

staff. To the question: "What is the responsibility of the auxiliary in a classroom?", an unequivocal answer came through in all the projects from the auxiliaries themselves—"To help the teacher teach." To the follow-up question: "What, then, is teaching?", the answers tended to come more slowly, both from the auxiliary-participants and the teacher-participants, meeting separately. The hesitation of the latter group may have stemmed from the difficulty of adjusting to a more complex and important level of professionalism with emphasis upon diagnosis, program planning, and leadership functions. It appears that teachers, by and large, have not yet been prepared either by colleges of teacher education or in-service training programs to orchestrate other adults in the classroom, since this is a relatively new responsibility for those in the teaching profession.

In the group interviews, the teacher-participants tended to view this new function not as a substitute for direct contact with the pupils but as a positive factor in teacher-pupil relations. Teachers defined this as freeing the teacher from many routine and time-consuming duties and by providing more opportunity for differentiated education to meet individual needs of pupils.

These reactions were apparent even among teachers in the practicum who were not enrolled in the training program, as they became more comfortable about the unusual experience of having another adult in the classroom. The possible threat of such a situation appeared to be effectively relieved and a continuing process of role development for auxiliaries appeared to be established when teacher-auxiliary teams as co-participants had an opportunity for daily evaluation of their experience together. This process was facilitated when individual and/or group counseling was also available to help participants cope with their personal needs as they adjusted to a new situation.

Several attitudinal changes were perceived by observers within and outside the projects alike, which appeared to have direct relationship to the training experience: 1) the auxiliaries reported a new feeling of confidence, hope and aspiration; 2) the teacher-participants in most of the projects expressed a change in their image of poor people which paralleled and reinforced the improved self-image of the auxiliaries themselves; 3) both types of participants agreed that low-income auxiliaries could facilitate communication with pupils and their parents in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, even to the point of eliciting a twinge of jealousy on the part of some of the teacher-participants; and 4) there was general agreement among the teachers and auxiliaries that the latter could, when trained and encouraged to do so, contribute to the learning-teaching process, and that their activities should not be restricted to routine clerical or custodial functions provided the selection criteria utilized were consistent with a broad role concept. The extent of involvement in the learning-teaching process depended upon the ability and potential of the auxiliaries. Most projects picked the cream of the crop in this experimental type of program. Only Howard University and Ohio University made an effort to reach potential drop-outs.

Finally, there appeared to be consensus among the various observers of the programs that a realistic appraisal and interpretation of the policy, needs and expectations of the local school system with respect to the utilization of auxiliaries was essential to prevent false hopes, leading to frustration, but that realism regarding employment opportunities does not need to connote defeatism. They saw role development as a dynamic and continuing process in which professionals, nonprofessionals, educational institutions, and the community all have a responsibility.

In cases where pre-service training was followed by on-the-job experience, institutionalization was facilitated.

SUMMARY

The elements in the demonstration training programs which were identified by visitation teams as particularly effective in implementing project goals were:

(1) Cooperative planning by school systems, institutions of higher learning, community action agencies, professional associations, instructional staff and participants.

(2) Skill training which is realistic in terms of local employment opportunities, but also geared to future potentialities in the utilization of auxiliary personnel by the local school system.