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ABSTRACT

A MODEL FOR LEARNER-DIRECTED BEHAVIOR CHANGE IN SMALL GROUPS OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Richard A. Lacey

B.A., Yale University, Connecticut
M.A.T., Yale University, Connecticut

THE PROBLEM

This study is concerned with developing a training model for practice teachers, incorporating elements of both behavioral and humanistic psychology in order to address systematically the large variety of needs which student teachers typically experience. The model defines a structure to enable a college supervisor to develop more intimate relationships with his student teachers, to assume a facilitative rather than a judgmental role, and to coordinate the personal resources of small groups in implementing a program in which student teachers can assess themselves.

THE PROCEDURE

This conceptual study grows from three case studies attempting to use eclectic sensitivity training procedures with small groups of student teachers in markedly different settings in order to discover whether they would form teams to provide feedback on their teaching behavior based upon observed patterns in small groups. In this procedure the student teacher, consulting with other student
teachers, the supervisor, and the cooperating teacher, would determine his own behavioral objectives and performance criteria for teacher effectiveness.

The results of these studies, based on self-reports, questionnaires, interviews, and participant-observation, refuted the hypothesis that student teachers would develop and implement learner-directed contracts based on learning in intensive group experiences. From these results emerged a model comprised of analogues to Maslow's theory of motivation – a hierarchy of human needs, including those of survival, belongingness, self-esteem, and self-actualization.

The needs described by the teacher training hierarchy are met by a combination of training procedures selected according to their particular application to student teachers' needs at given time. The procedures include microteaching, interaction analysis, strength training, value clarification, conference grouping, consultation techniques, brainstorming, encounter grouping, and components of methods courses. The supervisor diagnoses needs, provides feedback, counsels, and coordinates training procedures.

Although the model is untested, many of its components are supported by a large body of research. The model is designed to provide a flexible structure for the many training procedures available and to establish a theoretically reliable framework for meeting changing needs of student teachers.
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CHAPTER I

Until recently, conventional strategies in practice teaching have gone virtually unchallenged. Conant, for instance, could safely state in 1963, "the one indisputably essential element in professional education is practice teaching," (p. 142). Although typical programs have received increasingly critical scrutiny and precise, systematic techniques of supervision and training have appeared, no new, more humanistic approach is likely to challenge conventional programs unless it features a reliable, familiar design.

The increasing attention given to applying aspects of the human potential movement to teacher education (Brown, 1969; Alschuler, 1969; Combs, 1962; Jersild, 1955; Rogers, 1969a; Hamaehek, 1969) has implied that the behavioral approaches to developing skills in teaching are insufficient to produce authenticity in teaching. Combs (1966) contends that teacher education should stress the process of becoming a teacher - that is, of becoming a self - rather than teaching skills. The authentic teacher, in this view, is not simply one who has developed a reliable set of behaviors, but is one who is able to use his unique self as an instrument. Although Combs (1965) and Rogers (1969a) have outlined general characteristics of what teacher education programs should contain in order to produce authentic teachers, their recommendations are general, non-specific, and largely untested.
At the same time, many educators stress the need to solve several generic problems in conventional student teaching programs, primarily by teaching effective teaching skills and providing accurate clinical feedback on actual teaching which takes place. Two of the most prominent strategies, micro-teaching (Allen and Ryan, 1969) and interaction analysis (Amidon and Flanders, 1967), have been amassing an increasing amount of research to corroborate their claims of promoting behavior change that increases classroom effectiveness - that is, versatility and efficiency.

Although it has traditionally been difficult to reconcile the behavioral position represented by Skinner (1968) and Bandura and Walters (1963), and the humanistic position represented by Combs and Rogers, the two aims of teaching effectiveness are not deliberately at odds. On the one hand we wish to develop knowledge and proper application of methods, yet on the other hand we also acknowledge the need to stimulate their unique and effective combination in a human being. We also recognize that the climate of a teacher education program is important, and that a person is not likely to feel trustworthy, wanted, and worthy unless he is treated as if he is. The controversy has centered upon how the aims are to be achieved rather than whether they should be achieved. This argument in teacher education is, however, a straw man, for the issue is really how behavioral and humanistic approaches can be integrated into a model which suits the particular needs of the individual student teachers.

Such a model requires systematic facilitation. I am proposing that the supervisor act in a specialized facilitative role - as diagnostician of student
teachers' individual needs according to specified criteria, as coordinator of training activities, and as a role model. The strategy for a student teaching program, then, incorporates a fresh model of supervision. In this way I propose to construct a humanistic model for learner-directed behavior change characteristic of flexible, authentic teaching while accommodating the remarkable advances in other approaches.

The strategy entails a marriage between humanistic and behavioral approaches to teacher education, formed and maintained by the supervisor. He will unify the two approaches by determining behavioral objectives and performance criteria jointly with the student teacher. Together they will diagnose the prominent needs of the student teacher in the particular situation he is experiencing at a given time. Details of the principles governing how they will determine objectives and criteria appear at the end of chapter three.

Thus in this strategy both supervisor and student teacher will determine what objectives most clearly suit perceived needs, what performance criteria will satisfy those objectives, and what training procedures are most appropriate for meeting the specifications. Since other student teachers may assume the role of raters providing feedback for the ratees, the supervisor will often coordinate rather than implement supervision itself.

The study which follows is based in part on the proposition that an integration of various applications of the human potential movement, including techniques of value clarification, action research, and clinical encounters through group methods may provide one solution to the need the humanistic educators
have stressed. Originally, in fact, I proposed to restrict my attention to a model of self-actualization. However, such an approach does not consider sufficiently the advantages of other approaches mentioned above, especially the focus upon specific classroom skills and techniques of handling stressful situations. The model I propose coordinates techniques developed to meet those practical demands with strategies for fostering authenticity.

The model is based upon Maslow's (1943) theory of motivation, which delineates a hierarchy of human needs: (1) physiological, (2) safety, (3) love and belongingness, (4) self esteem and (5) self-actualization. Maslow states that an individual cannot fulfill higher levels of needs until he has fulfilled lower-level needs. My model proposes analogously that a student cannot concentrate upon self-actualization - authentic teaching - until he has fulfilled lower-level needs.

To illustrate, a physiological need might be to have sufficient energy to conduct a class or to maintain a normal load of classes; a safety need might be to solve discipline problems or to perform tasks of classroom management sufficiently well to pass student teaching; a need for belongingness might be to feel that one is accepted by faculty and students as a legitimate, if only temporary, member of the teaching staff; a need for self esteem might be to have certified and consistent success in the classroom; and finally, self-actualization would be developing learner-directed behavior change and self-monitored maintenance of effective behavior - creative, authentic teaching.

Self-actualization is probably more a theoretical goal of teacher education than a felt need of most student teachers, certainly at the beginning of the
practice teaching experience. At first glance, then, it may be argued that self-actualization procedures have no practical value in a student teaching program. I am including such activities as encounter grouping as part of the self-actualization component in the model, but not as a generally applicable procedure, for several reasons. First, the research does not warrant its general use; second, my own experiences with small groups of student teachers, cited in chapter four, confirm their limited application; third, a few student teachers will, in some situations where they are particularly successful, appropriately participate in such sessions and may discover exciting directions for personal and professional growth; fourth, experienced, successful teachers and supervisors should find them beneficial in their own work. This final reason is most important, for such people should provide role models for student teachers and should also have a regular opportunity to provide one another with feedback about their own behavior. Since they are not conventional student teachers, but are nevertheless concerned with improving their own teaching, the intensive group would be a generally appropriate training setting for them. In addition, the model provides opportunities for intensive group participants to amplify or to refocus their training by making use of the other training opportunities available to them. Finally, the groups would help to establish a climate for continuing involvement in the process of systematic learning on the part of all members of the teacher education program who immediately affect the student teachers.

The intensive group experience is one approach to self-actualization whose praiseworthy intentions have neither offset the effects of popular and professional
controversy surrounding it nor produced substantial results in changing teaching behavior (Sutton, 1969). Its advocates agree that we need a model of group experiences which emphasizes behavior change as well as attitude change. This study develops a model for behavior change that meets all five needs in Maslow's hierarchy.

In chapter three I examine how team and group approaches to supervision, using several procedures of teacher training designed to suit the five needs, entail a redefinition of the supervisory role – the theoretical basis of the model. During the spring semester 1970 I conducted three groups of student teachers using various affective approaches to stimulate behavior change, but neglecting to address systematically several lower levels of needs in the hierarchy. These explorations provided information leading to my model, and I review my conclusions in chapter four. The model itself comprises the fifth chapter, and in the final chapter I explore implications for teacher training.

The next chapter is devoted to the need for the model – a program of various group experiences coordinated to meet the pre-potent needs in the hierarchy.
CHAPTER II

The conceptualization of a model for learner-directed behavior change in small groups of student teachers grows from a study of the literature in teacher training, which reveals salient issues that invite partial solutions from a variety of perspectives. In attempting to synthesize diverse approaches I developed a model with both phenomenological and behavioral roots. In the course of defining the major needs in teacher training which the model addresses, the following discussion will outline these major components:

1. phenomenological roots – a rationale for using intensive groups with student teachers

2. practical needs for group strategies in conventional practice teaching programs

3. behavioral roots

4. philosophical foundations.

Phenomenological Roots – A Rationale for Using Intensive Groups With Student Teachers.

In the massive accumulation of literature and research on teacher training, perceptual views have increasingly attracted attention, but their prominent advocates – Rogers, Combs, Hamachek, and Jersild – have offered no systematic programs or models. Perceptual approaches, rooted in phenomenological psychology, are relatively embryonic, and their exponents have devoted most of their energy to developing their view that good teaching is characterized by the
unique personal qualities of the teacher himself — qualities which no amount of
training in skills and approaches to modern curricula can instill.

Although this view tempers widespread emphasis upon behavioral skills
alone, it does not disparage skills and materials altogether. Rogers (1969a) says
that although teaching skills, scholarly knowledge, curricular planning, audio-
visual aids, lectures, and books may be valuable resources, they are not sufficient
to initiate significant learning, which has a quality of personal involvement, is
self-initiated, is pervasive, is evaluated by the learner, has an essence of
meaning. Significant learning depends upon "certain attitudinal qualities which
exist in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner" (p. 106).
The three essential qualities in the effective facilitator are genuineness or
realness, acceptance and trust, and empathic understanding.

Rogers does not offer any systematic procedure for developing these
qualities in teachers other than to offer a workshop of intensive encounter groups
and to educate them along the broad guidelines in his book, expanding the
possibilities suggested by the prototypes he describes. Rogers' own method of
facilitation, however — the use of basic encounter groups — suggests possibilities
for teacher training that others echo or implicitly endorse.

Hamachek explicitly advocates the application of group encounters to
teacher education. Responding to Ellena and Biddle (1964), who state that "the
problem of teacher effectiveness is so complex that no one today knows what the
competent teacher is," Hamachek (1969) contends that we do know what a competent
teacher is and that his own review of the research describes specifically why we
do know. He maintains that "a good teacher is a good person... is flexible... and good teachers are, in a sense, 'total' teachers. That is, they seem to be what they have to be to meet the demands of the moment" (p. 344). In summarizing the theoretical stance which justifies incorporating intensive groups in teacher training programs he says that we should spend a great deal of time exposing students experientially to the complexities of personality structure. Beyond this, however, he does not offer any systematic propositions.

Combs (1962), whose book on a perceptual approach to teacher education Hamachek cites, states the humanistic position forcefully by exploiting the claim that "there seems to be no objective measure which can be relied upon with any degree of certainty that will distinguish the good teachers from the bad ones."

We know the difference intuitively, he claims, but we cannot measure the qualities of good teaching because teachers are unique individuals. Moreover, a good teacher is "an individual who has learned to use his particular self in effective and efficient ways. Since every self is different... every good teacher will necessarily behave in ways that are individual and unique" (p. 458). This position implicitly supports intensive group encounters for potential and practicing teachers because groups are designed to train a participant to do exactly what Combs' good teacher does - "use his particular self in effective and efficient ways."

While neither Combs nor Hamachek disparages research, both imply that the very nature of the subject - the good teacher - defies codification. Instead of concluding that the research is bewildering and frustrating, they maintain that it points unequivocally to a perceptual view of teacher education, one feature of which
might be the intensive group experience.

Jersild (1955), whose work mirrors Combs', discusses his empirical study which showed that teachers desire to face personal issues in a way that differs from academic approaches – therapy, for example – and states this broad principle to justify group methods:

Just as it is within an interpersonal setting that one acquires most of the attitudes involved in one's view of oneself, so it is likely that only in an interpersonal setting can a person be helped to come to grips with some of the meanings of these attitudes (p. 84).

Persuasive as these writers are, they do not offer a solution to the basic problem of what kind of group experience is feasible, reliable, and appropriate for student teachers. The most well-known group approach is the T-group, but as Stock (1964) pointed out, research on T-groups reveals many gaps and is not closing them because many new issues are constantly emerging in response to new applications and modifications. Campbell and Dunnette (1968) indicate that research on effectiveness of T-group experiences in managerial training and development has been largely concerned with the effectiveness of such experiences, and that any systematic, thorough examination of the factors affecting outcomes or governing consistent design is lacking. House (1967) and Rogers (1969b), assessing the state of intensive groups, indicate that the problem has become even more complex than Stock (1964) suggested. Rogers (1969b) states, "in the rich, wild tapestry which is the intensive group experience, one looks in vain for reliable or familiar designs. If such exist, we remain a good stout distance from discerning them" (p. 27).
The Need for Group Strategies in Conventional Practice Teaching Programs.

The conventional triadic structure of student teaching experiences - student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor - contains many tensions for reasons that Yee (1969) explains in the course of identifying several problems that pervade typical teacher training programs. Most of the needs he mentions invite partial solution through intensive group experiences. The first need parallels Biddle and Ellena's concern, but Yee's formulation of the problem is misleading:

Little attention has been given to the identification of factors that significantly determine the nature of outcomes in student teaching experiences. Not knowing for sure what really matters in student teaching, very little empirical research has been conducted to explain how it affects the candidate in his professional development. Until much greater knowledge is sought and found concerning what variables really matter and how they affect behavior, systematic improvements in student-teaching programs will be unlikely (p. 96).

Unfortunately, Yee is not sufficiently considering the various programs which have already provided systematic improvements based upon identifying factors which affect outcomes. Microteaching, for example, systematically improves teaching skills and promotes discrimination in behavior change; strength training, (Ungerleider, and others, 1969) systematically tries to improve a teacher's ability to handle stressful situations; interaction analysis systematically provides descriptions which identify factors that determine, in part, the nature of specific outcomes in a given class. A more reasonable conclusion is that these systematic improvements have not yet been integrated into a program which will meet the particular needs of student teachers at specified stages in their professional developments.
Recalling Combs (1962), what really matters is that the student teacher be able to "use his particular self in effective and efficient ways," or as Hamachek (1969) puts it, be able to "be what he has to be to meet the demands of the moment." The critical element in determining outcomes of student teaching must be the quality of interactions which contribute to a teacher's development of trust, self-acceptance, openness, and sensitivity to the feelings and needs of others, and the extent that this becomes evident in his behavior.

Exactly what components of the available techniques will contribute most heavily to a sense of personal adequacy depends upon what stage a student teacher is in his professional development - that is, how his needs may be described in terms of Maslow's theory of motivation. The weakness in Yee's formulation of the problem, then, is his generalized notion of professional development. Analyzing the implications of his final sentence above, we know that some variables do matter, and we know that several variables can affect behavior, but we need to coordinate them with the particular needs a student teacher has at a given time. Clearly a student teacher's needs may vary from week to week, or even from class to class; while he may need to develop skills in probing questions in one class, he may have severe discipline problems in another. The way to improve his teaching systematically is to identify the problems and match particular interventions to the diagnosis. Teaching is a complex activity whose components are not necessarily related to one another. Thus, it is not useful to say that one's teaching has "improved," for such a statement does not indicate
what aspects of teaching one is referring to. If we do not think of a student
teacher's professional development as linear, we are not bound by the equally
confining notion of designing programs which all student teachers should follow
in a similar sequential pattern.

The other major group of needs that Yee cites grows out of the necessity
to consider "the individual characteristics of all persons interacting in educational
situations. ... Groups' interpersonal conflict increases as the percentage of
members with high conceptual structures increases" (p. 96). Since interpersonal
conflicts produce many obstacles to effective student teaching we need to study the
relations and demands among leaders and followers and to find ways to provide
conditions for cooperative rather than typically competitive triadic relationships.
These needs are aptly suited to systematic examination in the laboratory setting
of intensive small groups. Hamacheck's and Yee's reviews of research in teacher
effectiveness point to a need to find ways of increasing awareness of the impact
of specific behaviors upon others, to experience and examine the forces that
operate in a group, and to examine one's own effectiveness in building and
maintaining a group. Emphasis in a group designed for student teachers must be
upon applications for learnings to all aspects of professional development - to the
daily job of working with regular faculty, administrators, college supervisors,
parents, maintenance and secretarial staff, and other student teachers as well
as with students inside and outside the classroom. In short, the group experience
is designed to help student teachers to become "total" teachers.
Other major interpretations of the literature in teaching effectiveness, together with other views of supervision (Musella, 1970; Goldhammer, 1969), confirm the proposition that supervisors and student teachers should work closely with one another (Goldhammer says "intimately") and that student teachers should begin to participate as fully as possible in assessing their own performances and in determining the evaluative criteria that they should apply. Although I will treat the practical implications of this position in detail in the next chapter, a brief review of pertinent research will provide more substantial support for the implications I have drawn thus far.

Flanders (1969), examining the implications of research on teacher effectiveness since Gage's (1963) thorough general review, indicates optimistically that trends promise considerably more useful results than they did in 1963, when Gage (1963) and Medley and Mitzel (1963) concluded that most of the work on teacher effectiveness was useless because it featured invalid criteria and no objective measures of teacher behavior. Flanders (1969) states that current research on teacher effectiveness is approaching the complex question of why teachers vary their behavior in different teaching episodes and whether these variations are related to educational outcomes.

He is particularly encouraged by the evidence that many researchers have devised increasingly sophisticated means of measuring the effects of teaching behavior (e.g., Miller, 1964; Taba and others, 1964; Gallagher and Aschner, 1963; Openshaw and Cypert, 1966; Parakh, 1965; Hough, 1967; Galloway, 1962). He concludes that there is new hope in preservice and inservice programs,
stressing simulation of teacher-pupil interaction by using adult-to-adult social skill training exercises and microteaching. His optimism is based on the emergence of more powerful observation techniques, but he also says that we lack teaching units which can be used to evaluate educational outcomes. We need, he believes, "to develop models which can be used to conceptualize classroom interaction and, in turn, help specify and suggest ways to quantify research variables more systematically," (Flanders, 1969, p. 1435).

Saadeh (1970), addressing the complexity of this problem, develops such a model, contending that instead of attempting to isolate and study discreet variables of teaching effectiveness, we must begin to use systems analysis, combining the resources of the theoretician and the technician. My proposed strategy is one attempt to foster this kind of cooperative enterprise. The hierarchical conceptualization, for instance, emerges from a consideration of the totality of the training experience. It is not enough simply to ask whether a given training experience is successful with some student teachers. We must consider the combination of factors which impinge upon his experience at a given time and construct the appropriate intervention accordingly.

Two studies of the relationship of human relations training to teacher effectiveness illustrate how an intervention may be appropriate for some teachers and clearly inappropriate for others. The two studies (Bowers & Soar, 1961; Soar, 1936) indicate that there was no relationship between changes of teachers' or pupils' behaviors as a result of sensitivity training. Instead, the studies showed that the best adjusted teachers became more effective following training, but the
less well adjusted teachers became less effective. The studies indicated that unless a teacher functions well to begin with, such procedures may actually produce adverse results. The studies also suggest, however, that human relations training might be effective for teachers whose needs are consistently in the higher levels of the hierarchy.

The studies of human relations training measured teaching effectiveness by process and change measurements of pupil products, including subject matter, creativity, and personality. There has been a great deal of dispute about how to measure teacher effectiveness, and the criteria used may often prompt different interpretations of the results. The argument for measuring effectiveness by pupil growth is that there cannot be teaching without learning, which involves measurable change. Saadeh (1970) presents an extensive and complex, convincing argument in behalf of measurement of pupil outcomes, but Musella (1970) presents an alternative position which avoids the complex problems of empirical research. Musella points out that we lack conclusive evidence about cause and effect variables in teaching and so cannot rely upon student-growth criteria to measure teaching effectiveness, desirable as such criteria may theoretically be. We should therefore devote our attention to extending opportunities for self-improvement. "The attempts at improvement that have the greatest chances for success are those that come from self, the person whose behavior is to be changed," (p. 19).

In his theory of supervision, Musella contends that the supervisor should work with the student teacher, not over him, facilitating his attempts to assess himself. Echoing Flanders (1969), he is encouraged enough by the improved
techniques for providing feedback to suggest that we now have the tools for students to assess themselves efficiently and objectively.

In another, complementary model of supervision, Goldhammer (1969) does not rely upon the techniques of feedback which encourage Flanders and Musella, but focuses his attention upon the supervisor himself. He maintains that the supervisory relationship must be close and regular if it is to be effective, and that it must embody the characteristics that Rogers (1961) cites. Goldhammer stresses, too, that his commitment to this value is essentially pragmatic. The teaching process involves human relationships, and it is upon these, he believes, that we must build. His stress in clinical supervision is upon the subjective self. "How a teacher feels about the content, for example, will influence the character it assumes as it is mediated to the students. Its character will also be affected by how the teacher feels about his students, about his employment, and, in some measure, about things generally," (p. 359). In defining the relationship a supervisor should have, he refers to "constructive" intimacy; one of the main characteristics of this positive relationship is that "both the supervisor and the supervisee experience spontaneous and authentic affection for each other" (p. 362).

All of these studies and theories point to fresh possibilities for creating a psychological climate in which a student teacher can systematically discover and develop his best capacities. Since he must synthesize a great variety of information and translate it into personally useful feedback, he needs support as well as techniques in order to do so.

A student teaching program supposedly prepares a candidate for independent
classroom teaching and evaluates his potential worth as a teacher, but developing habits of independence, while desirable in some ways, does not necessarily mean that one is progressing toward authentic teaching. If a teacher is to develop his full potential worth, he must become interdependent. He works with groups in the classroom, he must work with colleagues in his department, he must contribute to the efforts of the faculty as a whole, and he must work with a wide range of people in the school community.

Very few teachers, however, achieve this kind of professional versatility and authenticity. It is proverbial that teachers are among the most insular of professionals. When we speak of "full potential worth," moreover, we are talking about self-actualization - the highest need in the hierarchy. Before a student teacher can even begin to consider developing his full potential worth, he must achieve competence in the classroom, must feel at ease with students, must see other faculty as colleagues rather than as evaluators, and must be able to transcend the daily petty annoyances which characterize typical teaching situations. These are not goals which a conventional triadic practice teaching program can realistically hope to achieve regularly in a single semester.

Because many findings show that cooperating teachers strongly influence the future teaching methods of their student teachers (e.g., MeAulay, 1960; Soares & Soares, 1968; Price, 1961; Goodlad, 1965), some suggest that adequate qualitative screening criteria and preparation for cooperating teachers be found (Yee, 1969). Even when this is accomplished, however, a student teacher needs the opportunity to develop a professional style congruent with his personal values,
to receive support for his own attempts to learn apart from judgemental influence of supervisors. A student teacher needs particularly to examine his values in terms of his actual behavior; if he wishes to change his behavior, he needs help—that is, reinforcement for what he wants to learn. Often, however, he will not be able to examine his values or determine independently what behavior he wishes to change, much less how to go about changing, until he has solved some of the more pressing practical problems which he faces daily.

The inadequacy of methods courses or training in specific instructional techniques, or even practice teaching itself in producing genuineness, trust, and empathy is a theme common to much criticism of teacher education programs. In all fairness, these programs are not specifically designed to instill these qualities. Groups, however, are designed to foster them, for the learning that occurs in intensive groups is for personal growth as well as for training in effective work with others in an organization. Clearly genuineness, trust and empathy are desirable goals in teacher education, but a student teacher cannot develop them, even through an encounter group experience, if the situation in which he teaches is too threatening to invite such attitudes, or if he has had only marginal or incipient success in maintaining order, interest, and production in his classes. Rogers, Combs, and Hamachek all acknowledge that the personal qualities which they endorse are impossible to foster in an atmosphere which does not contain them in the first place. Thus, while a group which meets outside the regular teaching environment might conceivably be facilitative, it is unlikely
that any transfer of those qualities would occur if the teacher must constantly re-enter an unreceptive environment. Thus, he must learn skills to affect his teaching environment, to make it receptive to those qualities.

The college supervisor is in an appropriate position to provide the opportunity to explore fresh possibilities in learning through group methods; furthermore, group work would increase his effectiveness, since it would enable him to minimize his judgmental role and provide a climate for mutually educative personal relationships. Group methods are particularly attractive in the light of the tremendous handicaps of the college supervisor—administrative routines, superficial conciliations and facilitation of relationships between cooperating teachers and student teachers, and the onus of evaluation. As a result of such factors a supervisor is often unable to establish meaningful relationships with his student teachers.

By working with groups a supervisor could promote more meaningful relationships, but only if he is able to diagnose and meet the individual, changing needs of the student teachers. We should therefore redefine the role of the supervisor; he should be a diagnostician, not only of specific pedagogical problems, but of personal concerns. That is, he should be able to direct student teachers to those experiences which will most fully suit his current needs. Thus, theoretically the most meaningful interaction might not be in an encounter group experience. Instead, it might occur in a strength training session devoted to discipline problems. The student teacher might discover something about his feelings about authority in an encounter group, but he would not receive systematic
short-term practice in dealing with discipline problems in a simulated classroom. Possibly both the strength training sessions and the group encounter experience might reveal similar information about the student teacher's feelings about discipline, but the manner in which he could deal with disruptive behavior would depend upon the stage of personal and professional growth he had achieved at that time. It is important, as Hamachek says, for him to be what he has to be in order to meet the demands of a given unique moment, but his chances of developing this capacity will be greater if he has had some experience in meeting stressful moments with prescribed techniques tailored to his latent talents.

The Implications of Behaviorism for Group Programs in Teacher Training.

The tremendous importance attached to observable behavioral outcomes in the proposed model grows from strong behavioral roots. Many intensive group experiences are designed to promote personal change in the form of the following kinds of outcomes: the individual will find it less threatening to accept innovative ideas; he will be more likely to confront openly personal, emotional frictions between himself and his colleagues; he will be more able to listen to others and to recognize and accept their feelings; and he will be more likely to work out interpersonal conflicts with others rather than to rely on bureaucratic measures (Rogers, 1969a). Unfortunately, as recent studies (e.g., Sutton, 1968; Soar, 1966) have shown, there is little evidence that significant change occurs when sensitivity training is used either with teachers or with student teachers. In fact, participants showed regression in important areas - nervous symptoms, anti-social tendencies, occupational relationships and sense of personal worth.
Sutton's study concludes:

It can be stated that sensitivity training was not clearly demonstrated to be a significant factor in changing student perceptions of teachers, or stated another way, students did not perceive significant change in teachers who had sensitivity training. . . . Supervising teachers did not observe relationships between pupils and teachers who took sensitivity training to be significantly different from the relationships of those who did not (p. 2456-A).

Sutton's study recommends that research of longer duration be conducted to compensate for the regression factor and that more sensitive measuring instruments be developed to record significant changes that occur during training.

It is important that the sensitivity training group, designed to promote personal growth, has had difficulty in promoting behavior change on the job—transfer of training. Even if we hypothesize, following Combs' (1966) ideas, that important behavior changes in teaching will occur as a result of personal growth, or as evidence that the growth has occurred, the goals of sensitivity training seem too generalized to promote systematically the kinds of behavior changes which would meet immediate problems that a student teacher faces constantly during his classroom experiences. For this reason, the model features behavioral procedures designed to promote specific changes in a short time.

The basic procedure in behavior modification is alteration of environmental contingencies to affect a subject's response. That is, one must identify a problem based on observed behavior, identify the contingencies which currently maintain the behavior, alter those contingencies, and decide exactly what changes (reinforcements) are required to alter the behavior. While the Rogerian model
posits that in an atmosphere of acceptance, genuineness, empathy, and freedom, an individual will give expression to his urge for self-consistency and self-actualization. Behaviorism contends that a particular behavior be changed through the systematic and differential application of reinforcement. Recent research (Truax, 1966) has shown that even Rogers reinforces differentially, but the major point of contention centers upon who determines what behavior is desirable and why. In the proposed model the individual in the group will identify a particular problem with the help of others and will choose a particular strategy to solve that problem.

Some of the strategies, such as microteaching, are based upon behavioral principles (Bandura & Walters, 1963) of modeling. In addition, the supervisor, the cooperating teacher, or possibly a team of other student teachers will use reinforcement (Skinner, 1968) to support a new behavior. Strength training, which features coaching of prescribed new behaviors, also uses differential reinforcement.

Once a teacher is secure and wishes to improve an aspect of his teaching, he can specify independently the performance criteria for desired new behavior, a behavior which he will decide ultimately to reject, to incorporate into his repertoire of responses, or to supplant previous behavior altogether. He will make a contract with other group members to help him achieve his goal, and the team will reinforce his desired behavior through feedback. This self-actualizing procedure, however, is an extension of rather than a departure from previous behavioral approaches. It is unlikely that a student teacher with safety needs
would welcome other student teachers to observe him, but the same student teacher, once secure and consistently successful, might feel comfortable enough to invite them to provide feedback. The supervisor must, therefore, be sensitive to the changing needs of a student teacher in order to help him design the kind of approach best suited to his needs.

Team-building is necessary to make the final stages of the model more efficient than sensitivity training. Sutton's (1968) recommendation that sensitivity training be increased to one hundred hours or more is probably impractical in most programs, and it is based on the sole expediency of extending training without considering alternative ways of achieving desired behavior change. It also ignores the possibility that efficient behavioral techniques might be necessary in order to provide an atmosphere of psychological safety which would allow sensitivity training transfer to take place.

The question is not how much sensitivity training should occur, but what kinds of training are best suited to particular needs. All of the studies support the notion that while some student teachers might benefit from sensitivity training almost from the outset, others should not even begin it.

The task of applying behavior modification in student teaching is (1) to isolate environmental contingencies which can be altered significantly, (2) to discover adequate reinforcers, (3) to develop realistic contracts for reinforcing procedures, (4) to develop alternative strategies for behavior change. In short, the problem is to identify the activities which are sufficient and necessary to reach given behavioral goals as efficiently as possible.
In order to implement the model, the supervisor must match the various techniques to the appropriate problems and needs. Of course, some problems, needs, and techniques overlap. A session in strength training might be beneficial to students with vastly different needs on the hierarchy, but for different reasons. In other words, the same kinds of experiences are often reinforcing in different ways because they address different needs. One teacher may find that set induction is a partial solution to restlessness at the beginning of a class, while a more competent student might search for especially innovative kinds of set induction in the same microteaching lesson. A week later the former student might be undergoing strength training in order to deal with restlessness from a different perspective, while the latter student might be identifying personal behavior patterns which could be affecting his classroom performance.

Philosophic Foundations.

Because my model involves a coordination of elements in behavioral and humanistic psychology, the philosophic controversy surrounding the idea of learner-directed activity must be examined briefly. I have already shown that the conventional dispute between humanistic and behavioral views of teacher education strategies may be resolved pragmatically; the same is true with the issue of whether students are really self-directing as they learn.

A timeworn controversy surrounds the concept of choice; Rogers and Skinner (1953) delineated the opposing positions in their famous debate, and Bandura (1969) has recently explored the issue at greater length. Recent work
in psychological education (Ivey & Weinstein, 1970) has suggested that instead of being at odds, the selective behavioristic and humanistic strategies complement one another in appropriate phases. Both behaviorists and humanists are striving for similar results from different directions. Hence, if we are concerned primarily with the results we wish to achieve, we do not need to explore the philosophical ramifications of the two approaches.

A major pragmatist, Charles Peirce, provides a clear resolution of the problem by his insistence upon applying logical methods to life as well as to science, and upon connecting ideas to observable effects - operationalism. Corollary to Peirce's position is Dewey's idea of meaning as the perception of relations between actions and consequences. Thus, if teaching needs to be carried out in purposive units of action, then the teacher training process should become the resource for purposive units. The subject matter is the interaction process itself; individuals behave in order to fulfill needs and to solve problems; finally, the results must be observable. The group of student teachers, together with the supervisor and the cooperating teacher, exists to encourage perception of relations between action and consequence in order to enable individuals to behave more effectively and efficiently.

Thus, the choice of training procedures to solve various problems should be pragmatic. That is, the student teacher should select the experience which promises to work most efficiently, and he should rely upon the information from his supervisor and others to determine what it should be. As he advances in the hierarchy of needs, his choices will probably become increasingly self-directed.
This is consistent with common sense, for as a student becomes increasingly successful in the classroom, he will probably become less dependent and more open to a variety of possibilities, many of which he will perceive independently. The problem with many programs is that they neglect common sense. In advocating authenticity in teaching, evident in warm pupil-teacher relationships, genuineness, acceptance, and creative approaches to presentations, a supervisor may not consider the possibility that a student teacher may feel so threatened that he is unable to determine his own choices, direct his own learning.

While the philosophical foundations of my model are largely pragmatic, they also depend upon existential thought. Maslow's (1964) excursion into existentialism, for instance, is a synthesis of philosophy and phenomenological psychology. He asserts that he is not an existentialist, but sees existentialism as "essentially a radical stress on the concept of identity and the experience of identity as a sine qua non of human nature and of any philosophy of human nature" (pp. 88-89). This stance, naturally, posits the existence of choice in establishing and experiencing identity. The student teacher has a choice, I believe, of what controls he will acquiesce to, and he can determine the extent to which they will affect his relationships. Moreover, he can determine in significant ways the effects which he will have upon the controls themselves.

This becomes increasingly true as the student experiences success in his teaching. He is more able to experiment with a variety of alternatives when he feels secure; he is freer to make mistakes. Thus, behavioral approaches actually provide a foundation upon which the student can build his own freedom.
Without them, in fact, the student's freedom becomes a threat, and may truly seem "dreadful."

Summary of Conceptual Issues.

This dissertation grows from an analysis of several issues in teacher training - the problem of coalition formation in the student teaching triad; the unwieldy demands upon college supervisors; the difficulties of establishing meaningful interaction in the triad; the difficulties of promoting systematic behavior change; the need to provide structures for student teachers to aid one another; and the need to develop flexible, "total" teachers. The conceptualization of the model is based upon integrating a variety of teacher training procedures drawn from behavioral as well as humanistic psychology in order to fulfill all phases of growth in teaching, from elementary survival procedures to procedures designed to promote authenticity. At no point do the humanistic and behavioral tendencies conflict; on the contrary, they are designed to reinforce one another. The model does not pretend to train student teachers to be "total," authentic professionals in a single semester, but it is intended to provide a framework a full progression to occur.

These issues are all subsumed under Maslow's theory of motivation, whose analogues of systematic growth in teaching suggest a variety of approaches which can be utilized differentially to suit the particular needs of a student teacher at a given time. The limiting conditions under which the program would be instituted will be defined in the fifth chapter as part of the model along with the
rationale of providing a self-actualization component which will serve relatively few student teachers. Even a great variety of limitations, however, does not significantly alter the way the model addresses a central need in teacher education - to integrate systematic approaches to variables that affect outcomes in student teaching.
CHAPTER III

This chapter, which describes the theoretical and practical bases of supervision governing my model, contains two sections:

(1) Theoretical foundations: how Maslow's theory affects supervisory practices; Snygg and Combs' (1959) theory of the perceptual self; how these two theories are related to desired outcomes in student teaching; the need for behavioral definitions of teaching practices; a framework for examining methodology behaviorally; and the implications of these ideas for supervision;

(2) Supporting and extending supervision with groups and teams: an examination of self-supervision and of studies suggesting that when the supervisor serves as a group facilitator he can become a model for student teachers.

Theoretical Foundations.

Maslow's theory of human motivation, delineating the basic needs of man in a hierarchy of pre-potency, is a framework for examining problems in student teaching as possibilities for growth. Since higher needs emerge as soon as lower needs are largely fulfilled, the problem for teacher trainers is not to motivate students to improve, but to diagnose and help them fulfill needs. According to Maslow, if we can encourage a teacher to develop self-esteem and provide a facilitative structure for him to explore further possibilities independently, he will begin to self-actualize - that is, to become all that he is capable of becoming (Maslow, 1943).
There are degrees of relative satisfaction; an individual is normally partially satisfied in all of his basic needs, but in terms of decreasing percentages of satisfaction as we proceed up the hierarchy. Because apparent emphasis on a new need emerges gradually, partial satisfaction of a higher need may produce misleading interpretations of a student teacher's behavior. Thus, he may show occasional spurts of creative energy, which a supervisor might be tempted on an occasional visit to interpret as significant improvement. However, the new behavior may be temporary or compensatory, and the student may still have a problem fulfilling a lower level need.

Maslow's distinction between consciously felt wants or desires and behavior shows how behavior can be deceptive. That is, if a person is deprived of two needs, he will want the more basic of them and will act on his desires. The supervisor who concentrates his attention upon a teacher's classroom techniques may neglect the possibility that he may also feel isolated and that his major need is belongingness. In order to become sensitive to prominent needs, then, a supervisor must have close and frequent association with the student teacher. Furthermore, the association should not be restricted to classroom observation and analysis.

A corollary, potentially misleading phenomenon is the apparent reversal of needs that some people display, the most common being to reverse the need for love and belongingness and that of self-esteem. For instance, a student teacher who may not feel close to anyone in the school but is exceptionally determined to perform outstandingly in the classroom might be remarkably
conscientious and able to develop well organized and energetically presented lessons for a while, provided students are compliant. The traditional insularity of teachers, epitomized in the slogan that a teacher's classroom is his castle, would support such a pattern. Maslow contends, however, that behavior which suggests seeking of self-esteem (strength, adequacy, confidence, independence, freedom) may sometimes be a means to an end—love and belongingness.

This interpretation carries implications for team and group approaches in teacher training. Frequently, as my own case studies showed, student teachers are initially reluctant to have others, including supervisors visit them until they have achieved consistent classroom competence. Similarly, some people resist having student teachers work in teams before they have achieved consistent success, and state that a supervisor should ascertain a fairly high level of competence before relinquishing control to groups and teams of student teachers. Maslow's theory suggests that although a supervisor should first stress establishing marginal adequacy (a sense of safety), he should then concentrate upon establishing a sense of trust and group cohesiveness among student teachers, so that a student teacher can later concentrate upon building a sense of freedom, independence, and increased competence.

After minimal competence has been attained, then, the stress should not be primarily upon building further skills, but instead should be upon establishing trust, perhaps by means of a reference group. Naturally, some sense of belongingness and comfort will occur in the classroom as a result of improved teaching, so that an appropriate focus for cohesion of the group should be upon
teaching tasks. However, the supervisor should stress warm interaction as much as acquisition of skills. What should emerge from group activities (e.g., brainstorming) is a sense of mutual support through increasingly close personal relationships. When the need for belongingness is central, skills become secondary.

This distinction is crucial. The supervisor who is unacquainted with Maslow's theory may reasonably believe that he is working efficiently when he concentrates upon techniques, but he may, despite his good intentions, arrest rather than promote the process of becoming a teacher.

Applying Maslow's theory to teacher education gains further strength in the light of a complementary theory of the self. Snygg and Combs (1959) have developed a theory of the phenomenological-perceptual self which has special bearing on this interpretation of student teaching. The theory is that "all behavior, without exception, is determined by and pertinent to the perceptual field of the behaving organism" (p. 20). An individual's perceptual field governs his behavior at any given moment. This field, however, is composed of one's perceptions of himself as well as perceptions of the environment. Therefore, the individual's evaluative view of himself - his self-concept - strongly influences his behavior toward his environment and toward others. For this reason, any decision which a person makes - any teaching act, for instance - depends upon the self-concept.

Since the self-concept is a result of accumulated feedback from others, it changes constantly. Moreover, it is most heavily influenced by feedback from significant others - e.g., parents or supervisors. The individual, of course, is
not passive; as he responds he provides others with feedback which in turn influences their future behavior.

Snygg and Combs' theory implies that the practice teacher's behavior will depend in part upon his self-concept, which in turn will change in the light of feedback, especially from significant others. Therefore, in order to promote teaching behavior which will reflect positive self-concepts, we need to create a structure, method, and climate which will enable some significant others to provide positive feedback to student teachers. Teams provide one opportunity for supportive peers to become significant others.

Seen in the light of Maslow's theory, self-concepts will become positive in direct proportion to fulfillment of needs in the hierarchy. If we wish to improve self-concepts, we should not haphazardly reinforce appropriate skills, but must instead reinforce those activities which most clearly suit the prominent needs of the student teachers. Thus, reinforcing diligence in preparing lessons may not necessarily foster positive self-concepts at all if student teachers' needs are for closer personal relationships. Instead, such reinforcement may intensify threats and further alienate the student teacher from himself and his work or they may be ignored because they do not address a central need.

To cite a typical example, a supervisor might have two student teachers, one somewhat isolated but diligent and apparently fairly competent, if unexciting, the other normally gregarious but temporarily threatened by severe discipline problems. The supervisor might normally be tempted to suggest minor improvements to the first teacher but spend relatively little time with her, and to devote
a great deal of time and energy to helping the second teacher. He would be making a mistake, however, in assuming that the former teacher's needs are not at least equal to those of the more obviously troubled teacher. In fact, although the former teacher may seem to be more professionally developed than the second, she may ultimately be far less successful because her development has been arrested, while the other's has not.

Three studies illustrate how programs in student teaching often jeopardize self-concepts by violating the principles I have been discussing. Petrusich (1968) states that the majority of teachers in her study were extremely unhappy in practice teaching and revealed that they would not want their friends to undergo the experience and felt inadequate and unsuccessful despite passing grades. She concluded that student teaching is often traumatizing, despite the apparent successes corroborated by certification, grades, and warm recommendations. Her study revealed that although student teachers typically showed more positive self-concepts than other seniors before their experience, they showed significantly less positive self-concepts than typical seniors after their experience.

Aspy (1969) discovered that many teachers enter the profession with a major concern for their own survival, and that supervisors and principals typically assess teachers and student teachers primarily for their ability to survive in the classroom. Thus, the resulting climate of student teaching programs is organized around survival rather than competence or excellence, despite stated objectives to the contrary. "Unless the individual teacher is strongly growth-oriented, he is pressed to the survival mean, and finds out that rocking the boat
is a crime" (p. 306). Aspy concludes that prospective teachers should be assured of survival in the classroom before beginning to teach.

The difficulty is not, however, that student teaching programs are organized around survival, but that the stated aims of the programs do not fit the candidates' needs. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with a need for survival, especially if there are resources to meet the need. Similarly, it is fair for a supervisor to assess a student teacher on his ability to survive if that is the need which he has been trying to fulfill. To decide arbitrarily to assess student teachers according to how innovative they are or even whether they have mastered certain skills of presentation is equally ill-advised. We need instead to assess student teachers - and our programs - in terms of whether the student teachers have made progress in fulfilling their particular needs in the proper order.

Walberg (1968) studied role conflict in urban practice teachers and found that student teachers initially entered teaching wishing to establish close, warm, supportive relationships with their students but discovered that the role they had to assume did not permit them to do so. As a result of the role conflict, their self-concepts suffered. In a follow-up study, Walberg and others (1968) carried out the implications of his original hypothesis and found that student teachers who tutored did not suffer role conflict and therefore had relatively more positive self-concepts than colleagues who taught larger classes. This finding is consistent with Maslow's theory, for a student teacher would first be concerned with survival, then with a sense of warmth and supportiveness in relationships with students. The next logical step would be to work on the student teacher's skills,
then upon ways to facilitate the teacher's search for freedom and an integrated system of personal and professional values.

If we want to produce teachers who are flexible, who feel worthy, free, trustworthy, and creative, we must begin with selective behavioral approaches to solving their needs rather than concentrate upon determining criteria for excellence in teaching and then attempt to train subjects to behave accordingly. Behavioral approaches promise to be especially effective when suited to particular needs at appropriate times, but they will be only marginally successful if they are used indiscriminately. My formulation of the issue is consistent with Bandura's (1969) statement that behavioral approaches actually enhance freedom and support a humanistic morality. Once a student teacher grows by meeting his needs as they emerge, he can develop self-esteem, achieve increasing independence and freedom, and then can, as Combs (1962) says, "find his own ways." For this reason, even though we agree with Rogers, Combs, and Hamachek that our ultimate aims must be humanistic, we should avoid talking solely in terms of self-understanding, self-acceptance, empathy, self-direction, and so on. Instead, we should define our goals behaviorally, addressing specific needs of student teachers as they emerge in the hierarchy.

Krumboltz' (1966) argument for behavioral goals in counseling applies equally to goals in practice teaching. Translating his three criteria for counseling goals into their corollaries in teaching, we find that the goals of teaching should be capable of being stated differently for each individual; the goals of teaching for each student should be compatible with, though not necessarily identical to,
the values of his supervisors; and the degree to which the goals of teaching are
tained by each student should be observable.

Krumboltz contends that "abstract goals are not wrong; they are just not
as useful as more specific statements would be" (p. 158). He continues:

To those who say there is "something more" than behavior (defined broadly) I would ask these questions: (a) Can you point to any individual who exhibits the "something more" trait? (b) Can you point to any individual who fails to exhibit this trait? (c) What does the first individual do or say differently than the second individual under what circumstances that leads you to conclude that he possesses the "something more" trait? (d) Why don't we list what he does or says under which circumstances as another possible behavioral goal? (p. 158)

Thus, it is difficult to know what a facilitator who is genuine, prizing, and empathic (Rogers, 1969a) does, except in a highly intuitive way. Student teachers must generate more specific information about their behavior in order to begin systematically to change. While they can agree with general recommendations about human interaction, they must solve immediate problems with specific strategies. Ivey (1970) defines the goals in terms of developing "intentionality," that is, giving individuals maximum choice of alternatives for their own behavior, an ability which involves learning new behaviors. Putting it another way, Weinstein (Ivey & Weinstein, 1970) believes that the goal is to expand a student's repertoire for negotiating with himself, with others, and with society.

Ward's (1966) behavioral definition of methodology provides a useful process goal for student teachers attempting to meet any level of needs:
Methodology can be thought of as a process in which the teacher (a) seeks cues by observing the dynamics of the classroom moment, (b) combines these cues with the aspirations and objectives he has for the learners (using his own hypotheses about learning), (c) makes a "move," and (d) evaluates the consequences of the move and the hypotheses on which he acted, in order to be able to make a better prediction next time, (p. 79).

This is a particularly useful formulation of the flexible, "total" teacher who is an individual in process because it indicates operationally the system which such a teacher follows in determining his actions. However, it also provides a useful tool for a student teacher who is struggling to survive in the classroom.

To summarize, behavioral goals in student teaching cannot be used effectively if they do not address the prominent basic needs of the student. Teaching behavior is not necessarily a reliable index of needs, for it may reflect more than one level, and the student teacher will follow the desires that reflect the lowest level of basic needs. Supervisors must not only consider how to convey important technical skills but must also diagnose the needs which the skills fit. We will probably best meet many of our humanistic goals by using behavioral procedures, which will provide a firm basis for developing the freedom to learn - our ultimate objective.

Clearly the model I have been describing demands a redefinition of the supervisor's role. Purpel (1967) recognizing the need for student teachers to receive strong and continuing support, urges that they be given the chance to establish a close and extensive personal relationship with at least one trainer, but he recognizes a serious problem when he says, "We need sensitive and knowledge-
able supervisors who are experts in the teaching process and have at their disposal the necessary and unusual amount of time required to help a student discover about teaching" (p. 23). He understates the case when he says that there is a shortage of such supervisors.

Student teachers themselves should, at appropriate stages, be able to assume the role that he urges, establishing helping relationships in small teams. They would not be certified "experts in the teaching process," but they could be coordinated by a supervisor who would be, and who could direct them to other experts. Purpel echoes others in saying that a student's growth as a teacher will proceed most efficiently in the presence of someone who shares his excitement and concerns. There is no reason, however, why the students themselves cannot be mutually excited and share concerns. Their excitement will be productive, too, if it is channelled into specific appropriate behavioral activities, perhaps culminating in group activities designed to promote learner-directed behavior change.

Johnson and Seagull (1968) sharply criticize present practices in teacher education because the form of education courses typically contradicts the principles they advocate; training programs do not practice what they preach. As a result, teachers learn that "learning to play the game" is most important, not only in what they have learned in their practice teaching experiences, but in what they have learned all along in their education courses. They have learned to deny affect, to want what others want, to accept external criteria of values, even in their long-range life goals. Johnson and Seagull found that teachers typically
display inability to take interpersonal risks and develop mutual nonaggression
pacts, and they concluded that "the form of teacher education as it now is has a
profound, though generally unplanned, influence on the values of prospective
teachers" and that "a more conscious and deliberate attention to the teacher's
personal value system is needed" (p. 170).

As Taylor (1960) puts it, "Values are learned, not always consciously,
by the particular set of situations in which people spend most of their time" (p. 49). Thus, it is important that a program practice what it preaches by valuing freedom, but the best way it can do that is to provide adequate resources for student teachers to be able to use the freedom which they seek. The supervisor should recognize that they do not always seek freedom as we conventionally think of it, but sometimes they seek strong guidance; they seek freedom in the last two stages of the hierarchy, particularly the fourth, but they are much more likely to be frustrated by it when they are experiencing lower level needs.

Certainly the supervisor should possess the qualities which Rogers (1969a) believes are essential to an effective facilitator, but he is more likely to be efficient if he also translates his concern into particular strategies based initially upon behavioral procedures. Macdonald (1966) has said that we have entered the feedback era of supervision. However, the supervisor using this model must do more than provide feedback; he must coordinate activities and be sensitive to fluctuating levels of needs, often relying upon others to conduct the actual training procedures.
Supporting and Extending Supervision With Groups and Teams.

There is a mounting body of evidence that teams and small groups provide a valuable structure for using students themselves as supervisors. Furthermore, small groups of student teachers may provide a forum to examine freely various personal concerns, trials and errors, and value issues; a reference group which can supply constant support; and a setting in which the supervisor can influence students by serving as a model.

Johnston (1969) and Furbay (1969, 1970) indicate that student teachers can supervise themselves effectively when using feedback procedures. Johnston, in a study of the effects of teams of student teachers who supervised themselves using microteaching and Flanders interaction analysis, based his program on the importance of the helping relationship (Combs & Soper, 1963; Rogers, 1961). Noting that there has been no formal practice in which students supervised themselves without being evaluated and analyzed by college personnel and cooperating teachers, Johnston found that self-supervision promoted significant relationships between attitudes and teaching behavior, indirect teaching, and higher scores on the MTAI.

Johnston's study also revealed that the attitudes of the student teachers' membership group differed from those of their reference group, experienced teachers. Since Siegel and Siegel (1967) have shown that an individual will be influenced to change his attitudes toward those of his reference group, Johnston concluded that a strong tie lessening the width of the interval between theory and practice is desirable. Harrison (1969) suggests that this would be practically
necessary if the student teacher were to remain influenced by relatively progressive university courses in philosophy and psychology.

Furbay (1969) studied self-assessment groups of student teachers who focused upon immediate and special problems that they faced on the job. In a warm, supportive climate they sought solutions to their problems; specified their own instructional objectives operationally; designed and utilized their own feedback systems; engaged in self-confrontation, examining discrepancies between ideal and actual performances; and selected, implemented, and evaluated innovations for attaining their goals. Thus, the group leader played a linking rather than an advisory role.

Although Furbay did not develop extensive empirical data in his first study, he observed several trends. Students in self-assessment groups differed from those in control groups in the following ways: they were more student-centered in their approach to discipline, more likely to individualize instruction through giving options to students, less talkative but more likely to explain things clearly, more willing to let students speak freely without first getting permission, less subject-matter oriented, less likely to assign homework (especially to utilize extra homework as a method of punishment), and less idealistic about teaching as a career. Pupils saw self-assessing teachers as less bossy, and they participated not only in mechanical details of classroom management, but in the designing of learning experiences in classes. Finally, teachers saw schools more as an appropriate agency for innovation and social change, they were more tolerant of deviant behavior, less likely to clamp down on troublemakers, and wanted more
of a personal relationship with their students, in which activities came about through caring rather than obedience.

Furbay's follow-up study on the same teachers (1970), however, is a sobering commentary on the counter-persuasive power of schools in which beginning teachers learn to "adjust." He says that "from theory of attitude change, it seems necessary to make more direct application of techniques for insulating persons against counter-persuasion and building into the program self-reinforcing mechanisms" (p. 12). The questionnaires, attitude tests, and interviews which comprised this study revealed that the positive teaching behavior which the student teachers had demonstrated was consistently extinguished during the first year of teaching.

The value of the self-assessment program for the individual participants was consistently evident in the interview data. The students reported that they enjoyed open and free discussion of one's strengths and weaknesses with a group of concerned professionals willing to help, the emphasis on behavioral objectives, the use of several feedback techniques, and the emphasis on teaching people rather than merely teaching subject matter. Furbay believes that the program depended primarily upon the first factor; participants later missed interpersonal support most of all. Without a supportive reference group, they felt unable to resist the institutional pressure to "adjust" their teaching behavior.

This evidence calls into question any program which encourages flexibility, increasing freedom for students, and authenticity, my own model included. Designing a support system for beginning teachers — perhaps a network of
reference groups, using resources in universities, colleges, and area schools - may be among the most crucial needs in promoting continuing change in elementary and secondary education. Until such support systems can be devised, we must consider changes in student teaching behavior as short-term effects, for chances are strong that any advances may be extinguished during the first year. In my final chapter, therefore, I will examine possibilities for using my model to promote such a support system.

Muro and Denton (1968) conducted a study of counseling groups for prospective teachers which indicated that such groups may be a valuable opportunity for students to examine the problem of identity. They studied two groups, meeting for one hour a week for fifteen weeks, using an eclectic counselor. The major theme which emerged in discussions was the role of the teacher and the self as a teacher. Students typically asked, for example:

"What makes a good teacher?"

"How do I know I'll make a good teacher, when I won't get a chance to find out until it's too late?"

"I've had to many poor teachers - will I be poor to?"

"Can I control the class?"

"Shall I be allowed to introduce controversial subjects?"

The questions fit into three general categories: "Who am I?" "Where am I going?" "Can I find a place in life." The discussions concluded that a good teacher is a rare individual and that each prospective teacher should carefully study his own behavior before making up his own mind to enter teaching. Two
students, after examining themselves and the profession, decided to withdraw from the School of Education and transfer to the College of Arts and Sciences.

Citing Omwake (1954), Berger (1952), and Phillips (1954), Muro and Denton maintain that accepting oneself stimulates a corresponding acceptance of others, and that as counseling continues, negativity decreases; this occurred in their study. They believe that programs in teacher education should provide prospective teachers with experiences which will enable them to discuss their own views in an atmosphere conducive to self-growth, and that prescriptions about the profession have little bearing upon students' perceptions of the personal role of a classroom teacher.

"Since acceptance of others would seem to be vital to teaching, some kind of support for this is necessary for teacher education" (p. 470). Students in their study felt that education became increasingly impersonal and that in teacher training programs more intimate interpersonal contact is important.

Clearly, the evidence that Furbay and Muro and Denton cite is related to the third level of needs, which is probably universally important in the professional growth of a teacher. Muro and Denton conclude that counseling groups are more likely to modify attitudes than are academic education courses. However, behavior as well as attitudes can be modified if the supervisor builds upon the interpersonal relationships formed in the groups by providing at appropriate times (that is, when cohesion is sufficiently high) tasks leading to improved teaching skills. Subsequently behavior changes should become integrated with a clear system of values.
Lewis (1969) states that the conference group leader, who also acts as supervisor, may serve as a model to influence student teachers' classroom behavior. She ran groups with six to twelve students, meeting weekly for one hour with no agenda; she gave students an opportunity to discuss their trials, errors, and concerns with their supervisor in a relaxed atmosphere. The supervisors were able to stimulate evaluation of students' perceptions of themselves and the ways in which others in the groups perceived them, and to help students generalize from their experiences in the meetings. Although the groups met for short periods and provided little structure for systematic behavior change, Lewis indicated that supervisors believed that they had had significant impact on their student teachers.

Samler (1960) and Williamson (1966) provide further evidence from counseling that a counselor may be a role model, and that one major goal may be to change a client's values. Values should be a major concern of any teacher, especially of a supervisor, who often acts as a counselor as much as he does a teacher (Goldhammer, 1969). Lewis' conclusion has special significance for my model, too, in the light of Macdonald's (1966) contention that teachers rarely possess a highly integrated professional and personal value system. He believes that teachers ought to spend a great deal more time than they do in examining and clarifying their values. He lists the following necessary conditions for changing student teaching programs accordingly: (1) a setting in which rewards are for growth rather than for service, (2) a climate of support for risk-taking, (3) provisions for reality testing, and (4) occasions for value clarification. The first condition
is especially difficult to meet, for "the allocation of rewards is generally not focused upon the growth of the teachers, but rather upon the service to the system" (p. 4).

Many writers have pointed out the need for an atmosphere of psychological safety so that teachers will take risks. The threats of disapproval for risk-taking, of evaluations, of judgment of merit, and of unknown results cannot be overcome without a climate of strong support and positive regard (Rogers, 1961). "Teachers must feel that other staff and leadership personnel are supportive and regard them as worthwhile persons no matter what they do or do not try. . . . It is as important to preserve the right not to change as to change" (Macdonald, 1966, p. 5).

The supervisor, therefore, is the fulcrum of this support, which should entail not only a warm, accepting climate, but a variety of behavioral procedures designed to provide solutions to problems and to address basic needs. The supervisor acts further as a model in group conferences, and may be able to stimulate self-esteem by using techniques of value clarification constantly in his associations with student teachers. Raths, Harmin and Simon (1966) show how a teacher can, in brief encounters with students ("one-legged conversations") gently and constantly prod their thinking with clarifying questions; this procedure seems aptly suited to supervision as well. In addition, by coordinating a variety of small group activities, the supervisor should be able to match procedures to all basic needs in the hierarchy.
The training procedures employed must be constantly reviewed for relevance to perceived changing needs as the student teacher assesses himself by determining behavioral objectives and attempting to meet self-designed performance criteria. Musella (1970) explains how and why such criteria of teacher effectiveness may be defined operationally by the supervisor and student teacher working together:

...The superordinate-rater must provide the means for describing and categorizing the teacher act in terms that he and the teacher can understand and accept - in other words, terms that do not connote values of effective or ineffective teaching; and...the superordinate-rater must provide the teacher with the opportunity for self-assessment based on the criteria previously decided upon.

Development of Criteria
Obviously the above statements need considerable explanation. First of all, the development of criteria is the necessary prerequisite to any assessment. If an effective teacher is one who has control of the classroom, and if control is defined as determining pupil behavior, then this must be understood at the outset. If an effective teacher is one who displays flexibility in the classroom, and if flexibility is defined as shifts in presentation and climate as demanded by shifts in student response, then this must be defined, stated, and understood previous to the assessment. If an effective teacher is one who is permissive, and if permissiveness is defined as accepting student initiative and leadership, then this must be understood as such by both parties. The question at this time is not the universal acceptability of the criteria of effective teaching nor the acceptanee of the criteria by both parties in the particular rating situation; rather, the objective is their awareness and understanding of the stated criteria (p. 19).

These kinds of criteria may be further defined behaviorally. Thus, control - "determining pupil behavior" - may be further specified in a session of strength
training, and upon examination, the parameters of control may be expanded considerably. A student teacher may wish to define control as establishment of quiet at the beginning of a class period, and perhaps he may use clear, firm instructions for a task requiring silence to begin a class. Upon clarifying his objectives, though, he may find that he would also welcome purposeful, lively discussion as long as students were attentive and complied with the teacher's instructions. Once the student teacher, together with the supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and other student teachers, explores many possible behavioral criteria of effective control, he will be able to embark on a training program and attempt to meet various performance criteria with the understanding that he has participated as fully as possible in determining the direction his learning should take. Furthermore, he is aware that at any time he may revise that direction in the light of new perceptions of his needs. Perhaps, for instance, he may decide that he does not yet want to risk encouraging lively discussion for fear that he may lose control, and he may want to concentrate instead upon building a resource of interesting short tasks which require silence. When he feels confident he may then risk trying other strategies.

The supervisor's diagnosis will also be guided by behavioral objectives. The student teacher will exhibit behaviors inside and outside of the classroom, in conferences with the supervisor, and in larger group sessions; these behaviors would reveal levels of needs. Sometimes a need would become evident from a direct report by the student teacher. Since this would be a particularly efficient method of diagnosis, it reinforces Goldhammer's (1969) emphasis upon the
necessary intimacy of the relationship between supervisor and student teacher. Some of the behavioral data which would provide a basis for the supervisor's diagnoses would follow these guidelines:

**Survival needs:** The student teacher has difficulty maintaining autonomy in the classroom, feels that his sense of identity as a teacher is threatened, and cannot create a climate of cooperation in the classroom. He may express his feelings of impotence and demonstrate defensiveness in several ways - by frequently shouting angrily at students, by using homework as a punishment, by ejecting students from the room for minor infractions by making derogatory or sarcastic remarks about individual students or about the class, by stating that his students have no capacity to learn, by stating that the students lack motivation, etc.

**Belongingness needs:** A student teacher infrequently associates with other student teachers or faculty members outside of the classroom, does not initiate exchange about his teaching experience, asks for frequent conferences with the supervisor without also relying upon other persons for suggestions, feedback, and general conversation.

**Self-esteem needs:** Although the teacher can survive in the classroom, he does not yet demonstrate pride in his activities and lacks initiative. A marginally competent teacher might reveal that he does not look forward to coming to school, sees problems
as threats, and when planning is intent primarily upon finishing lessons with minimum risk of encountering ambiguities or unusual responses, rather than upon stimulating students to respond in many different ways or upon attempting a variety of approaches to a lesson. When teaching he would typically demonstrate a narrow range of teaching skills, would frequently depend upon ritualistic procedures, would consistently talk more than seventy per cent of the time, and would promulgate Goldhammer's (1969) "incidental learnings" (e.g., calling only on students whose hands are raised, arbitrarily assigning busywork to consume time at the end of a period, stressing cognitive memory responses).

Self-actualization needs: A teacher having these needs would show confidence in his teaching ability but would be searching for different ways of approaching problems. He would be able to maintain conventional order in his classes but would not necessarily endorse it as a desirable classroom climate. Comfortable with a variety of teaching skills, he would be increasingly interested in experimenting with other strategies of teaching - e.g., open classrooms, non-directive classes, student-designed and student-taught curricula.

To summarize, the proposed strategy stresses that the student teacher learn to assess himself and to assist others in assessing themselves, determining
his own criteria of effectiveness as he and others perceive his needs. Evidence for a hierarchical formulation of training strategies supporting this strategy is accumulating. Menaker and Fuller (1967), for instance, indicate that a series of studies at the Research and Development Center at the University of Texas shows that feedback of various kinds influences student teacher's behavior toward indirectness, but they also indicate that a student teacher cannot develop advanced skills until he has mastered certain prerequisite skills. In addition, the use of a hierarchy sheds light on other formulations of teacher effectiveness. Gage (1965), for example, cites five global characteristics of teacher effectiveness: (1) warmth, (2) cognitive organization, (3) orderliness, (4) indirectness, (5) problem-solving ability. Fostering the development of these characteristics in a student teacher, however, is not likely to succeed with a haphazard approach, and a hierarchical structure is theoretically useful. Indirectness, for example, is an advanced characteristic achieved when a student teacher has fulfilled lower-level needs, feels secure in the classroom, and can utilize a variety of teaching skills flexibly. Orderliness, on the other hand, is a characteristic which a teacher must probably acquire immediately in order to survive in most classrooms. Cognitive organization would be difficult to acquire or to demonstrate in a chaotic classroom. Finally, despite qualities of orderliness, cognitive organization, problem-solving ability, and indirectness, a teacher might not develop warmth if he has not satisfied a need for belongingness.

Rogers' (1969a) formulation of qualities of teacher effectiveness - genuineness, empathy, positive regard - all appear to characterize teachers with
higher-order needs; he does not provide a systematic support system for the teacher who has lower-order needs, nor does he indicate, beyond general suggestions, how a teacher can acquire the qualities of effective facilitators of learning.

The next two chapters are devoted to outlining a systematic approach to solving this problem, culminating in a model which focuses upon the student teacher as primary designer of his own training and assessment, and upon the supervisor as coordinator, facilitator, and diagnostician.
CHAPTER IV

The goal of this chapter is to clarify the function of the affective procedures appropriate to teacher training, techniques which comprise one major component of the model that I describe in chapter five. In coordinating procedures designed for self-actualizing teachers I formulate an idealized strategy for the use of a variety of small group encounter techniques. This strategy is based upon action research, clinical encounters and value clarification and is integrated through small teams which provide feedback to teachers who have designed performance criteria for desired behavior changes. These criteria, in turn, result from examination of personal behavior patterns observed in group activities.

This chapter serves, then, to clarify the appropriate function of eclectic sensitivity training procedures in teacher training. The idealized strategy which follows, while theoretically parallel to Rogers' (1969a) objectives, cannot be realized unless it is placed in the context of Maslow's theory and the considerable research on organizational development through group methods (Schein & Bennis, 1965). The following discussion prepares for the explication of the actual proposed model by examining the context in which the small group encounters and formal investigations of value clarification should take place.

These strategies are based on the premise that the teacher adapts himself to teaching in a manner that is harmonious with his expression toward life situations in general (Symonds, 1954), and that teachers resist theory when its immediate
practical meaning does not relate to themselves (Jersild, 1955). The procedure of using feedback teams for reinforcement is based upon the contention that feedback is a strong reinforcer in itself because it "informs the individual not only that he is what he thinks he is, but that he is becoming what he wants to become in respect to any particular competence area" (Maehr, 1968, p. 110). In addition to being appropriate to use of the various feedback procedures described earlier (videotape, strength training, microteaching procedures, interaction analysis, and clinical supervision) this principle is also central to T-group theory (Bradford, Gibb & Benne, 1964).

Since all of the activities require a great deal of voluntary commitment of time and energy, and since the strategies are learner-directed and entail disciplined teamwork, they are intended to fulfill the need for self-esteem and to address the need for self-actualization. For this reason they are inappropriate for teachers who have strong survival needs, or who have not yet developed self-esteem. Although the strategies involve small group work, then, they are inappropriate for teachers whose basic need is for belongingness; a variety of other group experiences would be more appropriate for them. The model in the next chapter is derived in part from unsuccessful experiences using affective procedures with three groups of student teachers.

This chapter contains three sections: (1) a description of the idealized strategy: action research, clinical encounters, and value clarification; and the procedure for learner-directed behavior change through use of an integrative process model, Borton's "Trumpet"; (2) a summary and interpretation of the
results of case explorations: design of the project, methods of conducting the project, results and conclusions which describe conditions necessary to incorporate into the final model; (3) implications for training model design.

Idealized Strategy.

A methodological issue underlying the rationale of the strategy is when action research or clinical inquiry is more appropriate, for as Benne (1964) points out, there are several differences between the two which influence the way in which training proceeds. Benne's summary points out that most laboratory sessions successfully utilize concepts underlying both models; he develops these major differences:

1. In the clinical model, problems for attention...arise out of the existential encounters of member with member with trainer. The specific character of these problems cannot be anticipated in advance. The problems emerge out of deeply felt difficulties inherent both in the life histories of individual members and in the encounters between unique individuals in the group setting. Data at the feeling level of experience are collected and out of these data problems can be clarified. On the other hand, the action research model...presupposes that the learning can be anticipated, at least in general terms, in advance...Where the clinical model stresses the amassing of qualitative data, the action research model seeks for quantifiable data as well.

2. In the clinical model, abstract concepts drawn from experience outside the developing group situation are weighed with great caution. Trust is placed in concepts developed in and near to the "gut-level" experiences of members which emerge in the group and demand more or less immediate clarification. In groups functioning with an action research model, on the other hand, concepts and related skills of data collection, analysis, and application, are provided as a necessary ingredient of thoughtful action-oriented research by group members into the problems that they encounter.
3. Actually, the hope in both kinds of groups is that learning and growth achieved in the laboratory experience will be transferred to improve the quality of personal functioning of members in their outside associations. But the assumptions about how such transfer of learning best takes place seems to be quite different in the two models. In the clinical model, what is likely to transfer effectively are growth in integrity and wholesomeness within the person of the member. The assumption seems to be that a person who can achieve a more authentic revelation of himself to himself and a way of relating authentically to others will transfer these personal achievements into the various relationships of his life. This transfer is conceived as a continuing process of personal growth in other associations. In the action research model more dependence is placed upon the acquisition of appropriate concepts and skills and of a developing habit of using these concepts and skills in clarifying and diagnosing problems in interpersonal, group, and intergroup situations (pp. 134-135).

This third formulation, however must be qualified considerably. As Bandura (1969) has emphasized, there is little evidence that such transfer of learning will take place unless the contingencies of reinforcement are similar in both situations. If they are significantly different or opposite, the individual's behavior will soon become extinguished. Furbay's (1970) follow-up study confirms how extinction took place with student teachers who had learned and successfully practiced specific behaviors under strongly reinforcing conditions. Furthermore, seen in terms of Maslow's theory of motivation, transfer of training is likely to take place only when it meets the prominent needs of the individual. A student teacher might learn to relate more authentically to individuals in an isolated group, but his new learning is likely to be quickly extinguished in a situation organized around survival, where teachers, administrators, and pupils alike might consider authenticity institutionally inappropriate.
My procedure attempted to combine action research and clinical encounters on the grounds that the members had anxieties best treated through encounters but also needed to isolate specific kinds of data about their personal and stereotyped teaching behavior. Goldhammer's (1969) discussion of rituals and incidental learnings is an example of material particularly suited to action research analysis. Similarly, a person's typical responses to meeting people or the kinds of non-verbal messages he conveys by his posture, clothing, physical position in a group, and facial expressions are appropriate areas for action research.

The major components of the strategy were:

1. Encounters: group members would discuss personal values and concerns, the relation of these to professional values and concerns - anxieties, resentments, encouragements and meaning in teaching. Inevitably they would discuss classroom problems, and feelings and opinions about students, administrators, cooperating teachers and the school community as a whole. They would immediately be guided to concentrate on here-and-now behavior and feelings, and to perceive forces acting in the group. They would undergo a variety of verbal and nonverbal encounters, including role-playing, in order to help them diagnose their typical patterns of behavior.

   In the first stage, they would concentrate upon examining how behavior relates to verbalized values, and identifying specific behaviors. At the same time they would be learning how to give and receive help (feedback), becoming sensitive to group processes and developing skills of effective group membership.

2. Experimenting with alternative behaviors: Having isolated behavior
patterns and discrepancies between stated values and behavior, they would experiment, if they wished, with new behaviors. The individual would define the performance criteria of the desired behavior and establish a contract with one or more other group members (or possibly even a person outside the group) to help him systematically in experimenting. Feedback may take a great variety of forms, including videotape, audio tape, interaction analysis, or clinical observation. Teams or individuals providing feedback would then monitor the teacher's subsequent behavior in other situations, including the group meetings, according to the same or analogous criteria and perform follow-up observations to determine whether the behavior change is consistent.

3. The behavior would be further evaluated according to the criteria defining values (Raths, Harmin & Simon, 1966), which clarify whether behavior is truly integrated into a set of values or is merely an interest, an attitude, a feeling, a goal, an aspiration, a belief, a worry, or an activity - value indicators. A summary of the criteria for values follows:

We see values as based on three processes: choosing, prizing and acting.

**CHOOSING:**

(1) freely
(2) from alternatives
(3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative

**PRIZING:**

(4) cherishing, being happy with the choice
(5) willing to affirm the choice publicly

**ACTING:**

(6) doing something with the choice
(7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life (p. 30).
The schematization of processes governing group procedures in this component of the model is driven from Borton's "Trumpet" (Weinstein & Fantini, 1970), originally constructed for developing relevant content for disadvantaged children. The same basic model (Figure 1) was used in a course at the University of Massachusetts, School of Education, called Education of the Self.

The Trumpet describes a process having the following seven components:

1. Confrontation: This includes any experience which occurs in the course, but particularly refers to the exercises designed to generate behavioral data to be examined in terms of the processes below:

2. Identifying common and unique responses: What responses did students share with others? How closely did these typical responses resemble each other? What responses seemed to be unique? How did those responses differ from others?

3. Identifying the function of a response: This process, of course, could become infinitely complex, based on a lengthy historical analysis of personality, but such an excursion would not be helpful. Describing the particular function it had in the confrontation would be sufficient.

4. Identifying consequences of the response: In addition to identifying, with the help of others, the results of one's action, he would examine whether it achieved the purpose for which he intended it.

5. Identifying behavior patterns: Do responses to various encounters repeat themselves discernibly? Does the individual find himself behaving in a similar way outside the group? Cue words: "typically," "always," and "usually."
Figure 1
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6. Trying on new behaviors: After identifying and examining the functions and consequences of a behavior pattern, the participant will experiment with a new set of behaviors in the same or a similar kind of situation.

7. Choose: After experimenting with the new behavior and evaluating its consequences, the individual will be ready to choose whether to add the new behavior to his typical repertoire of responses, discard it, or perhaps use it to replace his former behavior pattern altogether.

The Trumpet would be presented to student teachers as part of a group contract - a framework for examining all of the behavioral data which will emerge during the course of their meetings and during their practice teaching, including experiences outside the classroom with students, cooperating teachers, other student teachers, parents, and other school personnel. The Trumpet would provide the students a framework for interpreting their experiences and would begin immediately to elucidate interaction and process goals. Because personal needs would be apt to become apparent in early sessions, especially in clinical encounters, the model would provide a diagnostic strategy.

In a very idealized way, this component for self-actualizing teachers could be integrated according to the diagram following (Figure 2). The supervisor would coordinate the group activities in order to provide an appropriate balance among action research, clinical, and value clarification procedures, depending upon the individuals and small teams to determine and communicate particular issues needing special emphasis.
In this conceptualization, the nonverbal and verbal exercises in action research would be compared to data evolving in clinical encounters and examined in terms of the process defined by the trumpet. Both, too, would be examined by techniques of value clarification, and teams would be formed to examine further all of this information in classroom situations. The emphasis during this stage would always be focused upon rigorously defined behavioral criteria. The process would be reciprocal, too (represented by the double arrows) because the behavior would be subsequently re-examined in terms of new behavior in the isolated group setting. All of these procedures would be integrated further by means of a clear but flexible group contract outlining process, interaction, and content goals.

Actually, such a complex set of integrated activities would probably be impossible to implement with participants who have not had experience with all the elements described. However, a continuing reference group of excellent or self-actualizing teachers might be able, with practice and efficient coordination, to gain facility using such a strategy. They could then incorporate promising, competent beginning or student teachers into their activities and act as models for other student teachers.

I will discuss this possibility in greater detail in the final chapter. Clearly, however, such activities are unrealistic for student teachers as a whole. The studies which I conducted with three groups of student teachers revealed several factors which are essential to incorporate into the model itself. Following is a summary and interpretation of the results of those studies.
The design of the project.

The study was conducted during the spring semester of 1970 with three groups meeting once weekly for approximately two hours. Group A was composed of interns at a comprehensive junior high and high school; Group B was composed of about fifteen elementary and secondary (junior high) interns teaching at an inner city school; Group C was composed of five interns in social studies at a high school serving semi-rural students and experiencing severe political upheaval; Group C also contained four student teachers from other schools. The three major types of schools were distinctively different enough to provide different kinds of experiences for the interns, but they often posed similar kinds of problems for each group.

When the sessions began, the details of clinical and action research components were indistinct; pacing of activities, in particular, was problematic. In addition, because many of the students strongly desired to discuss common concerns, and because membership was unstable at first, I relied initially on clinical procedures. Opening sessions sometimes resembled group counseling roughly similar to the study by Muro and Denton (1968). In these sessions, leadership was minimally directive; I outlined basic goals of the strategy, stressing the Trumpet model and formation of teams to experiment with behavior. Directive components were introductory exercises, primarily metaphor games (see Appendix), chosen to acquaint members with methods of identifying feelings; here and now wheels (see Appendix) were introduced to assess group climate and to stimulate responses to be examined for emerging behavior patterns. As the
semester progressed, I selected clinical and action research components to suit exigencies.

Twice during the semester I distributed a questionnaire and during the final session in each group I taped an evaluation of our semester's experiences. Finally, I have incorporated my own analyses of content and process as a participant-observer; self and group reports about factors which affected attempts to change behavior, and development of group climate; and responses to clinical and action research procedures.

Methods of conducting the project.

Students were recruited by three methods: a brief announcement at a meeting of all student teachers; approaches to individuals; and an arrangement with the director of Group B, a friend, who helped to persuade his interns to participate. All candidates were informed that they could receive three credits for the experience. Although they were told that the groups would provide opportunities to interact with other interns in order to focus upon on-the-job behavior changes, several factors contributed to a variety of motives for joining.

Some students applied because the course fit schedules and promised to apply directly to teaching problems. My own student teachers applied because they believed that the groups would afford a chance to confer with fellow student teachers on a regular basis, to exchange ideas in a supportive atmosphere, and to receive more structured, formal contact with their supervisor than would be possible otherwise. Finally, formal credit was important to many members.
My references to on-the-job behavior change produced expectations which conflicted with my objectives and produced early confusion and tension. Several believed that they would learn specific innovative approaches which the more theoretical methods courses would be unable to provide; many applications anticipated sessions in which I would provide strategies tailored to specific individual needs. My assurances during recruitment that the sessions would not be sensitivity training helped to confirm the expectation that the meetings would consist of counseling, general conversation about problems, and practical methods of solving teaching problems. Several anticipated a variety of tangible dividends from a relatively small investment of time and energy. Finally, some students interpreted assurances that the meetings would not be sensitivity training to mean that there would be minimal attention to personal behavior and that the course would somehow concentrate upon innovative methods of teaching.

Several factors in membership, setting, and scheduling significantly affected group processes. All three groups contained factions and subgroups with strong survival needs, and individuals with personal problems. In addition, several members of each group felt that they had few concerns in common with other members. These factions generated many problems of group task and maintenance. Discrepancies between perceived and stated objectives promoted hidden agendas; coalitions formed quickly, and the groups had trouble recognizing and examining group norms and constructing or acting upon alternative procedures. Resolving the tensions was time-consuming because unacknowledged obstacles to communication hampered problem solving, a difficulty evident in resistance to
here-and-now content. Cohesion was greater when the setting was reasonably comfortable and isolated. This was most evident in Group C, which nearly disintegrated at the outset when it met in a sterile gymnasium classroom, but coalesced when it moved to a comfortable home. Finally, scheduling was important because some groups had insufficient time and energy to examine group norms and individual behavior. Group A met directly after school and suffered from delays, and Group B met directly after a three-hour methods class. Group C achieved more cohesion in part because there was ample time for extended meetings.

Results and conclusions.

Data from all three groups refuted the hypothesis that student teachers would attempt self-initiated changes in teaching behavior using teams for feedback. Only once did members in Group C form a team and develop a contract, but the student teacher to be observed did not initiate it and finally cancelled the agreement. Two social studies interns in Group A worked closely together and used information gained in the group, but they did not develop clear performance criteria. Two interns and a cooperating teacher in Group A began to form a team, but an intern who eventually withdrew from the program for personal reasons and who experienced severe survival (and sometimes physiological) needs caused the team to disintegrate. Although I focused attention upon parallel classroom and group behavior with individual student teachers during supervision, no student teacher initiated a self-designed contract with me.
The data also revealed several factors which must be considered in the design of the model based upon Maslow's hierarchy. The above description of the problems encountered in designing and implementing the project illustrate three issues:

1. External factors of setting and scheduling should be considered carefully. Groups should have maximum privacy, and teachers must have sufficient time to participate in group sessions and to conduct observations in the school – at least three hours per week. Since methods courses consume a great deal of time and energy, their resources should be incorporated into the model as much as possible in order to provide continuity among training components and avoid needless duplication.

2. Members must seek common contract, interaction, process, and content goals. Furthermore, need goals must be explicitly integrated with contract goals (Egan, 1970). Members must agree upon these goals beforehand.

3. Members must have common or closely related levels of needs. That is, they should be competent and voluntarily willing to attempt changing their behavior. Particularly, teachers who have poor rapport with students and other colleagues, who organize their teaching around survival, should not participate in these strategies.

The major issue which dominated the meetings concerned objectives. Although participants agreed with the strategy in theory, it was not meeting their needs for practical methods of survival or improved presentation and discussion skills. As a leader, I adhered too rigidly to my stated strategy, the trumpet and
contracts using teams, asking members to reserve practical issues for their methods classes. Naturally, the student teachers resisted this position and believed, moreover, that their methods courses were not fulfilling their needs either.

For some time, I interpreted their resistance to disclosing or examining feelings as a result of a variety of factors hampering cohesion — insufficient time and isolation, or fatigue, for example. These may have been factors, but they did make their strongest feelings unequivocally clear — that their needs were unfulfilled. It is now clear, though it was not at the time, that this resistance was not merely a reaction to minimally directive leadership as such. In two groups, B and C, where survival issues were prevalent and interpersonal tension was frequently high, the groups actually splintered over the issue of objectives. Group C reformed only after I acceded to conducting an auxiliary practical methods course.

In all three groups the most successful activities were task-oriented. They included Goldhammer's (1969) materials on examining rituals and incidental learnings; the NTL guidelines on giving and receiving help, which participants used to consult one another; brainstorming; and role-playing.

The importance of survival issues is clear in the following reports from participants, with whom all members agreed: "Before I want someone to observe me and before I feel qualified to observe someone else, I want to feel comfortable in the teaching situation." In the same vein, another intern summarized two prerequisites for contracts:
(1) knowing interns better and (2) having had some successful experiences in the classroom and being told so by the teacher and the supervisor. When I know where I stand it's easier to give support to others and ask for feedback about my bad experiences.

The evidence from these experiences confirms the hypothesis that student teachers who are experiencing needs in the first three levels of the hierarchy, or who are barely beginning to develop confidence in the classroom will not change their behavior as a result of basic encounter group experiences or even as a result of more structured action research procedures based upon the Trumpet model. The evidence also indicated that although student teachers are eager to use value clarification procedures as a way of livening their classes, they are reluctant to apply value clarification to their own teaching until they feel more secure.

Implications for training model design.

The groups were designed to stimulate independent assessment of possibilities for and commitment to voluntary behavior change, but because the activities took the form of classes which met regularly under my leadership, their form and problems reflected the distinctions which Miles (1964) explores between the T-group and the classroom. As he states in his introduction, "...unless we can make clear distinctions, attempts to locate continuities and make mutually beneficial syntheses are bound to be superficial and unfruitful" (p. 454).

The major differences in purposes accentuated our problems in agreeing upon objectives. The conflict between discussing these-and-then problems of
the members in order to suggest methods of planning and teaching, and examining here-and-now matters in order to identify and experiment with behavior patterns reflected the differences between subject-matter focus and different emphases on 
cognitive and behavior change in T-groups and classes. In all three groups, the 
difficulties in resolving these issues grew from the participants' conflicting 
opinions about whether group processes should be of direct interest or be vehicles 
for cognitive and attitudinal changes. In the early sessions many participants 
hoped that the meetings would closely resemble a seminar featuring practical 
classroom methods.

The distinction between preparatory sets is especially applicable. The 
members saw themselves not as adequate teachers, but as students preparing to 
be adequate teachers, and they indicated that their cooperating teachers often 
treated them not as colleagues or even as professional subordinates, but as older 
versions of the students they were teaching. Thus, interns' here-and-now jobs 
were no different from that of any typical student: "The student's here-and-now 
task, as classroom learning goes forward is, in effect, to please - or at least 
not to displease - the teacher" (Miles, 1964, p. 455). Participants spent a great 
deal of energy dealing with the anxieties that resulted in the ambiguous role 
definitions they felt - they were neither students nor teachers. They felt the same 
kind of confusion in the group sessions; we were not a "group" nor a class.

Miles states several differences in role prescriptions between teacher and 
trainer which inevitably demand different kinds of behaviors. Problems reflecting 
differences in role clarity, role differentiation, and role centrality were apparent
in all the groups.

My presentations and discussion of objectives and procedures in the groups attempted to be consistent with Miles' idea that the student must understand the teacher's authority, even (or especially) when the teacher chooses to share it. Rogers' (1969a) examination of how a teacher can share his authority had seemed to resolve major problems of role clarity, but I felt tension, especially in early session, primarily because I insisted upon adhering to a strategy which did not meet the needs of the participants, and which they had consented to follow but had had no hand in designing.

The problems of role differentiation and role centrality were apparent in the early sessions, in which student teachers seemed to encourage a multiple dyadic relationship with me which they had experienced in their other university classes, were observing in the schools, and were promoting in their own classes. In Groups A and C differentiation and centrality diminished, but while cohesion increased, productivity did not. Much of the difficulty in minimizing my centrality stemmed from the pressure of the group for me to provide methods and advice, and to control members who monopolized discussions. It was difficult for me to abandon my control, however, because I wished to promote my own agenda regardless of pressures to the contrary.

Using Bennis' (1964) outline for levels of intervention, Miles points out that teachers usually restrict discussion to Level 1 (content) and, occasionally, Level 2 (behavior) but rarely Level 3 (analysis of defenses) or Level 4 (anxieties), since the existence of prior bodies of subject matter is designed to
consume all the available time and to inhibit anything but cognitive discussion. The statement of objectives of the course I offered stressed Level 2, though Levels 3 and 4 were implicit in the exercises and became more prominent in clinical sessions. The difficulties arose, especially in Group B, when participants thought that we were concentrating upon Levels 3 and 4, which were too threatening. The ambiguous statements of objectives and assurances of what the groups would *not* be contributed to the difficulties; in addition, when we discussed anxieties we did nothing concrete about them and rarely, except once in Group C, did we explore my own defenses in a way which could meet participants' needs.

Miles explores several similarities between T-group and classroom which theoretically would promote our objectives. Student teachers understood that a teacher is expected to train students in developing effective role relationships, and they all acknowledged that they wanted to improve their own. Because interns were familiar with performance criteria and behavioral objectives, they were receptive to applying them to classroom performance. Since they appreciated, at least in theory, the need to educate the whole child, they acknowledged the parallel need to educate the whole student teacher. Similarly, they accepted that teaching involved integrating work and feeling. Although most had not experienced many examples of the experimental method of learning, had witnessed little of it in observations of cooperating teachers, and were not using it in their own classes, they were aware of its theoretical validity. All of these theoretical concessions, however, were fruitless when compared to the prominent needs of the student teachers.
Egan's (1970) strategy of using contract groups would resolve the major issues which arose from the tensions between classroom and encounter group processes, objectives, and leadership roles, provided prior needs had been fulfilled. As he explains, encounter groups often spend their entire time evolving a satisfactory consensus about objectives and procedures. Some (Slater, 1966) contend that this struggle is the source of value in the experience, but as Egan points out,

> The contract still leaves many choices to be made by the participants, but these choices, because of the contract, are focused on much more central issues. The contract group is much more likely to deal with the key issues... than is the group which must first hammer out its own contract. The contract provides structure, clarity, or definition, but with plasticity. Definition with plasticity seems to be an ideal condition for a group (pp. 44-45).

These remarks apply especially to the groups which I conducted, for despite repeated explanations of objectives and procedures, we wasted a great deal of time trying to resolve procedural issues. Even given a well-designed contract, however, student teachers would be unlikely to adhere to the variety of explicit limitations and channels of inquiry if they have survival needs.

Finally, the data consistently confirms Schein and Bennis' (1965) seven conditions for developing programs of social change. The first criterion is that "legitimacy for the change must be gained through obtaining the support of the key people" (p. 229). These would include administrators in the teacher training program and administrators in local schools. It applies particularly to cooperating teachers, since some behavior changes might directly contradict their values and objectives in teaching. If a student directly challenged incidental learnings and
rituals, reaction might be strong. Even raising questions might appear to be a direct attack on a teacher or a department. Harrison (1968) has shown that what a student learns during practice teaching often directly contradicts what he is taught in university education courses. It is likely that this incongruence might cause severe difficulties if conflicts become overt, and Furbay's (1970) follow-up study shows what how important ties with the university and a supportive reference group can be.

In planning the model we must ask,

How can teachers effectively transmit the value of aggressive learning when it has no survival in their own training and may even be maladaptive? If we are really teaching values, do we really want authentic, and well integrated teachers, and creative, autonomous children? How comfortable are we with students who are honest, who question, who are not passive, dependent variables?

(Johnson & Seagull, 1968, p. 70).

The premises of my model are that we do want such teachers and students, and that "man's dignity lies in the irreducible fact of human choice, choice which joins freedom and human responsibility" (Benne, 1967). The importance of the supervisor, together with the major personnel of the teacher training program, in helping to clarify alternatives and to acquire legitimacy for behavioral change is therefore crucial.

The process of negotiation is closely related to Schein and Dennis' second rule, "the process of installing the change programs must be congruent with the process and goals of such programs" (p. 230), which they stress by citing a dismally unsuccessful program in which the change agent operated more as an
undercover agent than as an agent of change.

Authentic and collaborative relationships undertaken in a spirit of inquiry are essential to any effective change; hence, to encourage student teachers to behave in ways which they cannot defend successfully invites disaster. Thus, student teachers must be fully aware of the possible consequences of their experiments, but they must also have a clear set of values underlying their choice to behave in a given way. This idea emphasizes once again how a student teacher must acquire techniques of survival, belong to a cohesive reference group, and acquire sound presentation skills before he embarks upon behavior which might threaten his survival.

Schein and Bennis' third condition, that "the employment of the change agent must be guaranteed" (p. 230), was a concern for members of Group A, for some believed that any public departure from established policy would jeopardize recommendations and possibly certification. In Group B, a few members resisted experimenting with any approach that deviated slightly from rigid and antiquated procedures on the grounds that to do so might invite dismissal. Interns in Group C were often concerned that the school committee would dismiss them at the first opportunity. Thus, psychological safety must be assured in all groups from the outset, but safety within the group may not be sufficient. In many schools - all three in my study, for instance - many student teachers and teachers may not be able to advance beyond the second level of needs, survival.
The fourth condition, that "the voluntary commitment of the participants may be a crucial factor in the success of the program" (p. 231), clearly affected the groups I conducted, since the participants' attitude was probably closer to tentative consent than voluntary commitment. Schein and Bennis say that learning will probably not take place if this condition does not prevail.

The fifth condition, that "the legitimacy of interpersonal influence must be potentially acceptable," is particularly applicable to a school system.

It is not exactly obvious that interpersonal competence is correlated with effective role functioning; in some specific situations, there may be no, or an inverse, correlation. Indeed, the theoretical foundations of bureaucracy are based on impersonality (Schein & Bennis, 1965, p. 231).

Similarly, it is not exactly obvious that schools are exempt from this observation, despite the stated importance of the personal nature of teaching. Data from my studies indicated that teachers often deliberately isolated themselves from students as well as from each other. Members of Group A often complained that cooperating teachers pointedly objected to informal associations with students, and to time spent in encouraging unassigned activities – including reading, writing poetry, etc. – during school hours or during hours which might be devoted to homework. Again, recalling Walberg (1968), those in Group B said that cooperating teachers were sometimes militaristic in their insistence upon silence and standing in line, a contrast to student teachers, desires to develop warm relationships with the children. Interns in Group C, too, indicated that several teachers were repressive toward students. In short, it is reasonable to hypothesize that schools will be impersonal in direct proportion to the degree
they are organized around survival needs.

The sixth condition, that "the effects on the adjacent and interdependent subsystems relating to the target systems must be carefully considered" (p. 231-232), applies to relations with all personnel who might be affected by innovative procedures. Schein and Bennis state that a complete diagnosis of the total effects on all relevant parts must be made before, not after, the training starts (p. 232), a rule which applies particularly to training of student teachers. We are trying to develop change agents, not martyrs.

The seventh condition is that "the state of cultural readiness must be assessed" (p. 232). They explain,

We have in mind the relationship between the organization and the wider society within which the target system is embedded. . . . Cultural readiness depends to some degree on the normative structure of the wider society; a clear diagnosis cannot be made without understanding these forces (p. 232).

This rule applies to behavior change in any school, whose policies usually reflect prevailing conservative social norms. Any teacher must face daily the issue of whether his behavior should reflect or shape community norms, and no student teacher can escape the role tension in this issue. During the university-wide strike of Spring, 1970, the only students who were not free to strike with impunity were student teachers, whose schools would not permit absences from anyone. Rogers' (1969b) comment that the aims of group training may be inconsistent with the values of the larger social system is pertinent here.
In the next chapter, which describes the model, I have taken these conditions and limitations into consideration.
CHAPTER V

This chapter, the explication of the model itself, contains four sections:

(1) major components: an explanation of how the training components fit the hierarchy of needs, and two integrative factors - the supervisor and the reference group, (2) conditions and limitations, (3) implementation of the model, and (4) the flexibility of the model.

**Major components.**

Following is a list of the ten major components of the program:

1. **Strength Training**
2. **Brainstorming:** this procedure may be applied to all problems and may clarify which other components might meet particular needs.
3. **Microteaching**
4. **Value clarification**
5. **Action research:** affective exercises to be examined with the Trumpet
6. **Basic encounter,** also to be examined with the Trumpet
7. **Methods:** a variety of modular instructional offerings, including several devices - lectures, audio visual materials, and seminars; constructing behavioral objectives, lesson plans, and innovations within curricular limitations;
approaches to subject areas, e.g., poetry, composition, and specific curricular units; and recent innovations in a given field. In addition, methods would include value clarification techniques.

8. Interaction analysis

9. Conference groups: These would combine group counseling procedures, general examinations of teaching problems, and examination of results of other teaching procedures. The groups would also brainstorm and periodically inspect group processes. Finally, groups would sometimes be task-oriented. Small teams should be formed for self-supervision using their own choices of feedback instruments. Value clarification should be introduced to identify alternatives that stated concerns suggest.

10. Consultation teamwork: This would follow the NTL guidelines on giving and receiving help.

These components fit the hierarchy of needs in the following way:

LEVEL 1 ("physiological" - general lack of energy, exhaustion due to inability to cope; survival problems):

(a) Brainstorming: This procedure would be used to discover a broad range of alternatives which the student teacher could use to solve a problem. It would be coordinated with or amplified by other techniques in order to develop
a clear course of action.

(b) Consultation teamwork: This procedure would be used to examine dimensions of a student teacher's problem. If he constantly feels exhausted, other factors may be involved, such as unwise budgeting of time, the strain of discipline problems, or personal problems.

(c) Value clarification: Sometimes exhaustion may be related to unwise priorities. This procedure would help the student teacher to clarify and choose among alternative priorities.

(d) Methods: Exhaustion may be related to worry and overwork caused by inefficient planning. Methods training would improve efficiency.

LEVEL 2 (safety; survival):

(a) Strength training: Emphasis in this program is upon developing one's latent strengths, while fostering sensitivity. It is particularly appropriate to teachers with discipline problems.

(b) Brainstorming

(c) Value clarification: Frequently a teacher may be using techniques to control a class which are inconsistent with his teaching objectives and his stated teaching philosophy. Value clarification could help him to
determine ways to attempt more consistent alternative behaviors.

(d) Microteaching: Some selected skills would be helpful in establishing control of the class by promoting greater interest and student participation. Appropriate techniques include set induction, reinforcement, and stimulus variation.

(e) Methods: Well defined behavioral objectives would increase anxiety among students about confusing requirements; exposure to innovative approaches to lessons, including audio visual presentations, might increase students' interest in the material.

(f) Interaction analysis: Students trained in this procedure could monitor one another in order to determine whether their interaction patterns may be contributing to student restlessness.

(g) Consultation teamwork: Frequently a problem of survival is based upon factors which become apparent only with more searching examination. For example, a student may feel a strong distaste for certain types of students or for his cooperating teacher, or he may be experiencing personal problems.
LEVEL 3 (belongingness):

(a) The conference group

(b) Consultation teamwork: Small teams could be formed within the conference group to form a basis for continuing intensive interaction with other students.

LEVEL 4 (self-esteem):

(a) Microteaching: Expanding and refining one's repertoire of teaching skills.

(b) Strength training: The emphasis during this stage would be upon refining rather than beginning to develop strength and sensitivity.

(c) Methods

(d) Brainstorming

(e) Value clarification

(f) Consultation teamwork

(g) Affective exercises

(h) Encounter grouping

The final two procedures should be used only when teachers have developed competence in the classroom.
LEVEL 5 (self-actualization):

The primary procedures here, affective exercises, encounter grouping, and value clarification, have been discussed. They are not meant necessarily to be coordinated as in Figure 2, but to be a set of resources available to competent teachers. A trainer should, however, attempt to achieve a sound balance among the components in order to integrate examinations of behavior. In addition, participants should avail themselves of other techniques to refine skills as economically as possible. Conceivably, expert teachers would be able to coordinate data from a variety of sources and provide considerable support for student teachers who are only beginning to learn how to examine their behavior systematically.

Many of these procedures are repeated in various levels of the hierarchy and may be thought of as a "spiral curriculum" (Bruner, 1961) of teacher training procedures. That is, there are certain codified principles of teaching which may be learned at increasing levels of sophistication. In strength training, for example, a teacher may undergo the same exercise during two separate stages of his development and perceive the experience from two vastly different perspectives. Similarly, a teacher may work on developing skills of set induction from a limited perspective when he experiences survival needs, but he may later develop the skills imaginatively as a competent, innovative teacher.

The notion of the spiral curriculum may be somewhat misleading if it implies that one steadily advances to higher needs. In fact, various events may thrust a lower need into prominence. For example, an enthusiastic, well-organized student teacher might begin a semester by teaching a group of bright, responsive
seniors and quickly gain self-confidence, concentrating upon microteaching skills of higher order questioning and probing questions, perhaps examining his responses to affective exercises. In the spring term, however, he might be asked to teach a ninth grade class of rambunctious slow students and discover that he needs strength training. In short, he may desecend the spiral.

Two factors, the supervisor and the conference group, integrate the model. The supervisor, by diagnosing need levels, by coordinating activities, by supervising clinically, and by facilitating the conference group, maintains clear distinctions among programs for individual student teachers and helps to maintain appropriate team membership. By serving as a forum for airing personal concerns, experimenting with solutions to problems, and examining values, the conference group addresses needs for belongingness and provides a way for the supervisor to establish meaningful interaction with student teachers and to diagnose needs. The conference group also serves as a continuing reference group for student teachers. Some might wish to continue meeting in the group in lieu of attending other training programs.

Conditions and limitations.

The model is designed to be implemented under the following conventional standards: Student teachers will undergo training for three hours each week, spending one hour in the conference group and two hours in selected training programs. Each supervisor should have between five and ten student teachers, and should be required to spend twenty hours per week working with the student teachers.
The training programs, in order to be maximally available for student teachers, should be flexibly scheduled, using evenings as frequently as possible. Microteaching, which ideally occurs in a teach-reteach sequence, should be scheduled twice per week; teams of student teachers could supervise themselves. Methods courses should be designed in modular units and taped to enable maximum repetition and availability. Some activities, such as encounter grouping, might be scheduled to last longer than two hours weekly, and exercises in value clarification could be organized to be performed in two hour units.

The central feature of the model is that it is learner-directed. All training programs should be voluntary, and students should understand from the outset that the programs are resources rather than requirements, designed to meet needs rather than to set standards. Thus, they should think of components as possibly, but not necessarily sequential. They should feel free, therefore, to move freely among programs as they desire. Some programs entail contractual commitments (e.g., where teams are asked to provide feedback) which must be re-negotiated.

Several other factors meet the seven conditions for social change cited by Schein and Bennis (1965). Administrators and participating faculty in the schools must be made aware of the rationale for the program and invited to participate in the planning and implementation as fully as they wish. For example, they can be especially helpful in arranging schedules to enable student teachers to observe one another, and in modifying demands on the student teachers' time and energy in order to accommodate team projects during the school day. Cooperating
teachers should be invited to use the facilities of the model to meet their own needs. Finally, all experimentation and innovation should be negotiated with teachers and administrators. Student teachers should engage as fully as possible in this negotiating process in order to learn techniques which they will need if they are to grow as well as survive in subsequent teaching situations.

Implementation of the model.

During the first two weeks of a teacher training program, student teachers will become acquainted with a variety of techniques of observation to use during classroom visitations and throughout the term, and they will begin attending their conference groups immediately. For the first two weeks, conference groups will run for two hours rather than one. During the remaining hour students will become acquainted with the available components and will learn how, when, and why they should use them. The emphasis during this period should be upon how programs are designed to meet needs rather than upon details of operation.

During the third week the student teachers will begin the program described above.

Supervisors should meet as a group once a week in order to compare observations, explore problems, coordinate demands on the time and energy of the personnel, and find ways to develop small teams of student teachers who share similar needs, who might be able to help others, or who seem promising candidates for affective procedures.

The crucial factor in the success of the program is accurate determination of needs. The student should determine his own needs, relying upon the supervisor,
the reference group, and exercises in consultation for a variety of viewpoints. Theoretically he will attend the programs which most accurately meet his needs, and when they cease to do so he will transfer to others. However, since he might not become fully aware of a new need for several weeks, the supervisor should maintain close ties with him so that he will be able to take advantage of the most appropriate components as soon as possible. The cooperating teacher would be especially helpful in monitoring needs because he would have more continual contact with the student teacher. The selection of various components should, however, always be learner-directed; supervisors, cooperating teachers, and fellow student teachers should always act as advisors.

The affective procedures of action research and basic encounters would be appropriate for few, if any, student teachers until several weeks had passed. These procedures should not, therefore, be offered at the very outset of the program. Of course, student teachers should isolate behavior patterns as soon as possible when they enter such groups. Those undergoing the procedures would be somewhat familiar with behavior patterns which they had observed during other training procedures, and they should concentrate upon identifying them as preparation for the new programs. Many might concentrate upon only one component. Some might devote their time to value clarification, perhaps becoming interested in developing their abilities to apply the techniques systematically in their own classrooms.
Model Flexibility.

The model is flexible enough to accommodate a variety of special circumstances. Four paradigm situations follows:

1. If a student teacher's needs vary suddenly, he is free to transfer to other programs. Similarly, a student teacher might have more than one need. He might, for example, be teaching one class of cooperative, receptive students and another class with discipline problems. He could work with his supervisor and others to determine which need seemed most important to solve and could arrange activities accordingly. Possibly he could spend more than three hours during a given week in order to address both sets of needs.

2. If a student misses a formally scheduled program he may still receive training. Methods can be taped or summarized, and others who have received the training may teach the student teacher. In addition, most training procedures are designed as units which may be studied individually or in small teams.

3. Special problems may be solved by consultation, with supervisors, concentrated clinical supervision, brainstorming, or concentrated attention from several supervisors.
4. Inaccurate diagnosis of needs or improper selection of programs may be detected early in training. Since one major function of the supervisor is to ascertain whether needs are being met, inaccurate diagnosis should become quickly apparent in individual conferences. Finally, since the general conference group is designed to illuminate problems, dissatisfaction should become evident there.
CHAPTER V I
CONCLUSION

Furbay's (1970) discouraging study suggests that most remarkable successes of teacher training programs are likely to be short-lived unless the schools in which beginning teachers work encourage flexibility and openness. Furbay believes further that only if beginning teachers can maintain or initiate ties with a supportive reference group can they withstand institutional pressures to adjust their teaching styles to suit prevailing traditional practices. Such reference groups are most likely to be promoted in academic communities where teacher training institutions foster them.

One alternative possibility would be for the training program to end by exploring ways for beginning teachers to seek out kindred souls and stimulate reference groups within schools. Negative versions of reference groups are everywhere in the form of cliques of dissatisfied teachers who complain about the system but seem unable or unwilling to attempt constructive change. If student teachers could be taught ways to galvanize these subcultures, or the most positive representatives within them, into reference groups, they would become effective change agents. Although such training would require time, effort, and planning, it might be a wise investment.

Conceivably, too, students could work on ways to organize reference groups composed of excellent teachers from several local teacher training institutions if
possible. A variety of such potential sources exist in some places, e.g., the Screen Educators Society in Chicago and a variety of organizations in the Philadelphia area. Some educators, such as Neil Postman, have tried to stimulate formation of organizations for "subversive teaching" on the national level, notably at the 1969 National Convention of Teachers of English, and have received widespread positive response. Media and Methods has promised to promote such organizations in print. In short, there is an incipient grass roots movement which would support such reference groups.

Teacher training programs using the model I have described could use the components promoting self-actualization as a continuing source of excitement for strong, sensitive, and creative teachers in local school systems. These individuals would not only serve to promote closer bonds between the university and the school system, but could become adjunct faculty in the teacher training program itself. Because they could be models for student teachers and could also facilitate experimentation in the schools, they would be invaluable liaisons between the administrators and other faculty in the schools and the university. Because of their continuing contribution they would deserve lucrative payment; furthermore, a program might reasonably support advanced training for such teachers, perhaps through the National Training Laboratory or similar organization.

Although the training program that I have described includes practical as well as theoretical considerations, it has the major limitation of being untested. The experiments which I conducted, after all, did not reveal any concretely
encouraging results. They served instead to reinforce the need for extensive preparation for such experiences. Furthermore, none of the studies using sensitivity training or human relations training with teachers empirically support the notion that such procedures can reliably increase teacher effectiveness, especially when pupil outcomes are used as a measure.

My formulation of the appropriate context of humanistic procedures is practically sound only to the extent that prior training procedures are effective and supervisory commitment and efficacy is reliable. Despite so many variables, though, the system may be conceptually attractive enough to warrant testing. One of its major attractions is that all of the elements in the model already exist and have commanded considerable commitment in teacher training institutions.

Attractive as the many possibilities for this training program appear, though, they remain distant. For the time being we must be content with trying to produce the strongest and most sensitive teachers we can and hope that they will somehow find sufficient nourishment to grow as well as to survive, hoping too that other forces in education will promote institutional changes which will provide more chances for these potentially excellent teachers to develop their capacities.

Without an accompanying effort in the redesign of systems of education, chances are good that even if my teacher training strategy is tested, found effective and reliable, and is implemented in several institutions, results would still be temporary.
Common sense and our own experience tell us that good teachers do exist, and that teachers can and do improve. Given the continued healthy emphasis upon teacher training, we should attempt to construct programs devoted to meeting the needs of those who have chosen to teach in order to help them grow. Moreover, there are encouraging signs that total system redesign in education is in sight, particularly in New York State, where regional centers of education are charged and funded to facilitate community-designed, learner-responsive, self-renewing systems.

For the time being, teachers will have to rely upon other, less structured and less supportive ways of meeting needs. Nevertheless, some may have developed enough self-esteem and confidence in their own imaginations and capacities to promote change that they may grow in spite of obstacles. The crucial factor may be whether students understand that problems may be seen as needs which can be met with existing tools. Moreover, if a teacher has an integrated set of values he will possess the tools to determine consciously the basis of his choices, whether they be concessions or assertions. A teacher may then be able to maintain his integrity and encourage others to follow his example.

Similarly, teacher training programs may be able to find solutions to some of their most exasperating problems by reorganizing the resources that are already available.

As a famous Zen poem puts it:
It is too clear and so is hard to see.
A man once searched for fire with a lighted lantern.
Had he known what fire was,
He could have cooked his rice much sooner.
APPENDIX
AFFECTIVE EXERCISES MENTIONED IN TEXT

METAPHOR GAME:

Describe yourself in terms of a fruit, vegetable, or other kind of food.

Alternative: Describe yourself in terms of an automobile.

Expansion of exercise: Explain why you chose the metaphor you stated; explain whether you changed your mind as you hear other metaphors stated; give metaphorical impressions of others; examine reasons for metaphors you chose.

HERE-AND-NOW-WHEEL:

On a piece of paper draw a circle with four spokes radiating from the perimeter, labeling the spokes with feelings that you have here and now, e.g., you might write: "Confused, tired, curious, irritated" or "relaxed, comfortable, tired, mildly interested."
OBSERVATIONAL GUIDELINES
FOR
"GIVING AND RECEIVING HELP"

(From National Training Laboratory Materials)

Note instances in which the person you are observing in the consultant or helper role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERSUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggests problems, facts, solutions, actions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks client for clarification of his perceptions, facts, solutions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprets client's feelings motivations, inadequacies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand client's feelings, ideas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveys doubts about client's ability to cope with difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages and supports client using his abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCIDENTAL LEARNINGS


1. "What do you think we're going to do today?"
   "I'm thinking of a word. Can anyone tell me what the word is? It begins with E."
   "You'd better pay attention because this question is just likely to come up on the test."

2. "America was discovered by. . ."
   "Three and what are seven?"
   "In a molecule of water there are two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of Oxygen. True or false?"

3. Whenever pupil gives response, teacher repeats it.
   Whenever pupil gives response, teacher paraphrases or otherwise elaborates it.

4. Poll-taking questions: "How many of you read this chapter?" How many of you understand this?" "I don't see very many hands!"

5. In situations where teacher is recording pupils' successful responses on the board, he does so in precisely the language used by pupil.

6. Typical patterns of teaching:
   All directions given by teacher.
   All questions originate from teacher.
   All evaluations performed by teacher.
   Pace of instruction, sequences of instruction determined by teacher.
   "I" pattern. "I want you to open your books. Do you remember what I said about that yesterday? I want you to read. . . ."
   Multiple questioning pattern: Do you know what holiday we celebrate next week - who knows something about Independence Day - Do you know what we celebrate on the Fourth of July - When was the Declaration of Independence written?"
   Teacher calls on students who raise their hands.
   Having observed that Bill is staring through window, trance-like, teacher asks, "And what emotion was association with the Dorian mode - Bill?"
Teacher assigns extra work to children who finish early.
Reward pattern: Pupil finishes reciting, teacher responds,
"Yes, but...
Gratuitous questions: "What am I holding in my hand?" (when
teacher is holding an eraser in hand.)
"Would you like to open your books to page ten?"
Teacher teaches all the time: Example: grammatical corrections
while pupil telling about some experience.
Pupil is writing, asks teacher how to spell a word. Answer: "Look
it up in the dictionary." Or: "What is the dictionary for?"
Interpretations: "Johnny, how did Josh get that answer? Bill,
what did Fred really mean to say?"

Your own observations:
FEEDBACK

(From National Training Laboratory Materials)

"Feedback" is a way of helping another person to consider changing his behavior. It is a communication to a person (or a group) which gives that person information about how he affects others. As in a guided missile system, feedback helps an individual keep his behavior "on target" and thus better achieve his goals.

Some criteria for useful feedback:

1. It is descriptive rather than evaluative. By describing one's own reaction, it leaves the individual free to use it or to use it as he sees fit. By avoiding evaluative language, it reduces the need for the individual to react defensively.

2. It is specific rather than general. To be told that one is "dominating" will probably not be as useful as to be told that "just now when we were deciding the issue you did not listen to what others said and I felt forced to accept your arguments or face attack from you."

3. It takes into account the needs of both the receiver and giver of feedback. Feedback can be destructive when it serves only our own needs and fails to consider the needs of the person on the receiving end.

4. It is directed toward behavior which the receiver can do something about. Frustration is only increased when a person is reminded of some shortcoming over which he has no control.

5. It is solicited, rather than imposed. Feedback is most useful when the receiver himself has formulated the kind of question which those observing him can answer.

6. It is well-timed. In general, feedback is most useful at the earliest opportunity after the given behavior (depending, of course, on the person's readiness to hear it, support available from others, etc.).

7. It is checked to insure clear communication. One way of doing this is to have the receiver try to rephrase the feedback he has received to see if it corresponds to what the sender had in mind.
8. When feedback is given in a group, both giver and receiver have opportunity to check with others in the group the accuracy of the feedback. Is this one man's impression or an impression shared by others?

Feedback, then, is a way of giving help; it is a corrective mechanism for the individual who wants to learn how well his behavior matches his intentions; and it is a means for establishing one's identity - for answering who am I?
I must do certain assignments in ink, or typed, others in pencil.
I must raise my hand.
When bells ring, I must stop what I am doing and what I am thinking and go elsewhere.
I must memorize poems.
I must do homework.
Although I have nothing to do during large chunks of class time, I am not allowed
to do my homework during that time.
I must prove my points by citing evidence (that is, by quoting authorities) even
though teacher does not have to.
I must study what I am told to study, whether or not that represents something I
would like to study.
I must endure treatment from the teacher which I cannot return in kind; I must
always be ready to account for my behavior to the teacher, but am not
allowed to ask teacher to account for his behavior.
I must often express myself in terms the teacher prefers rather than in terms
that come more naturally to me.
I am not allowed to smoke in the building, even though teachers may.
I am required to participate in various forms of school and class government
(Democracy) but everyone recognizes that the only decisions that really
count are those approved by the teacher and the administration.
I must regularly read aloud.
I must be graded.
If I finish my work before others do, I must do more work; e.g., I must "double-
check it."
If I do something well (in teacher's terms) I am likely not to hear about it. If I
do something badly (in teacher's terms) I am likely to hear about it.

Any rituals here?

What are you doing about them?
NORMS

What are the norms in this group?

How did they originate?

What, if any, changes would you like to see?

How can we change?
A NOTE ON THE VALIDITY OF MASLOW'S THEORY

Unfortunately, Maslow's theory is not supported by empirical data. Most of the support comes from Maslow's own descriptive studies, primarily of self-actualizing people. These studies are predicated on the fact validity of his theory. While other theories of motivation may differ markedly from Maslow's, none refute it unequivocally with empirical data.

The theory may be examined, however, from a philosophical standpoint. A thorough critique of the implications in the theory appears in the following excerpt from an article by Archimbault (The concept of need and its relation to certain aspects of educational theory, *Harvard Business Review*, 1957, 27:38-63.).

The most pertinent section follows:

Maslow contends that there is something resembling a potential, or entelechy which is part of man's nature, and which provides a concept of the desirable in that nature in its very existence. This scheme is parallel with that of Rousseau who, postulating the innate goodness of the child, claimed that all that was essential for a maximum manifestation of his potential, was to provide good and proper conditions in which these qualities could flourish naturally and automatically. This parallel seems to be admitted by Maslow when he claims that the great failing of our society has been the failure to recognize the fact that instinctive needs are not bad, but neutral or good, and that careful attention to the nurturing of these will yield a clear criterion of the good. (Maslow, 1943, p. 135.)

The important difference between man and all other beings is that his needs, his preferences, his instinct remnants are weak and not strong, equivocal and not unequivocal, that they have room for doubt, uncertainty and conflict,
that they are all too easily overlaid and lost to sight by
culture, by learning, by the preferences of other people.
(Ibid, p. 344.)

Here are shades of Rousseau's premise that it is the institutions
of the culture which corrupt the innately good human nature and
prevent its maximum fulfillment. We find shades of this argu-
ment in the contention by many present-day theorists that comic
books and television are really the cause of juvenile delinquency.

Several difficulties become immediately apparent in an analysis
of this scheme. The major one involves the fact that a realization
and recognition of what can be serves only to widen the area of
possible choice from which preferences and goods must be
selected. A common cause of frustration and anxiety lies in this
very recognition of possibilities and the difficulty of making the
most satisfactory choice among them. Several facets of the
Maslow scheme are apparently in conflict. Man is differentiated
from lower animals on the basis of his ability to transcend his
lower impulses and to order his activities. This allows him a
great range of freedom for choice which is dependent to a great
extent upon his ability to conceptualize, project himself into the
future, and foresee consequences of his actions. Yet this seems to
be in direct conflict with the notion that there is a built-in
guarantee that only those decisions will be made which are in
fact most advantageous for the individual. Maslow seems to want
to eat his cake and have it too. If freedom is to have any meaning
at all it must imply the ability to act in a variety of ways in a given
instance, and therefore opens up the possibility of error. The
concept of an inherent tendency to act in a way which is inevitable,
and a notion of freedom, are incompatible in this sense. Given a
situation in which desires conflict, the problem remains as to how
the conflict is to be reconciled, and which of the tendencies is to be
chosen as the most desirable one.

With regard to the notion of institutions corrupting man, it would
seem that this view neglects the fact that institutions are in reality
man-made, and reflect tendencies of human nature as well as
controlling them. Institutions are the means through which individuals
attempt to reconcile and avoid conflicts among desires. As such,
they are not essentially evil. They are merely instruments which
may be used for evil purposes. This "evil" rests not with the nature
of the institution itself, but rather with the values and moves that
the institution is used to promote. Thus the ultimate ground on
which the good and evil in society rests in the prevalent mores of society rather than in the instruments which are used to nurture and sustain these values.

When we seek to find the "good conditions" which are necessary for a manifestation of these potentialities in Maslow's scheme we recognize another parallel with Rousseau: "In general these conditions may be summed up under the one head of permissiveness to gratify and express." Thus the innate potential of the individual will flourish and reach fruition providing that a completely free environment is provided. Two considerations are in order here. First, it may be noted that any realistic scheme must take into account the fact that in any societal structure complete freedom is an utter impossibility. The well accepted notion of individual freedom is correctly qualified by the admonition that the individual can be free only insofar as his freedom does not infringe upon the freedom of others. The very nature of a society expresses the notion of freedom within given limits. Complete permissiveness is impossible. Therefore, a further step in the scheme is left unmentioned - the necessity for defining what limitations and restrictions are to be imposed on complete freedom, and what tendencies are to be nurtured in the light of these restrictions. Thus any educational program must concern itself with the trends and desires inherent in the individual which are considered to be worthy of nurture, which will insure the maintenance of personal freedom, and which will impose only those restrictions which will allow for the development of selected goods.

Secondly, it might be advisable to invoke John Dewey's well-known contention that a policy of complete laissez-faire might in fact prove detrimental to the child in that by failing to provide the proper materials and directions for growth and adjustment it might produce unnecessary and harmful patterns of adjustment. Even if we grant the dubious assumption that in the course of natural adjustment the higher orders of behavior will evolve automatically, the task of education would still remain to abstract and nurture those tendencies which would be naturally evolved, so that a minimum of frustration and a maximum of efficiency would be attained. For example, the present trend toward "problem-centered" areas of activity is based on the assumption that the introduction of conflicts and barriers to the natural scheme of events will result in a spurt in the adjustive process, thus accelerating the evolution of desirable characteristics.
Lists of Basic Needs in Education

There are numerous attempts to set up lists of basic needs as guides to the formulation of educational objectives. Most of these studies accept the concept as valid, and then proceed to relate the general needs of youth to a specific curricular program.

A. H. Maslow sums up several of the difficulties involved in a cataloguing of needs or drives, maintaining that the lists are determined by the degree of specificity with which they are analyzed:

Thus we can speak of a need for gratification or equilibrium; or more specifically of a need to eat; or still more specifically of a need to fill the stomach; or still more specifically of a desire for proteins; or still more specifically of a desire for a particular protein; and so on. Too many listings that we now have available have combined indiscriminately needs at various levels of magnification. With such confusion it is understandable that some lists should contain three or four needs and others contain hundreds of needs. . . . Furthermore, it should be recognized that if we attempt to discuss the fundamental desires they should be clearly understood as sets of desires, as fundamental categories or collections of desires. In other words, such an enumeration of fundamental goals would be an abstract classification rather than a cataloguing list. (Ibid, p. 70.)

The difficulties involved here are indeed severe. In an earlier discussion we noted the limitations inherent in an abstract categorization of needs, emphasizing the tendency toward distortion of specific instances in order to maintain a logically imposed classification. Here it becomes apparent that the tendency to err in the other direction is equally dangerous. On the one hand, an abstract classification obscures individual differences. On the other hand, extreme specificity eradicates the essential unity and similarity among individual instances of need, thus posing the question as to the value of an undertaking which pretends to propose a scheme of needs which has validity and justification.
In the light of our earlier discussion it becomes clear that the value of these various listings is dependent upon their success in defining the basis for choice in determining which needs are to be emphasized, and just how the hierarchy is validated. Granted that certain tendencies must be nurtured in order to fulfill carefully specified conditions, such long lists of needs do not in themselves dictate which needs must be given emphasis and which are to be considered most essential in an educational scheme where economy of time is of utmost importance. Essentialists would certainly agree to the description of the characteristics of the well-educated person given by the Educational Policy Commission, for the listed characteristics are desirable enough. However, the task set for educational theory is to decide which of these characteristics are to be given emphasis, which are to be eliminated as specific objectives of classroom instruction in light of the obvious fact that the school cannot do all things well.

Many studies precede their postulation of needs with a set of presuppositions which serve to provide the general conditions under which the needs are to be considered valid. The analysis of basic areas of need by Camilla M. Low reflects this tendency, stating three basic assumptions underlying the study. (1) The validity of the ideological framework of The American Democratic culture. (2) The necessity of furthering democratic ends. (3) The supreme worth of the individual. Yet in an attempt to modify and clarify the concept of need in this context, it soon becomes apparent that such a broad construction as these three principles embrace is woefully inadequate. If education is to receive its direction from the needs of the individual as a future citizen in an American democracy and all that this objective entails, we are at a loss for defining the precise implications that this concept carries for the everyday necessities of classroom practice. We have no clearcut interpretation of the democratic tradition. About all it implies is the necessity of a free exchange of ideas, an opportunity for the airing of individual differences, the right of the individual to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. However, the essence of the democratic condition emphasizes the conflicts among individual needs and the importance that these be freely manifested.

We might ask if the "American creed," or the democratic tradition is not too amorphous and vague a criterion to serve as a guide for educational objectives. An attempt to postulate lists of needs as basic to an individual in our democracy is beset with two major difficulties. (1) A tendency to give lip-service to ideals which are
in turn open to great varieties of individual interpretation, meaning all things to all men. (2) A specific tendency to define the needs of youth in terms of the current superficial values of a society. Inherent in this notion is the danger of education to maintain the status quo. A list of needs in McGuffey's time would emphasize the good, homely virtues of honesty, humility and respect for authority for the purpose of perpetuating a value structure favorable to vested interests. If education is to serve the dual function of transmitting cultural values and providing for an evolving, changing value structure, then it is essential to provide an adequate program for doing precisely that, with recommendations for specific objectives to be attained in order to practically realize this goal.

The prime difficulty involved in the use of needs as a basis of organization lies in the relation between the felt needs of the individual, the lacks of the individual, and the values of society which are to be nurtured with respect to the individual as an integral part of his society. In our earlier analysis we have stressed the essential interrelatedness of these factors, and the further necessity of distinguishing them for the purposes of clarity and precision. Even if it be admitted that an optimum level of adjustment in the individual is an intrinsic good, the dynamic factors involved in the relation of the demands which the society makes on the individual must be considered as logically prior in any consideration of optimum adjustment. The notion of personal adjustment is in itself no adequate criterion for goal-making, for it is ultimately dependent upon what the individual is to adjust to. The principle of equilibrium in itself points to an optimum state of balance within the individual in relation to his desires, perceptions, and the demands which the culture makes upon him as an integral part of the social scheme, but the concept in itself provides no source of direction.

The various lists of needs, then, suffer principally in that they utterly fail to provide more than a simple admonition that goals must always be postulated with a full cognizance of the limitations of the existing situation, a constant reminder that ideal ends should not be postulated which are incapable of attainment or which fail to take into consideration the physiological and psychological factors involved in an understanding of the potentialities and limitations of the learner with reference to his intelligence, his maturation level, and his relations with groups. Yet after we
admit the importance of such consideration in exposing the possibilities open to us in the educational enterprise, we are left with the essential problem of what should be chosen as aims and objectives within this realm of possibility. In this sense the doctrine of needs resembles the concept of education as growth - a construct which in essence maintains that nothing should be done to deter the full actualization of the potentialities inherent in the learner with regard to his future adjustment to his environment. Certainly everyone would agree with this proposition. The question remains as to which of the potentialities inherent in the learner are to be nurtured, and in fact created in the course of his education.

Archimbault's objections, while cogent, may be answered in the light of the behavioral emphasis in my model. That is, Maslow's hierarchy is a framework for organizing the training procedures; each of the pre-potent needs is diagnosed and specified behaviorally. Critical to the success of such a procedure is a set of specific performance criteria which also buttress the reliability of applying the procedures at given times.

Certainly, then, although one may raise serious philosophical objections to Maslow's theory taken out of the context of the student teaching situation, such reservations apply only if the theory is considered apart from carefully defined behavioral objectives. This dissertation is based on analogues to the theory; the training procedures themselves will have varying degrees of efficacy depending upon the degree that they address needs as perceived by a variety of individuals interacting with the student teacher. However, in all cases those needs must be defined behaviorally or they will become vulnerable to the charges in Archimbault's critique.
STRENGTH TRAINING: DECREASING THE THREAT OF EMOTIONS IN THE CLASSROOM

By Gerald A. Loney

Strength training is a process which has two goals: to help people discover and develop ego strength and the ability to accomplish a task, and to assist them in becoming sensitive to the feelings which they arouse in others while they are working on these tasks. For teachers, this means that strength training gives them experience in setting classroom goals, instituting procedures (including classroom control) which are likely to be helpful in teaching these goals, becoming aware of their behavior, becoming aware of whether their students perceive them as being strong or weak, and using their strengths to overcome their weaknesses.

It is our belief that teachers too often have ignored the emotional aspect of learning. They have focused on the work to be done and have overlooked the effect the emotional climate of the class has on the ability of the class to get the job done. The results of this omission have been disastrous, and frequently have contributed to students' feelings of alienation, unimportance, and hostility. Too many students feel that teachers don't care about them and what they are feeling, but are concerned only that they do their assignments, score well on tests and create no disturbance in class.

It should be emphasized that strength training doesn't seek to eliminate homework, tests or behavior control. Rather it seeks to humanize the atmosphere in which they occur by helping teachers see that the affective and cognitive aspects of
learning are inextricably bound together, and may either be mutually destructive or supportive: when we feel negative emotions, it's difficult to work well, and when we feel positive emotions, our motivation is high.

Strength training was conceptualized by Gerald Weinstein at Teachers College at Columbia University. He saw that too many student and first-year teachers were unable to effectively deal with the stress they encountered while teaching in inner-city schools. When teachers were observed with the goal of diagnosing their strength and sensitivity, they were placed in one of the four following categories:

1. Strong-sensitive: This person can maintain a consistent orderly structure in which learners can operate and, at the same time, indicate that he is constantly aware of what is going on with the pupils. The pupils are treated as important and respected persons with feelings, attitudes, and experiences that are worthy of attention.

2. Strong-insensitive: The person can keep a class in order and maintain his authority, but he never can really see, hear, or experience the pupils. It is pretty much a case of him against the pupils, and the stronger will win.

3. Weak-sensitive: This person holds the interests and needs of the child foremost in his mind, but is unable to establish the degree of order which would allow him to capitalize on his sensitivity.

4. Weak-insensitive: This category obviously speaks for itself.

Ideally, the strong-sensitives would appear to be the most desirable trainees, but they are in the distinct minority. In one group considered, 5 out of 73 were given that rating. The largest number of people fell in the categories of strong-insensitives and weak-sensitives. Strength training was developed to assist teachers in becoming strong-sensitives.

The process used in strength training is role-playing, feedback and experimentation with new behaviors. A typical strength training session for a group of teachers begins with one of the teachers teaching a lesson to the others, who role play students of the grade level the teacher expects to teach. Role players are instructed to behave as the teacher makes them feel like behaving.

After about fifteen minutes of teaching, the lesson is stopped, and the teacher asks his colleagues for feedback of three kinds: ratings, feelings and behaviors. Ratings are one-word descriptions of the teacher, feelings are the words that describe how the teacher made the students feel during the lesson, and behaviors are those things the teacher said or did which aroused the feelings and contributed to the ratings. To get the feedback, the trainers ask the group to complete this sentence, "Mr. Martin is __________. He makes me feel __________, when he __________." When this information has been obtained, the trainers, teacher, and group members examine the data for trends and themes. They determine what things the teacher did consistently that had positive or negative effects on the class. Then they suggest things the teacher might do to help him use his strengths to eliminate or minimize the negative effects. The suggestions are in the form of specific behaviors which can be practiced by the teacher, either in or out of class. After a reteach, during which the teacher tries on these new behaviors, the group again gives feedback about the teacher's effectiveness. Ideally, the teaching sessions are all video-taped, and the tapes are used to give visual demonstrations of the verbal feedback.
An example may make this process more understandable. The feedback after Mr. Martin's lesson includes two things frequently mentioned by the group. Many class members rate him as friendly, kind, or helpful. He makes them feel calm, friendly and cooperative when he smiles at them, doesn't shout, looks them in the eye. Others, however, see Mr. Martin as weak and afraid. They feel antagonistic and resentful when he doesn't make Jose and Linda stop talking, and when he tells Charles to keep his feet off the desk, but doesn't say anything when Charles does it a second time.

After the feedback, Mr. Martin says he always has trouble being forceful with his classes. Because he wants to be liked and he wants his students to feel good, he doesn't like to come on as a hard guy. The training group points out that for some, his easy-going manner is having just the opposite effect of that he hopes for: they tune him out or become angry because they think he's weak. As the group discusses this, it becomes clear that Mr. Martin identifies the placing of any restrictions on his students as riding roughshod over them, and believes that people who do this are resented. Furthermore, he argues, it would be unnatural, if not impossible, for him to act tough, and his students would see him as a phoney.

The trainer suggests that he experiment with his belief that people who place restrictions on others are resented. He suggests that Mr. Martin, during the following week, practice giving "qualified yes's." That is, when people ask something of him, he is to state some kind of restriction. If his student secretary asks to use her work period to study for a test, he might give permission, but ask her to
proofread some typing overnight; if his son wants to use the car, he might ask him to get it greased before he goes anyplace. The trainer asks Mr. Martin to try to be conscious of how he feels as he states the restrictions, and to try to notice what reaction people have as they receive them. In addition, he is told that, for the next strength training meeting, he will do a brief reteach focusing on placing restrictions without seeming harsh or unfair.

At the beginning of the next training session, the trainers ask Mr. Martin about his homework. He reports that he gave qualified yes's about ten times. He says that the first time was difficult for him, but that it became easier and easier. The most surprising thing about the homework was that the people to whom he gave restrictions seemed to have no reaction at all! It was almost as though they expected the restrictions.

Then Mr. Martin teaches a short lesson. It's very similar to the previous week's. When LaFrancis throws an eraser at someone, Mr. Martin asks her softly not to do it again. But this time, when the eraser flies a second time, he interrupts the discussion, walks to her desk, looks at her for a second and says that he doesn't want her to do it again. She doesn't. During the feedback, someone asks, LaFrancis why she stopped. "Because I thought he really meant it. The first time was just for fun. The second time was to test him out. He passed the test."

There are a couple of things that should be emphasized about this process. First, it assumes that the teacher has a set of attitudes and accompanying behaviors that can not easily be changed. Therefore he is asked to try on only a small, specific behavior which seems in keeping with his personality. Second, the process
focuses on the feelings of Mr. Martin as well as those of his students. He is asked to try something and to notice how he feels. If the behavior causes too much discomfort, the group can suggest less threatening behaviors to try on. Third, the process provides a relatively safe lab in which to practice behavior change. Like microteaching, the costs of experimentation to both teacher and student are minimized by using role-playing. Fourth, strength training encourages teachers to be sensitive to affect in the classroom. Teachers are encouraged to view classroom behavior as being symptomatic of the classrooms' emotional climate. Teachers are encouraged to acknowledge the legitimacy of emotion in school and to consider its effect on the students ability to work.

Strength training encourages teachers to look at themselves and their students in a more holistic manner. It is a flexible and adaptable process which can be tailored to fit specific needs of specific schools, or used without specific focus for improving both in-service and student teachers. It has been used to ease the process of integration in the south as well as prepare new teachers for difficult assignments in Manhattan. There is a good reason to expect that the strength training program at the University of Massachusetts and similar programs elsewhere will contribute toward making students feel less alienated, angry and unimportant, and will help teachers feel less threatened by emotions in the classroom.
GLOSSARY

Behavioristic Approach: Referring to the work of B.F. Skinner, and Bandura and Walters, in which behavior is systematically modified through procedures such as reinforcement and modeling.

Humanistic Approach: Referring to the theories and procedures in education and psychology typified by Combs, Rogers, Jersild, Maslow, Alschuler, Perls, Brown, and Hamachek. See Bibliography, especially Alschuler, (1969), who provides an extensive discussion of the definition of psychological education.

Incidental Learnings: Collateral learnings that a student acquires in addition to formal instruction; e.g., while learning map-reading skills, a student may also learn that only students who raise their hands are called on, or that anyone who disagrees with the teacher or asks difficult questions is likely to be publically embarrassed.

Microteaching: A set of teacher training procedures in which students practice specific teaching skills, receive videotaped feedback and analysis, then reteach. The student teaches a small number of students (4-8) for a short period of time (5-10 min.).
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