

common causal factors, a single solution may have multiple values. It may result in positive pupil outcomes and in socially useful outcomes as well. The utilization of low-income auxiliaries in disadvantaged areas appears to be a case in point. Its possibilities are many. Its real significance is only beginning to be explored.

The study is designed to view these possibilities in terms of several reality situations, and to identify factors which seem to block or facilitate the realization of educational values from the utilization of auxiliaries in these specific situations.

DIFFICULTIES WHICH MIGHT ARISE IN THE DEPLOYMENT OF AUXILIARIES IN SCHOOLS

During the pre-planning for the overall study and for the demonstration programs, many professional and administrative concerns were discussed. Some of the anticipated difficulties were actually encountered. Others proved to be mere conjecture, not substantiated by experience. The fact that these possible problems had been considered in advance aided in their solution.

The difficulties anticipated by each of the groups involved in the training programs differed widely. For school administrators they were largely "how to" problems, such as establishing fiscal policies—the whole process of setting up a new hierarchy of positions, with job descriptions, job titles, salaries, increments, role prerogatives, and training requirements for advancement. Another "how to" problem for the superintendent was orienting the principals, who, in turn were faced with the problem of interpreting the new program to the teachers and other professionals so that they would utilize rather than ignore, reject, or resent their would-be helpers. Theirs was the task to determine who would conduct the training of both professionals and nonprofessionals and how to secure such personnel. Often all this had to be accomplished within and in spite of institutional rigidities. Moreover, the school administrator was responsible for involving local institutions of higher learning and the indigenous leadership in the planning, and for interpreting the new program to the Board and to broader community.

The professionals—teachers, supervisors, guidance counselors, et al—were primarily concerned that professional standards should be maintained. They wondered whether the auxiliaries might try to "take over," but they were even more concerned lest the administrators, caught in the bind between increasing enrollment and decreasing availability of professional personnel, might assign functions to the auxiliaries that were essentially professional in nature. The teachers, specifically, believed that teacher-aides might sometimes be assigned to a class without the supervision of a certified professional. Teachers, particularly, questioned whether funds which might have been used to reduce the teaching load would be used instead to employ auxiliaries, while increasing rather than decreasing the size of classes.

Some teachers and other professionals also doubted that adequate time would be set aside during school hours for *planning* and *evaluating* with the auxiliaries assigned to them. Moreover, many professionals were not accustomed to the new leadership function which they were being asked to perform. Some felt threatened by another adult in the classroom. Others could not envision ways in which to use this new source of assistance effectively. Still others anticipated that the auxiliaries might not speak in standard English and hence might undermine their own efforts to improve the pupils' language skills. A few wondered whether the pupils would respond more easily to the auxiliaries than to themselves and that they might therefore lose close, personal contacts with their pupils.

The auxiliaries, themselves, had many trepidations. They, too, appeared to be concerned about the differences in their background, values, and patterns of speech from those prevailing in the school. While the professionals often considered the effects of such factors upon pupils, the auxiliaries tended to become defensive and uncomfortable because of these differences. On the other hand, some auxiliaries were resentful, particularly in pre-school centers, when they observed only the end result of the planning—i.e., what was actually done for pupils and by whom in the classroom. Not understanding the diagnostic skills required of the teacher in designing the program to meet the needs of individual pupils, these auxiliaries were heard to say: "We do the same things as the teacher; why should they be paid more?"