help students find their way to competence" (p. 174). Jackson (1986) asks if students know "that it is safe not to know" (p. 59)?

Enhancing self-esteem. Gage (1972), reflecting on the changes that technology will make on the roles of teachers, states that a new role for teachers
must be to provide a more powerful affective role model to promote student self-esteem and creativity; he observes that teacher roles must also change in light of societal demands on education. Society values cognitive objectives for education, but it also requires that schools and teachers provide opportunities for "problem solving by groups, social development, enrichment, projects for individual needs and recognizing and rewarding creativity" (p. 137).

The teacher's role in promoting self-esteem as a corequisite of learning is well documented. Nave (1990) reports that self-esteem is more highly correlated with success than is IQ and that promotion of student self-esteem by teachers can be an effective component of drop out prevention programs. Improvement of students' self-esteem is also seen as an essential component of interventions with at-risk students (Conant, 1992; Garibaldi, 1992; Whisler, 1992), as a way to promote cooperative learning (Manning & Lucking, 1991) and as a way of promoting children's moral development (Walsh, 1994).

Parent educator. Gage (1977) suggests that teachers, parents and the community train together to create an educational experience for children which is wider in scope than that which is presently available. Although Gage believes that all parties have something to learn from mutual cooperation, it is clear that he sees teachers exercising a pedagogical role in the relationship. In Grumet's (1988) analysis, the natural alliance between teachers and parents (and the free exchange of information about children which is the natural by-product of such an alliance) is precluded by the adoption, by educators, of industrial and bureaucratic language, economic ethic and metaphor. Grumet (1988) maintains that
the gender contradictions, the simultaneous assertion and denial of femininity, have served to estrange teachers of children from the mothers of those children. Instead of being allies, mothers and teachers distrust each other. Bearing credentials of a profession that claimed the colors of motherhood and then systematically delivered the children over to the language, rules and relations of the patriarchy, teachers understandably feel uneasy, mothers suspicious (p. 56).

For Grumet, the natural relationship between mothers and teachers--which should permit the teacher to help the mother help the child (and vice versa)--is poisoned by the dominant social ethic. This unfortunate situation has two consequences pertinent to the teacher's role in parent education. The first is that whereas Grumet recognizes the potential for the teacher acting as a parent educator and acknowledges the importance of this role, she concedes that this rarely happens. The gulf between teacher and parent is frequently too wide to be bridged.

The second consequence for teacher-parent interaction is that teachers frequently want contact with parents only when the child is having difficulty. Lortie's (1975) informants confided this and he further found that teachers did not want more contact with the parents of successful students and, furthermore, that the schools and teachers wanted to define the context of parental contact by limiting access, duration, frequency and purpose of such contacts.

The ambiguity surrounding the relationship of teachers with parents is particularly disquieting given the prominence that reform efforts accord parental involvement in restructuring (Murphy, 1993; Payzant, 1992). Payzant (1992) concludes "one prerequisite for effective parental involvement may be parenting education" (p. 96).

Berliner (1987) reviews research on parent involvement programs and
concludes that such programs improve student achievement particularly with low income pupils. Berliner does not address the gender differences which are paramount in Grumet's argument, but he does note that racial, ethnic and class differences complicate the school-parent-teacher triad and he calls for a redefinition of the teacher's role vis-a-vis their pedagogical relationship with the parents.

Tangri and Moles (1987) reported on a program to educate parents on pedagogical strategies used in the school and then have those parents visit other parents to discuss classroom activities and to provide supplemental work for pupils. This intervention appeared to positively impact drop out rates and grade retention. They also cite a 1978 Gallup poll where 80% of parents surveyed thought that parents should attend evening classes to learn how to improve their children's performance in school.

Moral education. That the teacher has a role in moral education and that moral education has for decades been a part of American education--either implicitly or explicitly--is unquestioned. Flanagan (1978) cites the 1918 National Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education as stating that one of the cardinal principles of secondary education was to develop the ethical character of students.

For many researchers, teaching is an inherently moral task and teachers provide moral instruction either interventionally or inadvertently. Welker (1992) quotes Herbert Kohl as saying: "it is the teacher’s struggle to be moral that excites his pupils; it is honesty not rightness that moves children" (p. 72). Sizer (1984) identifies the teacher's role in moral education as a component of one of the
fundamental purposes of education: the enlargement of values and ideas. For Fenstermacher (1990), the teacher has a paramount role in a student's moral development. "The moral and intellectual development of the learner is sustained best when the finest practitioners remain as close to and as involved with the learner as possible" (p. 141).

Teachers interviewed by Lortie (1975) identified the moral aspect of their jobs as one of three major roles they fulfilled in school. Under tasks they identified as predominantly moral, they also included the function of teaching patriotism and citizenship.

Cohen (1987), Goodlad (1984) and Tom (1984) all view teaching as a moral activity and the teacher's role as one of transmitting a moral order. Cohen (1987) argues that effective schools share a moral order which creates an "identity for the school, provides meaning to membership in it, and reduces alienation" (p. 481). Goodlad (1984) describes the teacher's moral responsibility for "humanizing knowledge . . . organizing and presenting humankind's knowledge and intellectual tools in such fashion as to make them accessible to all" (p. 125).

Tom (1984) calls for schools to become more involved in moral education. Citing polls that reveal popular support for moral education, he argues that society needs tools to come to terms with racism, sexism, abortion and drug use, all of which he views as essentially moral issues. For him teaching is a moral activity because it involves the moral instruction of the young. It does so because the inclusion of a particular curriculum, either implicitly or explicitly, "reflects a conception of desirable ends and the general concept of valuation carries with it implications for conduct" (p. 78).
Interpreter of information explosion. One basic role of teachers, about which there seems to be little debate, is that of providing structures to help students understand new knowledge (Berliner, 1987b). The provision of what Berliner calls "ideational scaffolding" helps students identify, store and retrieve information. Teachers who are adept at constructing such a framework are good explainers and can model ways for students to process information (p. 290). Part of this modeling for students involves gathering, processing and employing new information.

It has been estimated that the information which has been compiled by humanity doubles every four or five years; that more information has been produced in the last 30 years than in the previous 5,000 (Linowes, 1991); and that the half-life of an engineer's knowledge was, in 1988, five years.

Given these realities--i.e., the teacher's role in facilitating the acquisition of new knowledge and the tremendous growth in new knowledge--it is logical to conclude that teachers must assist students in interpreting the information explosion. As Berliner points out, tying the new to the familiar can speed up learning (Berliner, 1987b, p. 286). It is the teacher's role to mediate information acquisition.

Transmitter of culture and Promoting patriotism and citizenship. Goodlad (1990b) identifies four dimensions of teaching including "facilitating enculturation" (p. 46). He defines the teacher's role as one of transmitting the foundations of political democracy, of developing effective citizens and of inculcating in students an appreciation for intangibles like truth, beauty and justice. In an earlier survey on teacher, student and parent satisfaction, Goodlad (1984) had included cultural
transmission as a goal of the school. Pounds and Bryner (1967) stress the role of the school and of teachers as transmitters of culture. Lortie's (1975) subjects identified their responsibilities in promoting citizenship as one of the major components of their role in the school. Tom (1984) observes that "in short, the teacher's task is to interpret our society's past traditions and current realities to the young" (p. 84).

Gray (1995) identifies the fundamental political problems of the late 20th century as a retreat from civic engagement. Like Dewey, he views people as social beings and argues that many fundamental rights accrue to civil or social beings; i.e., people who function within the webs of community and family. He believes that the challenge to society (and the schools have an unarguable role in furthering social goals) is to promote what he calls civic humanism, a sense of commitment to democratic ideals on the part of our citizenry. Gray's belief that an educated, virtuous and civic minded citizenry is the best guarantor of democracy is the latest manifestation of a role for education which traces its origin to Thomas Jefferson (Ravitch, 1983).

Banks (1988) sees the teacher's role as that of cultural mediator who "interpret[s] the mainstream and ethnic cultures to students" (p. 166). For Banks, teachers must display extraordinary sensitivity to both the macro- and microcultures extant in the schools.

Innovator or experimenter to improve education. Allen (1992) believes that innovation and experimentation are fundamental to teachers' roles if meaningful school reform is to occur. He maintains that experimentation in education has generally failed for four reasons: (a) experimentation has had no
mandate over an extended period of time; (b) evaluation has frequently been inappropriate or unsystematic; (c) experiments have been used as scapegoats to explain other failures in the educational system; and (d) teachers (as well as students and administrators) have been disenfranchised by reform efforts. The impact of this disenfranchisement has been that teachers have had no input into decisions about experimental curriculum, teaching or evaluation methods. Nor have they had a choice about participation. In order for comprehensive school reform to work, he argues, teachers have to be full partners in the undertaking.

The Accelerated Schools Project (ASP) unequivocally calls for teachers to be experimenters. "Teachers implement experimental programs as a result of communicating about and reflecting upon the school's problems" (Hopfenberg, Levin, Meister & Rogers, 1990). ASP relies on a mechanism, known as the Inquiry Process, to determine curriculum, instruction and organization for accelerated schools. In the Inquiry Process, teachers, administrators and staff identify challenges for their school, devise alternative solutions and experiment to evaluate those solutions (Hopfenberg, 1991).

Goodlad (1984) believes that experimentation is essential to break free of routine teaching methods. For him, "mere refinement of conventional practice is not sufficient. We will only begin to get evidence of the potential power of pedagogy when we dare to risk and support markedly deviant classroom procedures" (p. 249).

Busching and Rawls (1985) also identify a role for teachers as experimenters and researchers. For them, teachers should be active in testing new ideas in program development and instructional technique.
Student. The Kentucky Task Force on High School Restructuring (1993) identifies the teacher's continued intellectual growth as essential in meeting the state's restructuring goals. "[A]s lifelong learners and scholars, educators must constantly strive to grow, improve and innovate" (p. 13). The idea that teachers are lifelong learners is fundamental to the idea of staff development (Fullan, 1990) and to restructuring (Murphy, 1991). In fact, for Murphy (1991), "the categories of teacher as colleague, teacher as decision maker, teacher as leader, and teacher as learner capture the essence of the new roles for teachers in restructured schools" (p. 32).

Joyce, Bennett and Rolheiser-Bennett (1990) see the teacher as student as an aspect of empowerment. They reviewed research on teacher acquisition of specific pedagogical skills, on experiences designed to help teachers view their performance critically (with a view to improvement) and on programs to assist teachers to learn to construct more productive work environments through collective action; their conclusion is that the teacher's role as learner is under utilized and has great potential for expanding teacher competence (p. 38).

Fostering independence in students. Preparing students to meet the unexpected. Preparing students to accept responsibility for decision making and Encouraging students to develop judgment. These roles for teachers are all interconnected and are commingled under the rubrics Learning Environment, Meaningful Learning and Assessment by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 1994). The NBPTS document calls for teachers to "provide[e] students choices among learning and performance options" and to promote "multiple solutions and perspectives" for student learning (p. 23).
Teachers must also develop students' capacities to think critically and "recognize that today's complicated world requires a multifaceted approach to thinking and acting" (p. 25), and promote student learning accordingly. By building understanding, teachers help "students use what they already know to pose, explore and solve new problems. Encouraging such independence helps students gain confidence that they can solve problems they have never before encountered" (p. 26). Furthermore, teachers seeking Board certification "recognize the long-term importance of young adolescents assuming responsibility for their own learning" (p. 32).

Bruner (1962) observed that "the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing. The goal of education is disciplined understanding; that is the process as well" (p. 122). He develops this idea further when he argues that one objective of the teacher should be to lead pupils to discover for themselves and then to use that knowledge: "the leap from mere learning to using what one has learned in thinking is an essential step in the use of the mind." (p. 124) The role of the teacher is to guide the pupil in practicing decision making, exercising judgment and even in "plausible guessing" (p. 124).

Dewey (1910) also identifies the importance of teachers, as the agents of formal education, in promoting decision making on the part of students, in fostering independence and responsibility and in preparing students to meet the unexpected when he discusses judgment and thinking. Judgment and critical thinking entail

a constant tentative picking out of certain qualities to see what emphasis upon them would lead to; a willingness to hold final selection in suspense; and to reject the factors entirely or relegate them to a different position in
the evidential scheme if other features yield more solvent suggestions. Alertness, flexibility, curiosity are the essentials; dogmatism, rigidity, prejudice, caprice, arising from routine, passion, and flippancy are fatal (pp. 105-106).

Other writers note the importance of these roles for teachers when they discuss the transformative nature of education. Welker (1992) observes that "the teacher whose knowledge has not been used to make the student less dependent has failed" (p. 136). Jackson (1986) maintains that teachers must help students prepare for the ambiguities and unexpected nature of modern life by promoting cooperative work.

According to Jackson (1986), one strategy for doing so is to make sure that students "know it is safe not to know" (p. 59), and hence actively seek new approaches (such as cooperative learning) to learn how to solve problems. Sizer (1984) describes the process of inquiry for students as proceeding in discrete steps culminating in application; that is, making an estimate as to the probability that one's inquiry is correct. This is an essential process to creating independent learners.

Other observers (Porter & Brophy, 1988) see student involvement in what is to be learned as the first step in establishing student responsibility for decision making. Still others view establishing methods to improve student accountability as a way to encourage student ownership of the classroom (Evertson, 1987), argue that increasing the amount of responsibility for decision making on the part of students increases the students' susceptibility to their teacher's expectations of performance (Good, 1987), and see increased student involvement in decision making and independent inquiry as ways of democratizing the classroom (Sarason,
Although the value of independent action and of student involvement in decision making has been well documented (Aikin, 1942) and is acknowledged by accomplished practitioners (Steffans, 1990), it is a neglected area of pedagogical activity. This oversight has not been missed by students. In his analysis of a study of the perceived value of secondary education (a study which lasted 20 years and involved nearly 400,000 students), Tyler (1978) found that when adults looked back at their high school experience, they ranked as very important educational experiences that would "develop the ability to plan, to understand the meaning of life" or to aid in "decision making"; but they also believed that school did not transmit any of those skills. The subjects saw secondary school as designed to communicate a series of facts, not a way of understanding or living in the natural world.

In addition to the above roles, four additional roles were added to the study. Three roles were added as a result of a series of interviews (N = 50) with educational stakeholders. These roles, which emerged from the collective wisdom of the stakeholders, are: (a) academic role model, (b) moral role model, and (c) the teacher's role in motivating students to learn.

In the unfocused section of the interviews, when informants were asked what they thought were the most important roles for teachers, 44% (n = 22) identified roles related to providing an academic role model for students as important; 18% (n = 9) believed that an important role for teachers was that of providing a moral role model; and 26% (n = 13) identified the teacher's role in motivating students as important. These three roles represented the largest
concentrations of unprompted roles provided by informants.

There is also support in the literature for including the teacher's role as academic role model and in motivating students. Brophy (1987) neatly combines the two, discussing academic modeling as a strategy to motivate students:

In all of your interactions with your students, routinely model interest in learning: let the students see that you value learning as a rewarding, self-actualizing activity that produces personal satisfaction and enriches your life (p. 227, emphasis in original).

In a similar vein, Gage (1972) believes that teachers should act as role models to foster the student's ability to initiate independent inquiry.

Corno (1987) identifies student motivation as a "desperate concern" of teachers (p. 253); Bloom (1968/1985) views the teacher's role in motivation in more indirect terms. The teacher's role is to promote mastery learning; and self-motivation for further learning is one of the chief affective consequences of mastery learning. Lieberman and Miller (1990) also view motivation as a component of the teacher's affective responsibilities. They believe that "the affective mission requires that teachers somehow make friends with their students, motivate them, arouse their interest and engage them on a personal level" (p. 153).

A fourth role was added (the teacher's role in students' spiritual development) for several reasons. Only two informants specified this role as important in the unfocused section of the interview, but nearly one-fifth of the informants mentioned the teacher's role in moral education as being important.

The teacher's role in modeling moral and proper behavior for students is closely related to the idea that moral behavior is rooted in spiritual enlightenment. In
Western culture, spiritual development and moral rectitude are indissolubly wed; one need think only of the widespread use of the phrase Judeo-Christian ethics to discern how closely aligned are formalized spirituality and conventions of morality. Similarly, in the Phaedo, when Socrates argues for the existence of the soul he maintains that the existence of realities like wisdom, virtue and beauty demand the existence of the soul; and it is the soul through the "instrumentality of the body" (Plato, trans. 1961, Bollingen Series, p. 62) which makes inquiries of the physical world; indeed, in the Apology, Socrates states that "real wisdom is the property of God" (Plato, p. 9).

Huebner (1985) maintains that the resistance in schools to assuming a more active role in students' spiritual development is based on a long-running argument between schooling and a specific religious tradition. He believes that spirituality needs to be viewed in a new light and suggests that it might usefully be perceived as an aspect of life that is more than human and which implies the existence of deeper, hidden dimensions of life. The spiritual may be "lived reality, about experience and the possibility of experiencing" (p. 164).

The role of teachers in a student's spiritual development was once taken for granted. Aikin (1942) notes that Mississippi's program for the improvement of instruction included "Expressing Religious Impulses" (p. 74) as one of only nine points. Dewey (1910/1964), at the very end of the pedagogic creed which outlines his beliefs about the roles of education, schools and teachers, concludes that, in respect to the teacher's ability to promote individual development and social progress, "the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God" (p. 439).
Whereas this review of the literature offers a powerful rationale for employing the framework of these particular roles in a study such as the present one, several points remain to be made about the roles which are the subject of inquiry. First, all the categories are arbitrary and are not intended, in any general or specific sense, to be exclusive. Because teachers may act as guides or facilitators of learning, for example, does not imply that they do not also have a role in fostering student decision making. In many cases the roles are interrelated; it is difficult to conceive of a truly effective teacher who did not foster intellectual curiosity in students or provide opportunities for students to employ judgment. Lieberman and Miller's (1990) remarks quoted above attest to the interrelated nature of teacher roles.

Second, in the review of the literature, roles were grouped together when they were interrelated and where a particular work supported more than one role. Thus, the roles of transmitter of culture and of fostering patriotism and citizenship were grouped together because both supported the general notion of the teacher's role in acculturation.

Third, the literature review included several techniques elucidated by Cooper (1982), including using the invisible college, descendency and on-line searches. The invisible college approach involved contacting by telephone, meetings or e-mail, scholars working on similar or related subjects and soliciting relevant citations or avenues of promising inquiry. The descendency approach involved scouring the reference lists of relevant studies for papers central to the topic of this study. On-line searches of relevant data bases were conducted for appropriate citations. Additional technologies included brainstorming with faculty
members and education professionals and generating lists of relevant teacher roles. Interviews were conducted with stakeholders to confirm roles for inclusion in the study. In this fashion, the process of the literature review led substantially to the product used in the study, i.e., the list of roles. Significantly, no major roles for teachers were identified in the literature review which had not been anticipated by other research techniques such as the invisible college approach or brainstorming.

One other salient point emerged from the literature review. Based on the review for this study, it appears that scholars intent on the reform of American education tend to divide into two basic camps. One camp, whose proponents include Lortie, Sarason, Goodlad, Sizer and Schlecty describe schools accurately enough but tend to lament, Cassandra-like, the state of education while proposing little in the way of directly practical approaches to remedy the problems. The other camp, whose proponents include Berliner, Brophy, Good, Rosenshine and Evertson, provides practical advice on topics like use of instructional time, teacher wait time in questioning students, teacher question asking behavior and classroom time on task. Unfortunately, they seem more concerned about how teachers ask questions in classrooms than they do about what teachers ask. Jackson (1985) notes this politely when he comments about a conference on inattentiveness in the classroom.

Moreover, when we turn from empirical descriptions of inattentiveness to the question of what to do about such a state of affairs, the answers emanating from the research community to date are very small in number and strike me as being singularly lacking in inventiveness. For example, in one of the conference papers it was seriously proposed that pupils might be required to sharpen their pencils before class as a way of increasing engaged learning time. An additional suggestion was for the teacher to
have paper passed out ahead of time (p. 306).

In conclusion, the review of pertinent literature has established that national movements for the professionalization of teaching and for school restructuring both demand a reconceptualization of teacher roles. National certification standards also imply an expanded definition of the roles of teachers. The literature review also provides ample evidence that the roles initially selected for inquiry in this study (listed in Appendix A) have been identified by a disparate but scholarly group of researchers as components of teacher roles.
Design of the Study

This study employs a case study methodology to examine the perceptions of discrete groups of educational stakeholders about the roles of teachers in two temporal conditions: the present and the future. For the purposes of this study, the future is defined as the 21st century. The case study methodology has been chosen because the topic under study is defined broadly, includes the contextual conditions within which the roles occur and relies on multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 1993, p. xi). The unit of analysis (the case) is the perception about teacher roles of discrete groups. The groups investigated are teachers, preservice teachers, community leaders and parents.

The study was designed in two steps: a series of structured interviews and a card sort. The structured interviews were conducted with members of discrete groups, each with a direct interest in but varying perspective on education. Nine different groups in the study were identified by a descriptor indicating job or role in the schools (Media, Business, Police, Parents, Central Office, Teachers, Principals, Students and School Board). Individuals from these groups were interviewed for a total N of 50. All interviews were conducted according to an interview protocol (Appendix B) and the university's Human Subjects Review
Board also approved the methodology. The interview phase of the study was conducted to validate the selection of roles to be used in the second step of the study (the card sort) and to solicit potential new roles for inclusion.

For the second step of the study, 35 roles were printed on cards and presented to respondents for rank ordering in two different temporal conditions: the present and the future. Appendix A is a list of roles employed and Appendix C is the instructions for the card sort. Four groups (identified as Community Leaders, Parents, Teachers and Preservice Teachers) with a total N of 129 participated in the second step of the study. Table 1 summarizes groups participating in the study.

Selection of Informants

Informants were selected for inclusion in the study because they held membership in particular groups with an interest in education and because the groups are representative of the constituencies of education. Murphy (1992) defines the school community as "parents, professional educators, businesses, universities, foundations and the general populace" (p. 12); NCATE (1992) defines the broad constituencies of education as teachers, school administrators, school board members, business men and women, parents, students, preservice teachers and community leaders. A general group name was assigned to each group; group names reflect the field in which the individual worked or held membership. Groups represented in the interview portion of the study were: Media, Business, Police, Parents, Central Office (school system), Teachers, Principals, Students (both high school and university) and School Board. The group Media (n = 6) included individuals who worked either as writers, editors or
Informants were selected not only for the membership in groups recognized as the major constituencies of education but also based on guidelines suggested for case study research by Yin (1993), i.e., "criticality for the theory being tested . . . topical relevance . . . [and] feasibility and access . . . [a] person or group willing to be the subject of a case study" (p. 34).

The groups which participated in the second step of the study were grouped under the rubrics Community Leaders (n = 29), Parents (n = 21), Teachers (n = 47) and Preservice Teachers (n = 32) for a total N of 129. Community Leaders included members of the Hampton Roads (Virginia) Chamber of Commerce Education Committee and members of the Ocean View Coordinating Committee, the executive board for a coalition of civic, business and service organizations for a section of Norfolk, Virginia. The group Parents included parents of elementary and middle school students who attend urban
public schools in Norfolk. The Teachers group was composed of 12 elementary, 11 middle and 10 high school teachers from public schools engaged in a long-term (10 year) restructuring effort and five elementary, five middle and four high school teachers from one comprehensive private school located in an urban setting.

Table 1

Groups Represented in Interview Portion of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Media</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Police</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central Office</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Principals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School Board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups Represented in Card Sort Portion of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Leaders</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preservice Teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Data Collection

The structured interviews were conducted from September through November 1994 in Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia.

All interviews were conducted according to an interview protocol (Appendix B) by the investigator or graduate students enrolled in Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. Graduate students who assisted the investigator all participated in an interview session themselves as an orientation and training exercise prior to their interviewing any informants. Interview strategies were discussed with them prior to field work, and data collection and suggestions for conducting interviews were reviewed. For instance, Question #1 asked informants: "What do you think are the most important roles of teachers?" If informants paused after naming one role, interviewers were instructed to probe for more substantial replies by asking simple but leading questions like: "Are there any other roles you think are important?" If additional clarification was desired, interviewers were instructed to ask questions like: "Tell me more about that, please."

Interviews included both focused and unfocused sections. Unfocused sections included questions like Question #1 ("What do you think are the most important roles of teachers?") where the interviewers simply noted the informant's reply; and Question #5 ("Do you think teacher roles will change in the future?") where, again, only the informant's response was noted. The focused section provided informants with 31 2.5" x 3.5" cards on which a simple declarative sentence about teacher roles was printed; each card was numbered as a means of tracking its position when sorted. A list of these roles is included as Appendix A.
The roles printed on the cards were identified by the methods discussed in Chapter II — the invisible college (that is, discussions with other researchers investigating the roles of teachers in educational reform), the review of pertinent literature, and discussions with colleagues. Informants were asked to separate the cards into two piles. One pile would be roles the informant deemed important and the other would be those roles the informant considered unimportant. At the conclusion of the focused section of the interview, the informant was asked to select, from the important pile, the five roles they thought were most important. The interviewer noted the informant's responses to the questions on a form provided by the investigator.

Interviews were not tape recorded for two reasons. First, it was possible to obtain the information necessary to complete the study from the notes taken by each interviewer. Second, and more importantly, the interviews were not taped because it was felt that taping would have inhibited the informants' responses (particularly for those informants with potentially politically sensitive positions in the schools, such as principals or school board members) and that their responses would, consequently, have been less spontaneous and candid.

The interview phase of the study was conducted for two purposes: (a) to validate the selection of roles to be used in the second section of the study, and (b) to solicit potential new roles for inclusion. Informants agreed that the 31 roles used were representative of the components of teacher's roles and rarely identified, in the unfocused section, any role not already included in the card sort. Contamination of unfocused responses by focused ones was minimized since the
cards with the teacher roles printed on them were not presented to the informants until well after their opinions were solicited. The notes of each interviewer, as recorded on the interview protocol, were analyzed to determine if additional teacher roles should be included in the final card sort. Where significant numbers of respondents (defined as at least 20%) identified a new role (i.e., one not on the cards) as important, that role was incorporated into the subsequent card sort.

Roles added as a result of the interviews were numbers 32, 33, 34 and 35. These are, respectively: The teacher's role as an academic role model, as a moral role model, in motivating students to learn and in students' spiritual development.

The interviews yielded a total of 35 roles for use in the second step of the study.

For the second step of the study, the 35 roles were individually printed on 2" x 4.25" cards for sorting. Respondents were asked to rank order the teacher roles from most important to least important in two temporal conditions — the present and the future. Each card had printed on it the applicable temporal condition (Present -- Today; or Future -- 21st Century) and the stem for the role (The teacher's role in . . . ; or The teacher's role as . . . ; as grammatically appropriate); the stem was printed in 1/8" high letters and the role itself in larger 1/4" high letters. The list of roles is included as Appendix A. As an aid to organization, each role was numbered. To facilitate sorting, roles for the present were printed on pale gray cards and roles for the future were printed on blue cards. Thus participants were provided with two sets of cards (one for the present and one for the future), a sheet to provide demographic information (identical to the sheet used in the interview protocol) about themselves to facilitate data
analysis, and a sheet of instructions (Appendix C). The instructions directed the participants to rank order the cards according to how they perceived the importance of specific teacher roles. Additionally, participants were asked to insert into their stack of cards a 2" x 4.25" neon pink card (provided) to distinguish between important and unimportant roles. That is, participants placed above the pink card all roles considered important: all below it were ranked by participants as unimportant.

Participants performed the card sort without additional input from the investigator. When the cards were delivered to the participants, arrangements were made to retrieve the completed card sorts. Participants either received a stamped envelope in which to return the cards or the investigator made arrangements to pick up the completed card sort, either from the individual respondents or, in the case of teachers, from a central location such as the school office.

After the card sorts were completed, the cards were returned to the investigator who transcribed the rank order of the cards onto two different matrices: one for the present sort and one for the future sort. Data collected in the second section of the study consisted of this transcribed rank ordering, along with demographic information about the respondents.

Questions for Analysis

Rank order data in both temporal conditions from the second section of the study (the card sort) was analyzed to address the following questions:

1. Do the groups, on aggregate, share a consensus on which teacher roles are important in the present?
2. Do the groups, on aggregate, share a consensus on which teacher roles are important for the future?

3. Is there consensus within groups regarding the importance of specific teacher roles both now and for the future?

4. Does any pattern emerge, either within or between groups, from the data regarding the number of roles considered important (or unimportant)?

5. Can rank order of roles be predicted from group membership or other demographic information? For example, do teachers tend to order roles in any predictable fashion which is different from the other groups?
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data collected for this study were analyzed in two ways: with the use of statistical tools (chi-square, Cramér's V and a Kruskal-Wallis test) and by examining frequencies of response, both weighted and non-weighted. This two-pronged approach was adopted because it yields the most complete picture of the results, allowing an examination of the nuances of meaning inherent in case study data and providing a solid basis for drawing conclusions about the data. Ranking frequencies of response permitted examination of those roles which tended to cluster together at the top, or important, end of the scale and those which clustered together at the bottom, or less important, end of the scale.

Statistical Analysis

An analysis was done comparing the demographic characteristics of the respondents to their ranking of roles in both temporal conditions, i.e., present and future. Each respondent was identified by a numerical code indicating membership in one of nine categories (parent, preservice teacher, public elementary school teacher, public middle school teacher, public high school teacher, private elementary school teacher, private middle school teacher, private high school teacher or community leader), age, gender, educational background (subdivided into categories of less than high school, high school, some college,
college degree, master's level course work, master's degree or more than master's
degree), ethnicity (white, African-American, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, other),
years of experience in education, years of experience in urban education, and
whether respondents were enrolled in a degree program at the present time or
not. Each variable was compared with the respondent's ranking of roles for
temporal conditions of both present and future times. Both chi-square and
Cramér's V tests were run to discover if there was any statistically significant
relationship between any demographic variables and the rank order of the roles.
Although some minor relationships were observed (educational level, for instance,
was correlated with selection of the first place role in the future at the .005 level
and with the fourth place role in the future at the .021 level), these appeared to
be instances of random significance. Consequently, no significant interaction
between demographic characteristics and rankings of roles was observed.

Because the responses of more than two groups of respondents were being
analyzed, a Kruskal-Wallis test was run on the data as an additional check.
Again, no significant interactions were found. Based on these statistical analyses,
it is reasonable to conclude that there was no significant statistical relationship
between group membership, or other demographic characteristic, and the rank
respondents assigned to teacher roles.

The absence of a relationship between group membership and rankings is
quite important. As is discussed later, there is general agreement by disparate
groups, some of which are only tangentially connected to the schools, about those
roles perceived as important. This suggests that a broad consensus about the
central roles of teachers may exist in the general population.
Despite the general level of agreement about those roles which are important and unimportant, when the data are disaggregated and examined by group some differences are observed. These differences are discussed in a later section.

Selection of Important and Unimportant Roles

The data were then analyzed to determine where the respondents placed the division between important and unimportant roles. In the ranking of present roles, the least number of roles perceived to be important was nine. That is, one respondent, of the 129 participating in the card sort phase, placed the division between important and unimportant roles between rankings nine and ten. The next lowest number of perceived important roles was 13; that is, a second respondent placed the division between important and unimportant roles between rankings 13 and 14. Slightly more than half (56%) of the respondents (n = 72 of N = 129) believed at least 25 roles were important, placing the division between important and unimportant between locations 25 and 26. Nine respondents thought that all roles were important in the present. Conversely, no respondent thought that, in the present, all of the roles were unimportant.

The pattern was similar for the responses for the future. One respondent placed the division between important and unimportant roles between rankings 9 and 10 and two more respondents placed the division between rankings 13 and 14. Again, slightly more than half (54% or n = 69) placed the division between important and unimportant roles between rankings 26 and 27. And no respondent thought that, in the future, all roles were unimportant.

For both present and future states there appears to be general agreement
that a large number of roles performed by teachers are important; indeed, more than half the respondents agreed that 25 or 26 of the roles could be categorized as important. That most respondents identified 25 or more discrete roles as important for teachers suggests that the groups members believe that teaching is a rich, complex activity encompassing far more than the mere inculcation of facts.

Analysis of Mode

The rankings were also analyzed to determine the mode or most commonly selected role for each ranking; that is, which role was most often selected for a particular ranking. The top 10 selections are summarized in Tables 2 and 3. (In the text and in the tables, roles will be identified by a brief descriptor which is listed in Appendix A. This is done in the interests of brevity and clarity.) Note that the analysis does not measure the second or third choices in a particular ranking; hence this may tend to overdramatize the selection of specific roles over others. It is instructive, however, to observe that a display of the mode indicates movement towards viewing the teacher as a guide or facilitator of learning as that role clusters at the top of the scale in the future rankings. Also, the teacher's role in enhancing student self-esteem tends to be viewed as more important for the present than for the future. Perhaps the most revealing characteristic of this particular analysis is that the role of subject matter expert was never selected as the most common choice for any of the top ten rankings, present or future.

Analysis of Weighted Aggregate Rankings

Role rankings were also analyzed using a weighted analysis. Each role was assigned a numerical value corresponding to the location it held in each respondent's ranking. For example, each time Role 1 was selected as a
Table 2

Mode for Top Ten Ranks -- Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prepare for unexpected</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Mode for Top Ten Ranks -- Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondent's first choice it was assigned a value of 35; each time it was selected in second place it was assigned a value of 34; and so on. Totals were then computed for each role in both conditions, present and future. Results are summarized in Table 4.
Table 4

Weighted Rankings -- Present and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Weight Present</th>
<th>Weight Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>3856</td>
<td>4009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>3634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>3374</td>
<td>3595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3337</td>
<td>3291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>3262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subject expert</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>3138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fostering independence</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Academic role model</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prepare for unexpected</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>2922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>2818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recognize diversity</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moral role model</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Personal counselor</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Curriculum developer</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Interpret info explosion</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Moral education</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transmit culture</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Celebrate error</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>2065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parent educator</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Parent surrogate</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Non-instructional</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Provide child care</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note that every role appears to have some partisans who rank it as important. For instance, if every respondent ranked the same role last, its maximum value would be 129 (the N of 129 x 1, the lowest possible value). In fact, in the present, the role ranked lowest, spiritual development, has a value of 1119. In the future temporal condition, the role ranked last has a value of 824.

There is complete agreement among the respondents as to the three most important roles for both present and future, as well as general agreement on eight of the 10 roles ranked as most important. Two roles, considered important in the present (academic role model and disciplinarian), drop entirely from the 10 most important roles in the future to be replaced by the teacher's role in preparing students to meet the unexpected, and the teacher's role as an innovator. The relative fall of academic role model and disciplinarian is precipitous; academic role model drops from 9th to 16th place and disciplinarian falls to 20th place from 10th. The teacher's role as innovator rises in importance from 15th to 10th, and preparing students to meet the unexpected moves from 11th to 6th place, revealing marked shifts, though not as dramatic.

Movement of other roles casts some light on the changing perception of teacher roles, particularly when only roles that move five or more places are considered. The teacher's role as interpreter of the information explosion moves dramatically. In the present it is ranked 21st in importance whereas in the future it is ranked 13th in importance. This signals a dramatic shift in the perceived importance of this role for the future. The teacher's role as educational policy maker on school or district level moves from 29th place (where many respondents would have classified it as unimportant) to 22nd in the future, where it would be
considered by most respondents as solidly important, if toward the low end of the scale. Likewise, the teacher's role as student climbs from 27th in the present to 21st in the future, making a similar transition from marginally important to solidly important.

In a similar vein, the teacher's role as a referee drops from 26th place in the present to 32nd in the future, perhaps indicative of a hope that, in the future, less intervention by teachers in non-academic arenas will be required. The teacher's role as personal counselor to students falls from 17th in the present to 26th in importance in the future; again perhaps revealing the hope that students in the future will come to school with fewer personal problems requiring the teacher's intervention. The teacher's role in students' spiritual development rises from being last in the present to being ranked 30th in the future. Despite a rise of five places, it remains a less important role for most respondents.

The weighted analysis also yields other fruitful observations. For instance, the role ranked last in the present (spiritual development) "earned" a weighted score of 1119. In the future, the roles ranked 31 through 35 (i.e., the roles ranked in the last five places) all earned weighted scores of less than 1119, ranking lower more consistently in the future than in the present. These rankings are tantamount to an acknowledgement by the respondents, many of whom are not teachers, that teachers must shed many non-instructional duties to perform effectively in the 21st century.

An examination of roles ranked as important indicates complete agreement among the respondents regarding the three most important roles both in present and future temporal conditions. The roles ranked first, second and third in both
temporal conditions are guide, motivator of students and fostering intellectual curiosity. The weighted analysis indicates that many more respondents ranked the teacher's role as guide higher in the future than they did in the present (it had a score of 4009 in the future compared to 3850 in the present); the role of motivating students was ranked somewhat less highly in the future (3634) than in the present (3831), whereas the teacher's role in fostering intellectual curiosity was ranked somewhat more highly in the future (3595) than in the present (3374).

This shift toward viewing the teacher as a guide to learning is further substantiated when the rankings are analyzed to determine how often a particular role was ranked in the top five in importance by respondents. Table 5 summarizes these frequencies.

In the present, 78 respondents selected the teacher's role as guide most often in the top five positions. In the future, 91 respondents did so. Seventy six respondents ranked motivating students second in the top five roles for the present; 68 did so for the future. The teacher's role in fostering intellectual curiosity was ranked third most frequently by 45 respondents in the present and by 52 in the future.

When respondents' selections are analyzed to determine how often a particular role was ranked at the bottom, or least important end of the scale, the teacher's role in non-instructional duties, as a provider of child care, as a parent surrogate, and in students' spiritual development are consistently ranked in the bottom echelon. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed that these roles are a less important part of the teacher's real task.
Table 5  
Role Ranking Frequencies in Top Five Positions — Present and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Subject expert</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academic role model</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fostering independence</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Personal counselor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moral role model</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Curriculum developer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Recognize diversity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parent surrogate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prepare for unexpected</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Non-instructional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provide child care</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fostering independence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Celebrate error</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Moral education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Interpret info explosion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Parent educator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Transmit culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are two anomalies in the bottom rankings. The teacher's role as educational policy maker was ranked in the bottom five positions in the present by 29 respondents; in the future, only 20 respondents ranked it that low. This seems to offer evidence that, in the future, respondents believed that teachers should assume a somewhat more active policy making role.

More revealing is the change in ranking for disciplinarian. In the present, only 11 respondents placed it in the bottom five positions, an indication of its perceived relative importance today. Indeed, in the present, 36 respondents placed it among the top five rankings. In the future, the teacher's role as disciplinarian is seen in a much different light. In the future, 29 respondents placed it in the bottom five roles; only 17 placed it among the top roles in the future.

When the same weighting procedures employed earlier are used to weight role placement in the top five rankings, the perceived importance of the role of the teacher as disciplinarian changes dramatically. Table 6 summarizes the results of this weighting procedure.

In the present, with frequency of placement in the top five locations weighted, the five most important roles (with their weighted scores in parentheses) are: the teacher's role as guide (2643), in motivating students (2565), as subject matter expert (1476), in enhancing student self-esteem (1285), and as disciplinarian (1200). Using the same weighting scale, the rankings for the future are guide (3090), motivating students (2275), fostering intellectual curiosity (1703), subject matter expert (1593) and preparing students to accept responsibility for decision making (1000). In the future, disciplinarian is ranked 15th (553).
Table 6
Weighted Rankings -- Frequency of Placement in Top Five Positions Present and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Weight Present</th>
<th>Weight Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>3090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>2275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subject expert</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Academic role model</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fostering independence</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personal counselor</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Moral role model</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parent surrogate</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curriculum developer</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Prepare for unexpected</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Recognize diversity</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide child care</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-instructional</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Celebrate error</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Moral education</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Interpret info explosion</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parent educator</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Transmit culture</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 1 and 2 display the frequency with which roles were selected in the top five rankings by at least 20 respondents. Figure 1 presents the information for the present and Figure 2 for the future. One more role (13 versus 12) was selected as important in the future than was so ranked in the present. This indicates that respondents feel that there is slightly more variability regarding what will be important for the future. Roles ranked as important in the future tend to be professional in nature (the teacher's role as a curriculum developer, as leader in the school and interpreter of the information explosion) rather than custodial (such as disciplinarian and referee, both selected as important in the present).

Respondents also tended to agree about roles rated less important. Weighting responses for the bottom five rankings yields consistent results across both present and future conditions. Table 7 summarizes these rankings. Although they change relative position slightly, the roles most often selected in the bottom five positions for both temporal conditions are non-instructional duties, provider of child care, referee, parent surrogate and spiritual development.

Figures 3 and 4 display the same information for the bottom five roles, again using a cut off point of at least 20 respondents. There is total agreement between the two temporal conditions with two further roles added for the future: personal counselor and disciplinarian. This again appears to be evidence of the desire for a changed role for teachers in the future. The implication is that respondents see teachers as withdrawing somewhat from the personal lives of their students.

Rankings were also analyzed to determine which roles were least often
**Figure 1.** Selection of role in top five positions by 20 or more respondents, present condition.

**Figure 2.** Selection of role in top five positions by 20 or more respondents, future condition.
Table 7

Weighted Rankings -- Frequencies of Placement in Bottom Five Positions for Ten Lowest Ranked Roles -- Present and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Weight Present</th>
<th>Weight Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spiritual development</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide child care</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-instructional</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parent surrogate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Referee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parent educator</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Celebrate error</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ranked in the bottom five positions (i.e., those that were perceived as important) by less than 10 respondents. Figure 5 summarizes roles that were least often ranked in the bottom for the present and Figure 6 those least often ranked last in the future. Generally, roles ranked least often as unimportant in the present (15) tend to be pedagogical in nature or related to teacher's views of themselves (as a professional, an academic role model or mentor). In the future, more roles (18) are considered important, that is, more are ranked least often in the bottom five locations than in the present. Future roles also encompass the pedagogical but include an expanded view of the teacher's responsibilities. Viewed as gaining in importance for the future are curriculum developer, transmitter of culture, recognizing diverse responses, interpreter of the information explosion and moral role model.
Figure 3. Selection of role in bottom five positions by 20 or more respondents; present condition (* indicates role selected in both present and future).

Figure 4. Selection of role in bottom five positions by 20 or more respondents; future condition (* indicates role selected in both present and future).
Figure 5. Roles least often selected in bottom (by nine or fewer respondents); present condition (* indicates least often selected in bottom for both present and future).

Figure 6. Roles least often selected in bottom (by nine or fewer respondents); future condition (* indicates least often selected in bottom for both present and future).
Analysis of Weighted Disaggregated Rankings

In addition to being analyzed in the aggregate, rankings were disaggregated by group and examined to determine if variability existed between the way each discrete group perceived teacher roles and the manner in which the groups, when considered as a whole, viewed teacher roles. As in the aggregate analysis, rankings were examined in both temporal conditions, present and future. Results are summarized in Table 8 and in Figures 7 through 14. Figures 7 through 14 display weighted rankings; the weighting scale used was the same as that used earlier for the aggregate.

There is a great deal of agreement among the groups regarding roles perceived as most important in both the present and future. Table 8 displays the weighted rankings for each group and Figures 7 through 10 display the top five roles for each group. In the present, for instance, all groups agree that the teacher's role as guide, in motivating students, and in enhancing student self-esteem are important; in fact, three of the four groups (preservice teachers, teachers and parents) ranked these roles in precisely the order listed above. The fourth group, community leaders, ranked motivating first, guide second and enhancing student self-esteem fourth. In the aggregate weighted ranking, guide, motivating students, fostering curiosity, enhancing self-esteem, and accepting responsibility for decision making occupy the top five positions.

There is somewhat less agreement on specific roles perceived as less important. Figures 11 through 14 display roles ranked in the bottom five positions in the present.
Table 8

Weighted Rankings by Disaggregated Groups -- Top Five Roles -- Present and Future (Weightings in Parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservice Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Guide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1008)</td>
<td>1 (983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Motivating students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(979)</td>
<td>2 (919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(889)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Foster curiosity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(849)</td>
<td>4 (855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Develop judgment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>5 (805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (862)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (805)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Guide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1339)</td>
<td>1 (1409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Motivating students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1317)</td>
<td>3 (1241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Decision making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1218)</td>
<td>4 (1193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Foster curiosity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1209)</td>
<td>2 (1332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Fostering independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (1188)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Guide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(674)</td>
<td>1 (629)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Motivating students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(654)</td>
<td>2 (602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(572)</td>
<td>5 (511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Foster curiosity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(568)</td>
<td>3 (555)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Decision making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(545)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Interpret info explosion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (514)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Motivating students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(904)</td>
<td>2 (872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Guide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(848)</td>
<td>1 (947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(795)</td>
<td>5 (784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(784)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  Subject expert</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (760)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Foster curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (845)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Develop judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (810)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All groups agree that spiritual development is not an important role for teachers and is, in fact, ranked last by all groups. Three of the four groups (preservice teachers, teachers and community leaders) ranked provider of child care and non-instructional duties in the bottom five positions. Three of the four groups (teachers, parents and community leaders) ranked community leader in the bottom five positions.

There is, as noted earlier, less agreement on specific roles perceived as less important, but the less important rankings do reflect a general theme. Most of the roles perceived as less important have little or no pedagogical content; i.e., they are seen as peripheral to the teacher's real work, which revolves around fostering learning and personal development. Most roles perceived as less important require custodial or clerical duties.

The rankings of parents deviate somewhat from the rankings of the other groups. Parents ranked student, moral educator and parent educator in the bottom five positions. This, perhaps, reflects the parents' disinclination to see teachers usurp what they believe to be parental prerogatives in moral education and child rearing practices. It does, however, seem odd that parents, alone among the groups, would have ranked the teacher’s role as student in the bottom five. It may reflect either a misunderstanding of the function of life long learning in professional development or a belief that teachers are somehow "finished" when they graduate from college.

In the aggregate weighted rankings for the present, spiritual development, non-instructional duties, provider of child care, parent surrogate and social worker occupy the last five positions. Also in the aggregate rankings, though not among
the bottom five positions, community leader was ranked 30th in importance. In the individual group rankings it was ranked in the bottom five by three groups (teachers, parents and community leaders). Thus broad agreement about roles which are perceived as less important is evident in both aggregated and disaggregated rankings.

The agreement between rankings in the aggregate and rankings by discrete groups persists in rankings for the future. In the future, the groups, when considered as a whole, ranked guide, motivating students, fostering intellectual curiosity, preparing students to accept responsibility and developing judgment as the top five most important roles.

When the rankings by each discrete group are examined, it is evident that each group agrees with the whole. For instance, guide, motivating students and fostering curiosity were ranked in the top five by all groups; developing judgment and decision making were ranked there by three of the four groups. Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10 summarize the top five rankings by each individual group.

Other roles ranked in the top five positions in the disaggregated analysis are mentor (ranked by preservice teachers), fostering independence in students (ranked in the top five by teachers), interpreter of the information explosion and enhancing student self-esteem, both ranked in the top five future roles by parents.
Figure 7. Selection of roles in top five positions by pre-service teachers; present condition.

Figure 8. Selection of roles in top five positions by pre-service teachers; future condition.
Figure 9. Selection of roles in top five positions by teachers; present condition.

Figure 10. Selection of roles in top five positions by teachers; future condition.
Figure 11. Selection of role in top five positions by parents; present condition.

Figure 12. Selection of role in top five positions by parents; future condition.
Figure 13. Selection of role in top five positions by community leaders; present condition.

Figure 14. Selection of role in top five positions by community leaders; future condition.
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Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

Before discussing the conclusions of this study, one caveat is in order. Since this is a case study, prudence must be exercised regarding generalizations to populations. All participants in this study were drawn from an urban area in southeastern Virginia and the findings of this study may be particular only to that area. The findings, however, do suggest trends about the perceptions of teacher roles; groups in similar demographic or geographic areas may hold similar views.

The more important question posed by the results of this study is what does this microcosm say about teacher roles both now and for the future?

The results of this study indicate that there is general agreement by all groups, in the aggregate, about those teacher roles that are important in both present and future temporal conditions. As summarized in Tables 3 and 4, there was complete agreement about the importance of the three top roles (the teacher’s role as guide, in motivating students and in fostering intellectual curiosity) in both present and future temporal conditions. Indeed, when analyzed by overall weighting, 80% of the top ten roles ranked most important in the present were also ranked most important in the future. What is perceived as important for teachers today (primarily, process skills) remains so for the future;
there is great stability in respondents’ ranking of roles across time.

The importance of the agreement on roles perceived as important is underscored when the data is disaggregated by group. (See Table 8.) In the present, three roles (guide, motivating students and enhancing self-esteem) are ranked by all groups among the top five most important positions; three of the four groups also rank the roles of fostering intellectual curiosity and accepting responsibility there.

In the future temporal condition, all groups rank the roles of guide, of motivating students and of fostering intellectual curiosity in the top five; three of the four groups also place the role of accepting responsibility there. Half the groups rank the teacher’s role in encouraging students to develop judgment in the top five.

Given this degree of agreement, it is reasonable to conclude that the groups share a consensus on those teacher roles that are important. This consensus extends across both temporal conditions and among all the groups.

The data also supports the conclusion that there is agreement regarding the number of roles considered important. In both temporal conditions, more than half the respondents rated at least 25 of the 35 roles presented as important. This general agreement, not only on the roles considered important but also on the number of those roles, is one of the most meaningful findings of this study. It allows the creation of a conceptual picture of teacher roles which has implications for policy making and for further study. It is also an explicit acknowledgement of the complexity of teaching as a professional task.
No discernable pattern emerges from the data that permits prediction of role ranking from group membership. This strongly suggests that perception of teacher roles as important or less important is not a function of group membership; rather, agreement on the roles rated as important is relatively widely distributed. That a considerable degree of agreement exists among the groups about those roles that are important (and, by extension, less important) means that common ground exists for creation of school-parent-community partnerships, partnerships increasingly seen as crucial for effective school reform efforts.

Not only is agreement about those roles which are important noteworthy, the character of the roles selected as important is also of consequence. This is most evident when the respondents' selections in both present and future temporal conditions are analyzed to identify the mode. (See Table 2.) When the top ten locations (i.e., the ten roles rated most important) are examined to determine the most frequent response, the roles always selected as most important are those roles that reflect the process of teaching, what Devaney and Sykes (1988) call its "developmental" nature. Pedagogical roles that imply new problem solving skills (on the part of both teachers and students) are always ranked more highly than either content or custodial roles. Respondents voice concern not only about how teachers should teach but also about what teachers should teach.

In addition to the pervasive general agreement about those roles perceived as important, there are three other aspects of the data worthy of comment. These are: (a) movement, i.e., the change in relative standing of a particular role from the present to the future; (b) weighting, which gives a gauge of the relative frequency with which a role was rated important or less important; and (c)
differences between group rankings when the data is disaggregated.

Changes in the ranking of roles can be examined in two ways: (a) by analyzing the frequency of selection in one of the top five positions, and (b) by comparing the overall relative positions from present to future, based on the changes in weighted values assigned to each role. Weighted values, in turn, have two dimensions. One is relative standing based on a weighted value derived from frequency of selection in the top five positions; the second is an overall weighted ranking as a function of the frequency with which a role was rated important.

When the data are analyzed to determine change in rank from present to future, 80% of the roles perceived as most important in the present (i.e., roles that occupy the top ten weighted rankings) are viewed identically in the future. Furthermore, when ranked by overall weighting and with only two exceptions, the same roles are rated in the top 23 positions in both present and future. (See Table 9.) There is agreement that 23 of the 25 top rated present roles are important for the future. The two exceptions are counselor and moral education. Two conclusions can be drawn from this high degree of agreement. First, roles perceived as important in the present are viewed similarly in the future and vice versa. Second, there is substantial agreement about which roles performed by teachers are important.

When considering movement of ranking, three roles (disciplinarian, interpreter of the information explosion and fostering independence) are of particular interest. Their relative standing changes substantially from present to future.
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Weight Present</th>
<th>Weight Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>4009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivating students</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>3634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foster curiosity</td>
<td>3374</td>
<td>3595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enhance self-esteem</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3337</td>
<td>3291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop judgment</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>3262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Subject expert</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>3138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fostering independence</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Academic role model</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prepare for unexpected</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>2922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>2818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recognize diversity</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moral role model</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Personal counselor</td>
<td>2391</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Curriculum developer</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Interpret info explosion</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Moral education</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transmit culture</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Celebrate error</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When frequency of rating in the top five positions is considered, the teacher's role as disciplinarian moves most dramatically. Clearly, it is considered far less important in the future than it is in the present.¹

¹It is ranked 6th in the present and 16th in the future when frequency of placement in the top five positions is considered; when weighted rankings are considered it is ranked 10th in the present and 20th in the future.
There are several plausible explanations for this change. This may simply be a case of wishful thinking; it may also indicate a generally optimistic view of the future by the respondents where the responsibility for providing discipline has been assumed by institutions other than the school, or by a coalition of institutions including the school, a revitalized family, the church and the media. It may also reflect a hope that our society will become less violent and that as violence moderates in the larger society, children will exhibit less disruptive behavior as well. It may also be evidence that the respondents believe that schools can restructure and that alternate discipline structures will be developed, freeing teachers to teach.

It may also manifest hope that students will be better prepared to learn when they come to school and that programs and money will be available to make a difference in the pupils’ readiness. This explanation rests on the first of the America 2000 goals, i.e.: "All children in America will start school ready to learn" (Department of Education, 1991, p. 3). Thus respondents may believe that teachers will spend less time as disciplinarians either because the deportment of pupils has improved or because procedures, such as differentiated staffing, have been developed to deal with discipline problems.

Another role that changes its standing conspicuously is that of interpreter of the information explosion, which is perceived as much more important for the future than for the present. Again, this seems a straightforward indication of a

---

^It is ranked 29th in the present and 13th in the future when frequency of placement in the top five positions is considered; in weighted rankings, it is 21st in the present and 13th in the future.
change in perception of the teacher’s role. Respondents clearly believe that teachers must play an expanded role in helping pupils prepare for the realities of the information age. This perception is shadowed by the rise in ranking of the teacher’s role as innovator in education. Respondents appear to view the imperatives of the information age as demanding more and more innovative approaches from teachers.

Plausible as this rationale may be, the very use of the term innovator confounds the analysis. Such terms as innovator, or experimenter to improve education, may have been perceived by respondents as having futuristic overtones, and such perceptions alone may have accounted for its rise in the future rankings.

The last role rated materially different in the future was the teacher’s role in fostering independence in students. One explanation for this change is that it indicates a belief that students must accept more responsibility for their own learning. As such, it is a component of a problem solving skill which some observers advance as a part of a new agenda for pedagogy, "preparing students to organize and monitor their own learning" (Devaney & Sykes, 1988, p.19).

When the change in rank for fostering independence is coupled with the decline in rankings for such roles as parent surrogate, provider of child care, referee and personal counselor it seems clear that the respondents believe students will be obliged to accept more responsibility for their own actions. In the

---

‘In frequency of placement in the top five positions it is rated 15th in the present and 11th in the future; in overall weighting, it is 15th in the present and 10th in the future.

‘It was 13th in the present and 7th in the future in frequency of rank in the top five positions; overall weightings placed it 8th in the present and 9th in the future.'
future, the roles of both teachers and students will change; teachers must begin to see students more as intellectual workers (Reich, 1992) and less as charges.

An examination of the overall weighted standings reveals more subtle shifts in rankings. Several roles, for instance, move up in the rankings in the future, an indication of a rise in the perception of their importance. The teacher's role in preparing students to meet the unexpected, and the role of innovator both rise in importance for the future. Consistently, roles that reflect a more professional stance for teachers are perceived as more important in the future than they are in the present. The rankings of the teacher's role as educational policy maker and of the teacher's role as student both rise in the future. Both roles are perceived as becoming more important and both relate to increased professionalism. One indicates that teachers should be empowered to make more basic decisions about the conditions of their work; the other implies the importance of life-long learning. The trend in the future is viewed as being toward a more professional and process oriented role for teachers.

When weighting is considered simply as a function of the frequency with which a role is ranked as important, shifts in perception are also evident. For instance, although the teacher's role as guide is ranked first in importance in both present and future, it is consistently ranked higher in the future than it is in the present (4009 versus 3850). Whereas the teacher's role as guide is perceived as

\*In overall rankings, it ranks 11th in the present with a weight of 2839; in the future it ranks 6th with a weight of 3180.

\*In overall rankings, it ranks 15th in the present with a weight of 2471; in the future it ranks 10th with a weight of 2965.
important in the present, it becomes even more so in the future, further evidence that respondents believe that the process of teaching requires more attention.

There is also more agreement about what is important in the future than there is in the present. For example, the role ranked tenth most important in the present has a weighted value of 2845, whereas the role ranked tenth most important in the future has a weighted value of 2965. In the future temporal condition, respondents rated the most important roles more highly than they did the most important roles in the present.

The converse of this also holds true. There is general agreement between present and future as to those roles that are ranked last and are hence considered relatively less important. Roles ranked less important in the future receive consistently lower weightings than do those ranked less important in the present. For instance, the bottom ranked role in the present, the teacher's role in the student's spiritual development, had a weighting of 1119; the five lowest ranked roles in the future all received lower weightings (1043 through 824). Thus, the spread between roles perceived as important and those perceived as less important becomes greater in the future; the ends of the spectrum drift apart. Roles deemed important in the present become more so in the future, and those rated as less important are even lower rated.

The variations in selection of the top five roles by each group warrants comment. In the present, all groups rank the roles of guide, of motivating students and of enhancing student self-esteem in the top five locations. Preservice teachers, teachers and parents all rank fostering intellectual curiosity in the top five positions, and teachers, parents and community leaders rank accepting
responsibility for decision making in the top five positions. There are only two variations: Preservice teachers rank developing judgment in the top five, and community leaders rank subject matter expert in the top five. This latter ranking is particularly striking: Though it is always ranked as important, both overall and by group, this is the only instance of it being ranked as one of the top five roles in importance.

There is no clear explanation of why preservice teachers rank the role of developing judgment among the top five locations. All participants in the study generally agree that it is a component of teaching, and most teachers, presumably, seek to create opportunities for students to exercise sound judgment. Perhaps preservice teachers rate it highly because, as they commence professional training, they are compelled to weigh career options and to exercise judgment on a very personal level. This phase of their career may sensitize them to the necessity for exercising judgment. Perhaps because they are students themselves, they perceive the value of this role more acutely than do other groups. As preservice teachers they are also concerned about developing day to day classroom survival skills. One text used in the teacher training program at Old Dominion University, and to which some of the respondents may have been exposed, is Charles' Building Classroom Discipline (1996). Many of the disciplinary approaches discussed by Charles stress developing responsible behavior and self-reliance by helping students make good behavioral choices, i.e., exercise judgment.

The choice of subject matter expert by community leaders may be more easily explained. Criticism of teacher competency has been commonplace in the media for over ten years, and competence for teachers has become synonymous with
subject matter expert. In Virginia, the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education (1987) stated:

To bring about a real change in the way teachers are prepared in college, the undergraduate degree in teacher education should be abolished. The first requirement for teachers in Virginia must be that they are broadly educated in the liberal arts and thoroughly prepared in the subjects they will teach . . . graduation requirements for the teachers should be made more rigorous and more interesting (p. 1).

What is unusual is not that one group, community leaders, selected subject matter expert in the top five locations, but that no other group did. Indeed, examination of the mode for the top ten positions shows that subject matter expert was never the most popular selection for any position.

In the future temporal condition, all groups rank the roles of guide, of motivating students and of fostering intellectual curiosity in the top five locations. Preservice teachers actually rank six roles in the top five locations, with two (encouraging students to develop judgment and preparing students to accept responsibility) being equally weighted and tied for fifth place. Three out of the four groups (preservice teachers, teachers and community leaders) rank decision making in the top five; two groups (preservice teachers and community leaders) rank developing judgment in the top five.

The differences between the roles groups perceived as important are greater in the future than in the present. Only preservice teachers, for instance, rank mentor in the top five positions for the future, and only teachers rank fostering independence there. Parents differ from the other groups in ranking roles of interpreter of the information explosion and enhancing student self-esteem in the top five future roles.
That preservice teachers rank mentor highly in the future is not surprising. In educational circles, the role of mentor has been actively promoted for years, particularly in relation to programs for at-risk students. The role of mentor also complements other roles highly rated in the future by preservice teachers: guide, motivator, fostering curiosity and preparing students to accept responsibility for decision making. Mentoring by more experienced faculty is also suggested as a method for socializing new teachers into the profession.

Teachers rank fostering independence in the top five positions in the future. This is in concert with the general trend, in the overall rankings, of movement away from custodial roles and toward pedagogical ones. If, as respondents believe, teachers will withdraw from custodial roles, it is logical to assume that students will have to accept more responsibility for decision making, both personal and academic.

Alone among the groups, parents rank the teacher's role as interpreter of the information explosion as one of the top five future roles. There are several explanations for this. Parents may view the school as an ally to help them prepare their children to deal with the onslaught of new information and technology. Parents may also see the school as a potentially resource-rich environment where their children can have access to technology not available at home. In addition, parents may not feel personally competent to instruct their children in the use of technology, or to prepare them to confront the rapid changes attending the information age. They may hope that teachers and schools will perform that function for them.
Parents may also believe that one of the primary missions of the teacher and of the school is to prepare students to earn a living. In an increasingly complex world, they may view this preparation for the technological age as a logical function of the school.

While all groups rank enhancing self-esteem in the top five in the present, only parents rank it there in the future. There is no easy explanation for this. It is a role obviously important to parents; perhaps they view it as an essential part of character development. Parents may also be more sensitive to the importance of the affective component of education than are the other groups; consequently, they may view the enhancement of student self-esteem as a necessary precondition for learning.

The placement of several roles not previously mentioned also warrants discussion. Roles relating to moral development (moral education, promoting patriotism, moral role model, spiritual development and personal counselor) tended to be ranked in the middle of the group. These rankings indicate that most respondents believe that teachers should exercise caution when assuming a role in the moral and spiritual development of students. This finding appears to run counter to a national movement toward integrating programs in character education into the regular curriculum (Rosenblatt, 1995); indeed, emphasis on character and ethics development is a selling point for some highly promoted, private, for-profit alternatives to public education like the Edison schools

\footnote{Using the overall weighted rankings, moral role model was ranked 16th in the present and 17th in the future; the teacher's role in moral education was ranked 23rd in the present and 27th in the future; spiritual development was ranked last in the present and 30th in the future.}
The most obvious explanation for this apparent divergence is the simplest: In any rank order not all roles can be ranked first. Most of the roles relating to moral development were placed solidly in the important category by more than half the respondents, clear evidence of their relative importance. As discussed earlier, what is most important in the findings of this study is the richness of the number of roles perceived as important; and those relating to character development were generally ranked as important.

Another explanation for this divergence is the geographical location where the study was conducted. Southeastern Virginia is the home of the Christian Coalition, a religious and political movement with an explicit educational agenda. Respondents in the study may have been sensitized to that agenda and, when presented with role descriptions relating to moral education, may have perceived them as referring to a particular political perspective.

The placement of roles relating to moral development in the middle of the rank order is also emblematic of the confusion about what the appropriate position of the public schools should be, vis-a-vis character education. The controversial and non-controversial aspects of moral education (represented, for example, by discussions on the teaching of honesty in the schools contrasted with the debate on the issue of prayer in the schools) are so intertwined that they present a Gordian knot of complexity to the observer who inquires about the role of the school in character development. Because there is disagreement about what standards of moral education should be, the schools, by and large, do nothing. The rankings of roles related to moral education reflect this societal
uneasiness; the roles are perceived as important but are not placed in the first ranks.

Secondly, the litigious nature of society may have suggested to many respondents that teachers should avoid activities which might be perceived as an unwarranted intervention in a pupil's private life. At the time of the study, a vigorous public debate occurred in the Commonwealth of Virginia regarding the proper role of guidance counselors in the elementary grades. In fact, elementary guidance programs came under such attack in public meetings that the Virginia Parent Teacher Association felt compelled to issue a policy statement, for use in the General Assembly and by the State Board of Education, which supported guidance programs in the public schools (Virginia PTA, 1995). The question of a teacher's role in developing a student's character or moral code may have struck respondents as controversial.

There may be, of course, a more prosaic explanation for the modest reception of roles related to character development. Perhaps the language employed to describe roles related to moral development did not clearly evoke in respondents' minds activities relating to character development. If a role had been labeled: "The teacher's role in students' character development," perhaps the rankings would have been different.

A second role that was perceived as solidly important and near the middle of the rank order was the teacher's role in encouraging students to recognize the legitimacy of diverse responses.8 It was considered important, certainly, but not

---

8 In weighted rankings it placed 14th in the present and 12th in the future; in terms of frequency of selection in the top five places, it ranked 19th in the present and 18th in
ranked among the most important roles. Yet acknowledgement of diversity is perhaps the greatest challenge facing public education in the future. At 8.7%, the U.S. already has the highest percentage of immigrants, legal and illegal, in its population since 1940 (Holmes, 1995); the majority of these newcomers are from countries where English is not the primary language and whose cultural antecedents are non-Western.

But acknowledging diversity in schools does not mean only accommodating immigrants. It also means dealing with ethnic and cultural differences already extant in the culture. By the year 2000, nine states are projected to have public school populations composed primarily of minorities (Murnane, Singer, Willett, Kemple & Olsen, 1991). It seems imperative that teachers prepare to incorporate this great diversity into the schools.

There may be several avenues available to encourage recognition of diversity as a means to strengthen societal bonds. Some teacher educators see the need to construct pedagogy which incorporates different assumptions, values and practices into the classroom; in this sense, acknowledging diversity is generative for it requires a new curricular context (Cochran-Smith, 1995). In addition to curricular changes, other observers believe that the challenge to education is to overcome the ideological positions held by classroom teachers and to help teachers reconceptualize society from various viewpoints. Content can then be viewed from a variety of ethnic perspectives (Banks, 1988). Regardless of philosophical position, those teachers and students who prove successful in working in an
increasingly diverse milieu (in terms of language, culture and race) are and will continue to be those who can adapt to the demands of a multiethnic society.

As with the moral- and character-building aspects of teacher roles, semantics may have affected the question of diversity. It is possible that the description of the teacher's role in acknowledging the legitimacy of diverse responses may have been too indirect, inadequately evoking, for most respondents, the question of cultural diversity or multiethnic education. Phrased differently, this role may be perceived as being of greater importance, particularly for rankings in the future. It may also be that the promotion of diversity and the development of methods to acknowledge its value to schools, while vigorously debated at the university level, requires more promotion in the schools and in the community at large.

The last role which proved surprising in its placement was the teacher's role in interpreting the information explosion. As discussed earlier, it was perceived as important, but it did not figure prominently in the top five positions when the data were disaggregated; of all the groups, only parents rated it as one of the most important roles for the future. Its importance to parents may be related to their view of technology. Parents may see technology (and particularly technology education) as a magic economic bullet. The position promoted by the popular media, is that if we have enough technology, our students will excel academically and our country will once again be globally competitive. Other groups were less enthusiastic about the role of technology, perhaps because they have had more experience with it and have a more educated opinion on its value and costs.

---

It rose from 29th in the present to 13th in the future in frequency of selection in the top five places; it rose from 21st to 13th when weighted values were considered.
The moderate reception accorded the teacher’s role as an interpreter of the information explosion is, again, at odds with the approach to education touted by the privatization movement. That movement promises a computer for every child, e-mail for parents and teachers and automated classrooms (Verhovek, 1995). In fact, Benno C. Schmidt, Jr., president of the Edison Project, has been quoted as describing the Edison school as "the most high-tech school in America" (Schmidt, quoted in Verhovek, 1995, p. B6).

Implications

The wide distribution of agreement has extremely important implications for future research. Based upon the high degree of agreement between respondents, the study appears to have identified a reasonable catalog of the roles which constitute the activity of good teaching. Additional support for this view is provided by the responses of the informants in the interview section. In that phase of the study, participants agreed that the roles presented adequately summarized teaching; rarely, in the unfocused sessions, were new roles added for consideration. It seems safe to conclude with some confidence that the roles employed in the study constitute a useful framework for subsequent investigations of the teacher’s role. This identification and cataloguing of roles represents an essential first step in examining the role responsibilities of such a complex task as teaching.

In addition, the conclusions of the present study impact the movement to improve the professionalization of teaching, for restructuring efforts in education, for extending the literature reconceptualizing the components of good teaching and for public policy decision making.
As summarized in Chapter II, the improvement of the professionalization of teaching hinges on a new definition of teaching roles (Goodlad, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992); the board certification process advocated by the Carnegie Forum on Education also stresses the development of a consensus about the roles performed by teachers as a prerequisite to developing standards to measure teacher effectiveness (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1993).

While all science is tentative, the present study has, as discussed above, identified an array of roles shown to be perceived as important facets of teacher roles. The agreement about those roles strongly suggests that these are useful categories for subsequent investigations.

This view is sustained by the responses of the informants in the interview section. Interviewees agreed that the roles presented summarized teaching, and new roles were added for consideration. This identification and cataloguing of roles represents an essential first step in identifying those individual components (i.e., roles) that comprise the complex task of teaching.

The literature on restructuring education also demands a redefinition of teacher roles (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1992; Murphy, 1993; Schlecty, 1990). Murphy's description of restructuring is particularly applicable to this position when he describes restructuring as the development of new approaches, "particularly [to] the work performed by teachers and the teaching learning process unfolding in classrooms" (Murphy, 1992, p.3).

Yin (1984) cautioned that the value of case studies is that they yield data generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations; in that sense the
conclusions of this study are generalizable to a new definition of teacher roles, extending the literature on teaching in several ways. The roles identified in this study are representative of what Shulman (1987) labeled as part of the knowledge base for teaching: pedagogical content knowledge. Shulman defines pedagogical content knowledge as "that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding" (p.8); it is at the heart of the management of ideas within the classroom. The emphasis on the pedagogical clearly evident in the conclusions of this study supports the position of melding pedagogy and content and offers a tentative approach to defining pedagogical content knowledge. Although respondents believed that both content and pedagogy are important, the roles directly relating to the how of teaching (guide, motivating students and fostering intellectual curiosity) consistently outweighed content in the perceptions of the groups. In a similar fashion, this study supports Grossman's (1990) contention that "disciplinary knowledge alone, while crucial for teaching, does not provide teachers with the pedagogical understanding necessary for teaching a wide range of students" (p.143). Again, this study provides a constructive debut for exploring pedagogical perspectives on subject matter. Sternberg and Horvath (1995) agree that, in order to promote excellence in education, we must develop our most important resource (our teachers) for that end. In order to develop our human resources fully, we need a conceptualization of what constitutes good teaching. They argue that an expert teacher is just that: expert at teaching. This is an important departure from the conventional teacher-as-expert metaphor (Welker, 1992), which defines expert teachers as subject matter experts. Sternberg and
Horvath argue that a useful conceptualization of good teaching is both descriptive and generative. The present study appears to satisfy both these conditions: It describes what teachers should be able to do in terms of pedagogy, provides a conceptual picture of good teaching, and, in addition, suggests successive lines of inquiry.

The general agreement about those roles which are perceived as important leads to other research questions. For instance, subsequent investigators might inquire of teachers if they were ever taught any of the skills or techniques inherent in these roles. Do teacher training programs, for instance, routinely include experiences which help aspiring teachers learn how to be guides or facilitators of learning? Do in-service workshops include exercises on how to prepare students to accept responsibility for decision making or on how to motivate students to learn? If there indeed exist programs which teach these pedagogical skills, then such programs need to be identified and replicated.

If, however (as seems more likely), these skills are not taught as part of teacher training or in-service, a second research question arises. That inquiry centers on determining if teacher educators really know how to fulfill any of these roles. Do schools of education know how to train teachers to encourage their students to recognize the legitimacy of diverse responses or how to encourage students to develop judgment? What do teachers and schools need to do to foster intellectual curiosity or to prepare students to meet the unexpected? What measures must be developed to assess how, when, and to what degree, teachers have fostered independence in students? How can we determine if teachers have acted effectively as interpreters of the information explosion? Addressing these
questions, even tentatively, will lead, inexorably, to investigations of how best to enhance teacher training in these pedagogical skills. The answers to these difficult questions will have profound implications for the retraining of teacher trainers.

The focus on pedagogy implicit in the rankings of the roles identified in this study has important policy implications, particularly for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Since 1990 prospective teachers, in order to qualify for licensure in Virginia, must have what the State Board of Education considers an academic degree; i.e., an undergraduate degree in a traditional arts or sciences area such as English, math, science or any of the social sciences. Degrees in education, with some few exceptions (health, physical education and vocational technical subjects), are not considered academic degrees in Virginia. In addition, within state-certified teacher preparation programs, only 18 semester hours (or equivalent) are permitted in professional studies, i.e., pedagogy. The agreement between the State Board of Education and institutions to approve programs for teacher licensure in effect forbids undergraduate degrees in education for core academic areas (Governor's Committee on Excellence in Education, 1986) and severely limits opportunities for the transmission of pedagogical practice.

The concern on the part of the Commonwealth seems to be that the subject matter expertise of teachers is eroding: "The first requirement for teachers in Virginia must be that they are broadly educated in the liberal arts and thoroughly prepared in the subjects they will teach" (Governor's Committee on Excellence in Education, 1986, p. 9). If additional preparation in professional education is desired, universities may institute five- or six-year programs (p. 10).
Certainly no one can quarrel with the assertion that teachers must be adequately prepared in their content areas. Indeed, respondents rated subject matter expert highly in both temporal conditions. But, more importantly, the respondents always ranked pedagogical concerns ahead of content expertise. Respondents evinced greatest concern about the process of teaching.

The findings of the present study reflect this disequilibrium. Too often, it seems, the essential balance necessary between pedagogy and content is lost; this is evident in the back to basics movement, where subject matter expertise is promoted at the expense of pedagogy. The clear implication of this study is that the balance between these complementary aspects of teaching needs to be restored. Respondents agree that process overpowers content in complexity. In a world where the half-life of knowledge is approaching five years, the attributes of intellectual curiosity, of informed judgment, of motivation, of independence and of guide to learning assume great importance. It seems odd that the Commonwealth's plan to improve teaching may actually (if inadvertently) weaken it.

The findings of this study also impact another area of public policy: the alternative routes to teacher licensure. As Grossman (1990) points out, the current assumption about alternative routes to licensure is that content knowledge and life experiences prepare individuals to teach. State licensing agencies believe "the rest will come through a smattering of pedagogical principles, classroom experience, and perhaps mentoring" (p. 141). The findings of this study indicate that we have much to learn about the process of teaching; alternative routes to licensure, praiseworthy as they are, must pay careful attention to pedagogical
concerns.

After all, arguably the West's greatest teacher was no subject matter expert; indeed, he claimed to know only three things. Socrates, somewhat disingenuously, maintained that all he knew was that he did not know. But—and this is most important—he also knew what kind of knowledge to seek and how to seek it. This is the knowledge of process, knowledge that can make all the difference for education.
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Appendix A

TEACHER ROLES WITH DESCRIPTORS

1. The teacher's role as subject matter expert. (SUBJECT EXPERT)
2. The teacher's role as guide or facilitator of learning. (GUIDE)
3. The teacher's role as leader in the school. (LEADER)
4. The teacher's role as educational policy maker on school or district level. (POLICY MAKER)
5. The teacher's role as disciplinarian. (DISCIPLINARIAN)
6. The teacher's role in non-instructional duties (hall monitor, clerk, security guard). (NON-INSTRUCTIONAL)
7. The teacher's role as personal counselor to students. (PERSONAL COUNSELOR)
8. The teacher's role as a curriculum developer. (CURRICULUM DEVELOPER)
9. The teacher's role as mentor. (MENTOR)
10. The teacher's role in encouraging students to recognize the legitimacy of diverse responses. (RECOGNIZE DIVERSITY)
11. The teacher's role in encouraging students to develop judgment. (DEVELOP JUDGMENT)
12. The teacher's role in fostering intellectual curiosity. (FOSTER CURiosity)
13. The teacher's role as a professional exercising professional judgment. (PROFESSIONAL)
14. The teacher's role as parent surrogate. (PARENT SURROGATE)
15. The teacher's role in celebrating error in the learning process. (CELEBRATE ERROR)
16. The teacher's role as interpreter of the information explosion. (INTERPRET INFO EXPLOSION)
17. The teacher's role as a provider of child care. (PROVIDE CHILD CARE)
18. The teacher's role as a referee. (REFEREE)
19. The teacher's role in enhancing student self-esteem. (ENHANCE SELF-ESTEEM)
20. The teacher's role as a parent educator. (PARENT EDUCATOR)
21. The teacher's role in moral education. (MORAL EDUCATION)
22. The teacher's role as a transmitter of culture. (TRANSMIT CULTURE)
23. The teacher's role in promoting patriotism and citizenship. (PATRIOTISM)
24. The teacher's role as an innovator or experimenter to improve education. (INNOVATOR)
25. The teacher's role as a social worker. (SOCIAL WORKER)
26. The teacher's role as a student. (STUDENT)
27. The teacher's role as a community leader. (COMMUNITY LEADER)
28. The teacher's role as a friend. (FRIEND)
29. The teacher's role in fostering independence in students. (FOSTERING INDEPENDENCE)

30. The teacher's role in preparing students to meet the unexpected. (PREPARE FOR UNEXPECTED)

31. The teacher's role in preparing students to accept responsibility for decision making. (DECISION MAKING)

32. The teacher's role as an academic role model. (ACADEMIC ROLE MODEL) *

33. The teacher's role as a moral role model. (MORAL ROLE MODEL) *

34. The teacher's role in motivating students to learn. (MOTIVATING STUDENTS) *

35. The teacher's role in students' spiritual development. (SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT) *

* Added to list for card sort as a result of the unfocused interviews.
Appendix B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTRODUCTION: Introduce yourself and set the stage for the interview by explaining that the study is designed to examine the roles of urban teachers (K-12) both now and in the future, and that it is part of a dissertation for the Urban Services program at Old Dominion University. Stress that, although some demographic data will be collected, the confidentiality of each informant will be respected. Informants will be identified in the study only in general terms: e.g., as "a principal in an urban elementary school" or as "a central office administrator in an urban school system." Ask the informant if he/she has any questions about the interview or purpose of the study. Answer any questions as directly as possible.

SAMPLE INTRODUCTION: "Good (morning)(afternoon). My name is -- ---- and I am working as part of a project at Old Dominion University to examine the perceptions people have about the roles of urban school teachers. This project is part of a dissertation in the Urban Services program at Old Dominion University. We are interested in seeing if there is a consensus among professionals in education about the roles of teachers in urban schools. One of the things we wish to determine is the different types of roles teachers are called upon to perform, and we are interested in your opinions on these roles. I appreciate your willingness to participate and assure you that your responses will
be considered confidential. I do have a short form for you to fill out with some
demographic data and then I want to begin the interview."

"I am going to ask you a series of questions about teacher roles for which
there are no right or wrong answers. What I am interested in are the opinions of
people about teacher roles. I will be taking notes about your answers and may,
from time to time, ask you to repeat what you say or to elaborate on the topic so
I get your responses down correctly."

Do not be concerned if your approach to the interviews varies somewhat
from the script as outlined above. The idea is to establish rapport, put the
informant at ease, and to explain the study in enough detail to provide the
informant with a framework in which to discuss teacher roles. After the
introduction, ask the following questions in the order given. Take notes about the
informant’s responses and, as far as is possible, record the informant’s own words.
Although what I want to examine are teacher’s pedagogical roles, note any
affective roles or personality traits ("must like children," "must want to help
others") identified by informants as teacher roles.
QUESTIONS

(N.B. On the actual form, ample space was provided for the interviewer to record responses.)

1. What do you think are the most important roles of teachers? After one role is described by the informant, ask questions like "Are there any other roles you think are important?" to elicit additional responses.

2. Do you think that the roles of teachers have changed over the years? (If the informant answers, yes, elaborate by asking how the roles may have changed.)

3. Do you think society expects different roles from teachers now than it did in the past? (What this question seeks to establish is whether or not the informant believes that teacher roles have changed or evolved over time. This line of inquiry may be facilitated by asking questions like "Are there roles for teachers which once were important but which are no longer important? Are there roles for teachers that were once considered unimportant and are now important?"

4. Given our current definitions of teacher roles, have we defined teacher roles this way for long? How long are these roles likely to remain stable into the future?

5. Do you think teacher roles will change in the future? (By future, I mean the next 25 years or so, although informants may take a longer view which is fine.) If the informant answers affirmatively, ask for elaboration -- "How might roles change?" and "Which roles might change and why?"
Give the informant the opportunity to add anything else he/she might wish to add to the discussion of teacher roles. Thank them for their help and emphasize how important the opinions and beliefs of practitioners (and others involved in education) are to the study.

6. Then tell them that you have some other definitions or ways of looking at teacher roles that you would like them to evaluate. The roles are shown as a series of numbered statements about teacher roles printed on cards, and that you would like them to divide the cards into two stacks of approximately 16 each. One stack will be for teacher roles they consider important, and the other stack for teacher roles they consider unimportant (or perhaps just less important). Note, by number, which statement goes in which pile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>UNIMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Take the "important" pile. Ask if any role which is now in the important pile would have been at some earlier time in the unimportant pile. Note the informant's answer.

8. Ask if any role in the important pile would, in the future, be in the unimportant pile. Note the answers.

9. Ask if any role in the unimportant pile would have been, at some earlier time, in the important pile. Note the informant's answer.

10. Ask if any role in the unimportant pile will, at some future time, be in the important pile. Note the informant's answer.

11. Next, ask if any role in the important pile is increasing in importance. Note the answer.

12. Then, ask if any role in the important pile is decreasing in importance. Note the answer.

13. Ask them to select from the important pile the five roles they feel are the most important. (Don't have to be in any order just the most important roles).

14. Ask if the informant feels that any of the roles listed on the cards overlap - that is, are any essentially the same? Note any statements which the informant feels overlap. (They may look at or pick up any or all of the cards to do this).

This concludes the interview. Thank the informant for their help and again tell them how important their contributions are. Let them know that if they are interested in seeing a copy of the final dissertation, they may contact Old Dominion University next January to request a summary of the findings.
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA code______

1. AGE ________________
2. GENDER ________________
3. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (No of years of education)
   __________
   DATE HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED _______________________
4. RACE ________________
5. OCCUPATION ___________________________
6. PRESENT JOB/POSITION IN THE SCHOOLS (IF EMPLOYED IN
   THE SCHOOLS)___________________________
7. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION (AS TEACHER OR
   ADMINISTRATOR)________________________
8. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN URBAN EDUCATION
   ____________
9. ARE YOU CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN FORMAL EDUCATION?
   YES ___ NO ___
10. IF SO, ARE YOU ENROLLED IN A CERTIFICATE OR DEGREE
    PROGRAM? YES _____ NO __________
    IF YES, WHAT DEGREE/CERTIFICATE_______________
Appendix C

TEACHER ROLE CARD SORT

Thank you for helping in this research project. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. I am interested in your ideas about the roles of teachers -- both today and for the future. By roles, I mean all the different things teachers must do on their jobs -- in the classroom, with students, in the community and in school. What I would like you to do is arrange the roles on the cards you have IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE TO YOU. I am asking you to do this twice -- once as you see teacher roles today and once as you see them for the 21st century.

You should have two stacks of cards (one blue and one gray) and two bright pink cards that say "Place this card in your stack so that all roles below this card you consider unimportant." To complete the card sort, take the gray stack labeled "Present - Today" and arrange the cards in order of importance -- the most important teacher role today will be on top and the most unimportant role will be on the bottom. Place the bright pink card in your stack so that all cards above it are those you consider important and all below it are those you consider unimportant. See the diagram below. Clip the stack together with the clip provided.

Then, take the blue stack labeled "Future - 21st Century" and arrange the cards in order of importance for the future -- the most important teacher role for
the future would be on top and the most unimportant would be on the bottom.
Place the bright pink card in your stack so that all the cards above it are those
you consider important and all below it are those you consider unimportant. Clip
the stack together with the clip provided.

Please keep the blue and gray cards separated into two different stacks.
Finally, please take a moment to fill out the demographic information
sheet. All replies are confidential and no names will be used in writing up the
results. All participants are identified only by a code. If you have any questions
or my directions are unclear, please call me at 587-0797. Thanks again for your
help.

Jim Onderdonk
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>AGE</strong> ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong> ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND</strong> (No of years of education) ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DATE HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED</strong> ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>RACE</strong> ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>OCCUPATION</strong> ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>PRESENT JOB/POSITION IN THE SCHOOLS</strong> (IF EMPLOYED IN THE SCHOOLS) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION</strong> (AS TEACHER OR ADMINISTRATOR) ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN URBAN EDUCATION</strong> ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. | **ARE YOU CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN FORMAL EDUCATION?**  
   | **YES ___ NO ___** |
| 10. | **IF SO, ARE YOU ENROLLED IN A CERTIFICATE OR DEGREE PROGRAM?**  
    | **YES _____ NO ______**  
    | **IF YES, WHAT DEGREE/CERTIFICATE** ______________ |