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ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between the Self Concept of Pre-Service Teachers and Two Methods of Teaching Value Clarification (May 1973)

Richard A. Wilgoren, B. A., University of Massachusetts

M. A. T., Wesleyan University

C. A. S., Harvard University

Directed by: Dr. R. Mason Bunker

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the self concepts of pre-service teachers are influenced by two different value clarifying strategies. One strategy, the Simon, invited the learner to articulate and organize his own value system at his own pace. The other, the Oliver, demanded that the participant compare his choices to the absolute hierarchy of democratic individualism.

 Fifty undergraduate, pre-service teachers, involved in methods "Potpourri" courses at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, in Amherst during the Fall semester of the academic year 1972-1973 participated in the study. Randomization of subjects selecting "Potpourri" values clarification to experimental treatment was used.

*"Potpourri" describes a wide range of mini-course offerings from which students select those appropriate to their needs.
Two "history" groups, also consisting of students who selected "Potpourri" methods courses other than values clarification, and who met at times coincident with the experimental groups were obtained.

All participants were given the Berger Self Acceptance Scale as a pretest and the Phillips Self Questionnaire as a posttest. Based on scores derived from the Berger scale pretest, subjects choosing a value clarifying course from the "Potpourri" offerings were randomly distributed into the Simon and Oliver experimental groups each of which met for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours during consecutive six week periods.

Basically, a preobservation-postobservation design was used.

Two kinds of variables, predictor and criterion, were employed in this study. The predictor variables included, the pretest, along with measures of age, sex, geography, transfer status, marital status, fraternal membership, and grade point average. The criterion variable was the posttest.

**Hypothesis 1**

For those persons experiencing either the Simon or the Oliver value clarification treatment, there will be self concept improvement, as defined by gains in scores from the Berger pretest to the Phillips posttest.

Five statistical measures (frequency distributions, T-Test by variable, T-Test (pretest to posttest), multiple regression, and a test of parallelism of regression were employed to consider this hypothesis.
These computations illustrated that persons in both experimental groups gained from pretest to posttest and therefore Hypothesis 1 is confirmed.

Hypothesis 2

There will be an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale, pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments.

This investigator used three computations (correlation matrices, parallelism of regression, and rank order distributions) to consider this hypothesis. Since an interaction between self concept level and treatment did not occur, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2A

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale, posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger Scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the higher the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely there will be no difference between the two treatments.

This investigator employed two computations (parallelism of regression and a T-Test, pretest to posttest) to confirm this hypothesis.
Hypothesis 2B

There will be differential self concept gains as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the lower the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely one would succeed more with the Simon treatment than with the Oliver treatment.

The author employed parallelism of regression to treat this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2B is rejected; for, the lower self concept people improved in a near parallel manner as a result of both treatments.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to find out the extent to which the self-concepts (as measured by the Berger Self Acceptance Scale and the Phillips Self Questionnaire) of pre-service teachers are influenced by two different value clarifying strategies. One strategy, the Simon approach, engaged the learner in a relaxed self-appraisal through identification, choice, and affirmation of his own value code. By comparison, the Oliver approach involved the learner in the repetitive defense of his value choices in the face of conflicting situations. This investigator believes that these approaches are viable for different learners.

Introduction to the Problem

The heart of this study involves learner style. The investigator traces the history of his concern with learner style relative to value clarification to his experiences teaching Social Studies at Lexington, Massachusetts High School. Here, some learners thrived on experiences rich in value conflict while others withdrew. The involved ones seemed to be confident and outgoing while those uninvolved appeared unsure and unwilling to be included. The investigator's frustration in not involving these withdrawers began this search.
The author started to focus his concern on the personality of the learner as a primary factor contributing to his active or passive responses to challenging dialogue. Some of the questions which surfaced are as follows: To what extent is there a relationship between this conflict-oriented strategy, the Oliver approach, and the diverse responses of students? Why are some learners more comfortable with this strategy than others? Could this range of responses be related to aspects of the learner's personality? Are there cues to a learner's response based on the degree of confidence he has in himself?

Questions such as these led the author to a study of learner self acceptance and self concept theory. The thrust of this study will involve the examination of the relationship between one's degree of self acceptance and one's willingness to undergo a process of self discovery through involvement with value clarifying strategies. More precise statements of significance will be presented later.

**Conclusions from the Research Literature**

Early studies concerned with finding an optimal learning environment are typically global in their concerns. Aiken, in the Eight Year Study (1933-1939) of students paired in "traditional" versus "progressive" situations found a clear superiority for "progressive" students in learning both cognitive and affective skills. The broadly drawn categories and lack of duplicative research weakens this study. Other reports by Anderson and his Associates (1945-1946) and Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) retained this general concern with classroom climate.
and individual behavior without directly touching upon personal characteristics of the learners.

Although scholars have not given up on this quest for an optimal learning environment, their efforts have not been fruitful. Several reviewers of research corroborated this lack of success. Withall and Lewis, in their review of the research of the 1920's and 1930's together with Wallen and Travers and Ebel's conclusions about the efforts of the 1960's were consistent in finding that there is no significant difference in learning outcome no matter what teaching method was employed. Two assumptions apparently underly these studies; first, that there exists one superior method of teaching for all learners and second, that the personality characteristics of learners can be ignored.

Similarly, educational research involving college teaching reviewed by Good (1952), McKeachie (1961, 1962, 1963) and Dubin and Traveggia (1968), is consistent in reporting little relationship between instructional method and learner achievement, where cognitive skills are taken as the criterion.

The consistency of negative results have forced scholars to seek answers. Goldberg (1969) suggested that either the measurement instruments were faulty or that the involved interactions were more complicated than originally thought. McKeachie (1963) and Wallen and Travers (1963) reasoned that the assumption that one method is good for all learners is faulty. Whithall and Lewis (1963) complained about the lack of attention given the affective interaction between teachers and students.
A few studies showed greater concern for the condition of the learner. Beginning with Murphy and Ladd (1941) and continuing with Flanders (1949), Perkins (1949), Wispé (1951), Johnson and Smith (1954), McKeachie (1954), and Beach (1960), relationships are found between student personality characteristics and teaching methods.

Jacob (1957), in his thorough volume on college teaching and values education, cautioned that teacher methodology didn't seem to influence student value judgments. He did, however, find a relationship between student personality and willingness to respond.

In a more positive vein, McKeachie (1967) and Thelen (1967) found a clear attempt to match learner personality with mode of instruction in the current research. Ten years earlier, Cronbach proposed a theory, Aptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI), claiming a relationship between a student's personality traits and the mode of instruction. By 1967, he advanced the hypothesis that student needs should determine which classroom methods are used. In his review of ATI literature, Pervin (1968) found some success in this matching process.

In total the research shows much effort and few positive results. Early attempts sought the all purpose method. Other efforts were concerned with achievement and disregarded the personality traits of the learner. More recent studies show some success in matching diverse personalities with varied modes of instruction. This study will explore the relationship between one aspect of personality, the individual's self view, and two modes of values instruction.
Theoretical Base

Both the Simon and Oliver approaches differ dramatically from past value clarifying strategies which rested on the premise that individuals would accept a preconceived set of values passed from one generation to the next. Fraenkel (1969) pointed out that "The most common means of teaching values employed by teachers in the past has been that of moralistic telling." Several corroborative studies by Allport (1954), Festinger (1964), McGinnies (1966), and Sykes (1966) agreed with the headlines of our daily newspapers showing that this process of absorption has not worked.

Simon (1971 and 1972) calls attention to the cacophony of conflicting choices faced by today's individual who is less aided than his predecessors by such outmoded institutions as the family, the school, and the church.

Such current concerned educators as Fenton (1970) and Kohlberg (1971) reminded us that teachers relying on the moralizing approach prevail in today's schools. Every teacher whether or not by design, is involved with values instruction. Furthermore, Fenton pointed out that attempts to avoid the teaching of values risks leading learners to believe that there are no worthwhile values.

Other educators attempted to offer ways of aiding the teacher to more positively involve students in their search for usable standards. For example, Jersild (1955) linked this development of a teacher's self knowledge with his capacity to teach. He claimed that the most significant element of a teacher's capacity to help students was self
knowledge, "The teacher's understanding and acceptance of himself is the most important requirement in any effort he makes to help students know themselves and to gain healthy attitudes of self-acceptance (p. 114)." More recently, the National Education Association in its 1962 yearbook agreed with Jersild, "to provide an atmosphere of acceptance of others, we must begin by helping teachers achieve a greater acceptance of self (p. 126)." Combs (1965) added his voice by stating that the preparation of teachers should center on one's discovery of self, "at the very center of the professional program would be provision for the continuous exploration and discovery of personal meaning (p. 119)."

What literature can the teacher call upon to aid in his search with students for self knowledge and value acquisition? Recent research pointed out the need for diverse instructional strategies to match varied learning styles. Snow (1970), in his review of research on media and aptitudes, rejected the premise that one instructional strategy will suit every learning style in favor of offering varying learning opportunities to differing learners:

Combining the ideas and methods of experimental and correlation psychology offered the possibility of differentiated instructional improvement in place of a continued, fruitless search for the one best way to teach everyone. The new approach would assign learners to different instructional treatments tailored to fit their own particular strengths and styles of learning (p. 63).

Within this new field of research, Apptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI), exists a terminology which helps us to relate learning style with teaching strategy. Snow described this interrelationship as a
"interaction" between a particular subject, or learner, and a particular environment, or treatment. In conjunction with Cronbach, he defined the aim of ATI research in education as:

Assuming that a certain set of outcomes from an educational program is desired and considering any particular instructional treatment, in what manner do the characteristics of learners affect the extent to which they attain the outcomes from each of the treatments that might be considered? Or considering a particular learner which treatment is best for him (p. 65)?

Two contemporary social educators, Oliver and Joyce, attempted to directly relate self development with value acquisition. In frustration over not involving some students in his conflict strategy, Oliver (1966) suggested that "the latest research pay off would come from a research design in which interactions between teaching style and personality in affecting learning could be test (p. 310)." In one of the latest books dealing with social studies education, Joyce (1972) sees a direct relationship between a person's development of a means for value clarification and the furtherance of his "functioning self (p. 209)."

Unfortunately, there is no extant literature which describes or tests the interrelationship between learners and treatments relative to value clarifying experiments. This study will relate these concerns. The process of both approaches differs from previous ones in the involvement of the learner in the structuring of his own value code.

Definition of Terms

Self. A workable definition of "self" is elusive. Theorists such as Jersild (1965), Cottrell (1969), and Diggory (1966) admit difficulty in arriving at a precise meaning. Purkey (1970), agreed
that it is impossible to perfectly define or totally know the self.
Purkey suggested that "No one, of course, can ever climb into another's
skin, or see this construct we call the self, but we can infer that
self in a number of ways (pp. 58-59)." He went even further by
suggesting humility and a need of unending search in his discussion of
"our limitations and our biases (pp. 58-59)."

He did offer helpful suggestions in the form of two methods of
drawing inferences about the self, self report and observation. Self
reports, he agreed, were limited by such factors as the quality of the
subject's expression, the lack of threat, and the degree of awareness.
Similarly, observation was limited by the screening mechanisms between
self and others.

Self Concept. These same problems are present in arriving at a
hands-on definition of self concept. Perceptual psychologists, like
Combs, Avila and Purkey (1971) defined the self-concept as the "I" or
"me"; that is, "that organization of perceptions about self which seems
to the individual to be who he is (p. 39)." Combs (1965) in two other
references refers to self concept as "a Gestalt, a unique pattern of
perception (p. 40)" and as the individual's "frame of reference in terms
of which all other perception gain their meaning (p. 145)."

The author accepts Combs' definition of self concept as those
terms an individual uses to describe himself. Fundamental to this
definition is the willingness of the individual to accept himself.
This willingness to accept oneself is measured by the two scales in-
volved in this study, the Berger Self Acceptance Scale and the Phillips
Self Questionnaire.
Two related terms require definition. **Lower self concept** refers to negative views of self as manifested by scores in the lower range (36-85) while **higher self concept** denotes higher scores.

**Value.** A value details those beliefs which guide an individual's behavior.

**Value clarification.** This term refers to strategies employed to encourage self awareness of values.

**Hypotheses**

An understanding of these terms is a prerequisite for clearly stating the hypotheses of this study. This investigator's experience bears testimony to the conclusion that those learners who are more self confident are more likely to enjoy a high conflict mode of value clarification while those who are less self assured prefer this instruction at a lower key. The hypotheses for this study follow from the author's experience.

**Restatement of Hypothesis**

**Hypothesis 1**

For those persons experiencing either the Simon or the Oliver value clarification treatment, there will be self concept improvement, as defined by gains in scores from the Berger pretest to the Phillips posttest.
Hypothesis 2

There will be an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments.

Hypothesis 2A

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the higher the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely there will be no difference between the two treatments.

Hypothesis 2B

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the lower the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely one would succeed more with the Simon treatment than with the Oliver treatment.

Significance

As we have seen, both Oliver and Simon believed that the learner should work out his own value system rather than accepting the
prescriptions of others. These strategists saw the relationship between the learner's self concept and the mode of instruction. Simon suggested that a comforting atmosphere will best allow any person, whether of high or low self concept to work through his values. Oliver, by contrast, preferred the tough skinned, high self concept, individual who can stand his challenging strategy. The thinking of these two men leads the author to state the following significances for this study:

1. That new ground will be broken by helping establish a new area of literature which relates learner self concept to the mode of teaching value clarification.

2. That the literature dealing with classroom methodology will be refined by the matching of two methods of value clarifying instruction with one aspect of personality, the learner's self concept.

3. That the assumption that every teacher should first become familiar with the personality of the learner before choosing a suitable mode of instruction will be supported.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH DEALING WITH SELF CONCEPT, CLASSROOM METHODOLOGY, AND THE TWO EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGIES

This above all; to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

Hamlet. Act I, Scene 3

SECTION A: REVIEW OF SELF CONCEPT LITERATURE

By comparison, the field of study concerned with self concept theory and research offers a substantially greater yield than does the field of research dealing with classroom methodology. This investigator believes that greater understanding and application of self concept theory will better equip educators in their attempts to facilitate student growth.

The central purpose of this chapter is to explore the meaning of and apply the results of self concept theory and research to the choice of alternative modes of instruction. Let us begin by addressing several questions that are appropriate to self investigation and that are rooted in research and theory. First, concerning matters of definition:

What is meant by "self" and "self concept?"
What difficulties are inherent in the definition of these terms? What is the relationship between "self" and "self concept"?
Second, considering characteristics of environmental influence:

What are the characteristics of a growing self and expanding self concept? To what extent is the individual influenced by his social environment?

Third, referring to the developmental stages of infancy and childhood:

Does an infant have a sense of self, a self concept? What are the major influences on the developing self concept of the child? How important is the home environment, the parents, the culture?

Fourth, concerning the school and the influence of teachers:

What influences does the school environment have on the developing self concept? Is there a significant relationship between school experiences and the changing self concept? What influence does teacher behavior have on a student's self concept? How can teachers become more helpful in helping students grow?

Finally, in writing this summary:

What conclusions can I draw about the meaning of "self," "self concepts," and conducive environment?

Definitions and Difficulties

As stated in Chapter I, working definitions of "self" and "self concept" are elusive. If theorists agree on anything, it is the common distress they express when they attempt to arrive at their own (never mind agreed upon) working definitions of these widely used terms. After perusing alternative descriptions, this investigator has accepted the definitions of self concept as offered by Combs and his colleague (1971). They defined self concept as those terms which an individual uses to describe himself. This description is closely akin to the willingness of an individual to accept himself as measured by the two
involved scales selected for use in this study, the Berger Self Acceptance Scale and the Phillips Self Questionnaire.

In attempting to define the "self", theoreticians resorted to composite generalities, focused on components, were concerned with its expression, or combined these approaches. Jersild (1965) used all three strategies in attempting to breathe life into this abstraction:

When we speak of "the self," we mean, among other things, a system of ideas, attitudes, appraisals, and commitments pertaining to one's own person. The person experiences these as distinctly belonging to him, and all of them together constitute the person's awareness of his individual existence and his conception of who and what he is (p. 532).

The self, as it finally evolves, is made up of all that goes into a person's experiences of his individual existence. It is the person's inner world. It is a composite of a person's thoughts and feelings, strivings and hopes, fears and fantasies, his view of what he is, what he has been, what he might become and his attitudes pertaining to his worth (p. 196).

William James (1890), considered one of the fathers of psychology, defined "self" in its broadest terms as the total of one's possessions, "In its widest possible sense, however, a man's self is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his land and horses, and yacht and bank-account (p. 183)."

Another psychologist, Gergen (1971), offered his composite definition of self as inclusive of the process of and product of ("structure") self definition. Thus, one's definition of "where he's at" depends upon how clearly he defines his behaviors:
The notion of self can be defined first as process and then as structure. On the former level we shall be concerned with that process by which the person conceptualizes (or categorizes) his external conduct and his internal states. On a structural level our concern is with the system of concepts available to the person in attempting to define himself (pp. 22-23).

Combs and Snygg (1949) became more specific than the fore-mentioned thinkers by defining the phenomenal self as "the individual's own unique ways of regarding self; it is the Gestalt of his concepts of self (p. 126)." Therefore, the self is the patterned representation of the "I" or "we (p. 126)."

Purkey (1970), another colleague of Combs, offered a living definition of self which emphasized both order and change: "a complex and dynamic system of beliefs which an individual holds true about himself, each belief with a corresponding value (p. 7)." Purkey illustrated how beliefs exist in an orderly relationship to each other with positive and negative values and with high or low importance. A person, then, owns a variety of beliefs about himself which can be divided into categories.

In his discussion of his second quality of self, it's dynamic character, Purkey reminded us that a person will change, will incorporate a new belief about his self as long as this quality is seen as consistent and congenial with existing beliefs. What he described, then, is essentially a Rokeachian system of central and peripheral beliefs. We are likely not to change our central beliefs and more likely to alter our peripheral ones. For example, this investigator places great value on his success as a teacher and it will take a lot of negative experiences to change his view.
Whatever the definition we are comfortable with, a precise definition of "self" remains elusive. Theorists repeatedly admitted difficulties. Jersild claimed that "in the present state of our knowledge the meaning of 'the self' can be defined only in arbitrary and tentative terms (p. 532)." Cottrell (1969) admitted that "it becomes problematical when we attempt to make its meaning explicit and precise (p. 513)." Hamachek (1965) warned that we should be careful to avoid reification of a theoretical construct (p. v)." Diggory (1966) criticized the confusing encrustation of affective connotations which have become attached to it, like barnacles in the course of centuries (p. vii)."

The degree of interest expressed by psychologists and educators easily counters this weight of difficulty. Jersild spoke of man's inherent capacity for introspection while Branden (1969) claimed that all men possess a sense of self worth in order to function as social beings:

Man cannot exempt himself from the realm of values and value-judgments. Whether the values by which he judges himself are conscious or subconscious, rational or irrational, consistent or contradictory, life-serving or life negating—every human being judges himself by some standard; and to the extent that he fails to satisfy that standard, his sense of personal worth, his self-respect, suffers accordingly (p. 107).

Furkey (1970) agreed that it is impossible to define perfectly or to totally know the self by suggesting that "No one, of course, can ever climb into another's skin, or see this construct we call the self, but we can infer that self in a number of ways (pp. 58-59)." He went
even further in suggesting humility and a need for unending search in his discussion of "our limitations and our biases (pp. 58-59)."

He did offer a helpful suggestion in the form of two methods of drawing inferences about the self, self report and observation. Self reports, he observed, were limited by such factors as the quality of the subject's expression, the lack of threat, and the degree of awareness. Similarly, observation was limited by the screening mechanisms between self and others.

These same problems are present in arriving at a definition of self concept. Perceptual psychologists, like Combs, Avila and Purkey (1971) defined the self-concept as the "I" or "me"; that is, "that organization of perception about self which seems to the individual to be who he is (p. 39)." Combs and his associates in two other references referred to self concept as "a Gestalt, a unique pattern of perception (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971, p. 40)," and as the individual's frame of reference in terms of which all other perceptions gain their meaning (Combs and Snygg, 1971, p. 145)."

Other psychologists, like Rogers and Ausubel, offered a more global description with greater emphasis on the self concept as an interactive instrument. For example, Rogers (1951) expressed his concern for the significance of individual "awareness":

The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; the goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive and negative valence (pp. 136-137).
Ausubel (1969) noted both the abstractness of and multivariated characteristics associated with self-concept:

An individual's self-concept is the set of cognitive and affective states which define his attitudes toward himself. That is, it is a more or less consistent and integrated view of himself which the individual carries from one situation to another. The self-concept is obviously a very complex entity embracing mental, physical, emotional, moral and social attributes (p. 405).

Ausubel's definition presents problems of measurement and analysis while at the same time relates to learning and value theory. Obviously such all-inclusive phrases as "cognitive and affective states," "moral or less consistent," and "embracing mental, physical, and moral study" are difficult to define. Nevertheless, Ausubel's concern for consistency is shared by Raths (1966), a helpfully corroborating finding.

Combs and Syngg (1949) aided the author's understanding of the relationship between self, self concept, and the environment with the following visual illustration:
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Fig. 1.—Self and Self Concept
In Figure 1, Combs and Syngg (1949) represent the perceptual field of phenomenal environment (C) to include all of a person's perceptions about self and not-self. Within this field exists the phenomenal self (B) denoting all the perceptions about self no matter how important. The central core of the personality, the self concept (A), includes only the most vital perception of "me (pp. 126-127)."

David Coffing (1972) also emphasized the difficulties involved with defining and measuring self concept. He pointed out that this term as an abstraction is a hypothetical or theoretical construct which is difficult, if not impossible, to accurately define and measure. He raised the possibilities that self concept may not have universal application and may be just a middle class, white phenomenon.

Yamamoto (1972) went further in reminding us that the self concept is as different from the self as a word is from a thing and a map is from a territory. Since it is a subjective composite construct, the self concept is an "imperfect me" representation of the true "I" self (p. 2).

Wylie (1960) further increased our awareness of the research problem. Because an individual's self-report responses may be influenced by many unmeasured factors, the variables operating and the interrelationships between variables are often hazy, she claimed, Wylie warned us of three compromising influences:

(1) The individual reports only what he wants to reveal to the researcher.
(2) The individual may claim attitudes or perceptions which are not his.
(3) The individual and the researcher may have differences in the use of language (p. 24).
This investigator is concerned but not chastized by this plethora of problems; for, the weight of literature underscores the significance of "self concept" as a factor worthy of consideration. Combs, Avila and Purkey (1971) claimed that "the most important single factor affecting behavior is the self-concept (p. 39)." McDonald (1965) another prominent psychologist, saw self concept as a key to understanding an individual's sense of unity. Kohlberg (1969) used similar reasoning in employing this concept to trace personality development:

There is fundamental unity of personality organization and development termed the ego, or the self. While there are various strands of social development ( psychosexual development, moral development, etc.), these strands are united by their common reference to a single concept of self in a single social world. (p. 349).

Combs and Snygg (1949) noted that an individual will aspire to the degree that his self concept allow him to aspire. Smith, Cohen, and Pearl (1968) agreed, "A teacher's expectations will definitely influence what, and how well, his pupils do (p. 90)." As a child, the investigator can remember when his mother would ask him where the missing points were when he brought an examination home from school. The author's level of aspirations became one of perfection and of distrust in any satisfaction since he never attained 100% on a regular basis.

In his works, Combs built upon still another difficulty characteristic of self concept, selective perception, and used this concept to illustrate how we can better understand behavior. Perceptions, according to Combs, are organized in reference to our self concept. A given bit of knowledge will have little effect on behavior unless we perceive such
knowledge, as being meaningful in terms of touching ourselves. For example, we all see that we are prejudiced but we will not act to change our prejudice, unless we feel a personal (self) need to do so.

The investigator, as we can easily see, has authoritative company for his appreciation of and willingness to work with these problems of definition.

Characteristics of Growth

Let us turn from our discussion of definitional difficulties to sample the literature relevant to the growing self. An individual's constant movement toward self-fulfillment (the growth principle) has been a given in the works of several humanistic psychologists. Maslow (1970) spoke of self-actualization, Allport (1954) of the process of becoming, Lecky (1945) of self-consistency, Festinger (1957) of dissonance reduction, Fraenkel (1969) of the search for meaning, and Rogers (1951) of the search of self-fulfillment. The theory of self fulfillment, stated simply, claims that "by knowing where a person is at," which need or needs are operative, we can better understand and predict why the individual is behaving as he is.

Let's look at Rogers thinking in more detail. Rogers (1951) hypothesized that "Every individual exists in a continually changing world of experience of which he is the center (p. 483)." Closely related to this proposition is the idea that reality for a person is the reality that he perceives or experiences not the absolute reality,
the objective state of being. Rogers saw the development of a sense of self plotted on a "perceptual map" of the real world.

Trust in self is the compass with which the individual plots his course. Rogers described a condition of self in which the person is able to trust and be open to new information as a psychologically adjusted individual who "feels that his strength can be and is directed toward the clear purpose of actualization and enhancement of a unified organism (p. 514)." In trusting his senses the person learns to accept himself and is open to change as conditions influence him. These characteristics are true of the high self concept subject involved in this study.

Opposite conditions lead to lack of growth and a maladjusted person. The person who views an experience as inconsistent with his self (his values, beliefs) will be threatened and the more he is threatened the greater the threat resulting in closure of self and lack of growth. This person distrusts and distorts his sensory perceptions and is increasingly closed to opportunities for change. For this reason, as the investigator has hypothesized, low self concept people when threatened should think less of self.

As the person increasingly integrates new experiences within "his self-structure," he replaces his outworn complex of "introjected" parentally-imposed values with his own value system based on his own experiences. The process of change in favor of a unique, separate self is in motion "with a continuing organismic valuing process (p. 522)."
Given this reasoning, the subjects of this study who are threatened will show less growth than subjects who feel comfortable.

Rogers (1951) illustrated the sensitive differences between a growth course based on trust, Figure A, and less helpful course characterized by distrust and denial, Figure B:
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Fig. 2—Trust and Distrust
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Area I - self trusts perceptions; open
Area II - self distrusts perceptions; relies on introjected values; closed
Area III - self denies threatening experiences (pp. 526-527).

Erikson (1965), a developmental psychologist, presented a more hierarchical description of the developing self as one moves through a series of stages of life, his eight crisis periods. Within each stage, one faces a crisis and may work out a negative (lack of growth) or positive (growth) result. The result is never complete victory, but instead a battle which must be continuously re-fought, usually at a higher, later, stage of life.
Like other developmental thinkers, Erikson (1965) saw a cyclical age development with an adversarial struggle to be fought at each stage as indicated in Figure 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>trust v. mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>autonomy v. doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play age</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>initiative v. guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School age</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>industry v. inferiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>12-18</td>
<td>identity v. role confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adulthood</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>generativity v. self-absorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senescence</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>integrity v. disgust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 3.—Growth Stages and Crises*

Adolescence and early adulthood, with the working through of the identity crisis, is the central stage for the pre-service teachers involved in this study. During this time, the adolescent, or young adult, successfully integrates past with future, childhood identifications with adult roles. To the degree that a person works out this "Who am I?" problem, or strengthens his self concept, "he arrives at a sense of psychosocial identity, a sense of who he is, where he has been and where he is going." (Elkind, n.d. p. 6). Erikson (1965) cautioned that this process is not a conscious one but a person who achieves his identity will be seen as one who "simply feels and acts predominantly in tune with himself. . . . (p. 331).

People are born to achieve a predestined goal. Maslow (1965), in his discussion of self-actualization, defined this process of
self-fulfillment as becoming "everything that one is capable of becoming (p. 257)." Maslow was hazy and admitted the need for research to determine the specific process by which a person conceives of and pursues a particular idealized self.

His colleague, Gergen (1971), was more concerned with the growth of divergent capacities, or many selves. "Others are continuously teaching us who we are (p. 82)," claimed Gergen. Each person possesses a range of selves which blossom depending upon the season. Other people provide the "cues" which stimulate the growth of divergent selves. This process of stimulation and the flourishing of selves is continuous.

Gergen reported illustrative research. We act differently, portray different selves, when relating to different cues. In responding to an egotist, we are more egotistical, "accenting our assets," while we are more humble when confronted by a humble person. Everyone owns an egotistical and a humble self. The environment also cues the expression of a particular self. We learn which self is appropriate. People act differently as students, as teachers, as mental patients, depending on the cues they receive from the school of the mental hospital.

Gergen considered the issue of whether this selective expression of selves is a "charade," a dishonest exchange of masks. He concluded that people clearly possess a wealth of selves, "a person may harbor a variety of concepts of himself which differ in salience from moment to moment (p. 86)."
Combs (1965b) was in agreement with Gergen when he states that our self is open to the social environment as a major instigator of change. Since we live in a culture which is changing rapidly, we are always faced with the necessity of rapid, continuous reassessment of ourselves. To this investigator, this process is both exciting and frustrating; exciting in the knowledge that things will be different tomorrow; and challenging and frustrating in my unfulfilled wish for some rest in the search.

Combs (1965b) found that we are more open to perceptions and therefore to change in areas which are peripheral and less open in central areas. The following illustration, Figure 4, helps us understand this continuum:
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Fig. 4.—Threat and Change
Other psychologists, as reported by Yamamoto (1972), pointed to the dynamic character of the search for self. Growth of self can be defined as "a willing(ness) to try out different pictures of self, so to speak, to find out how well they fit the self (p. 214)." The goal of a growth-directed self becomes a willingness to experiment, to change rather than a desire to retain the stable, consistent self concept. Trust in self, self esteem, is requisite to this desire for growth. This principle of self renewal, of experimentation with alternative choices, is central to Simon's value clarifying process. Moreover, the above mentioned psychologists agreed that the growth stages currently being experienced by the subjects of this study are prime times for such renewal and growth.

The Social Environment and Growth

Jourard (1964) maintained that man stays in touch with his self by disclosing himself to another, "No man can come to know himself except as an outcome of disclosing himself to another person (p. 5)." Gergen also found that high self-esteem people attempt to lead, to influence others in social relationships. He attributed this activity to the natural willingness to take the risk of alienating others and higher degree of self confidence coincident with high self-esteem. This study corroborates this conclusion. High self concept subjects tended to predominate during discussion.

Gergen (1971), in discussing this development of self conception, raised the question of how an individual arrives at his unique view of
himself given the common pool of cultural stimuli. He centered on "reflected appraisal," the feedback supplied by a significant others, as central to this development. "Reflected appraisal," he concluded is

"... maximal when (1) the appraiser is credible and personalistic in his approach; (2) he advocates great change in self-conception and he does it often; (3) his appraisal is not contradicted by other information; and (4) his appraisal is a positive one (pp. 40, 49)."

Therefore, the influence of parents during early childhood, of certain peers and teachers during adolescence, and of colleagues during adulthood is corroborated by this view. Studies by Combs (1965a, 1965b) and Kinch (1963) substantiated Gergen's emphasis on selective feedback.

In a corroborating study, Havighurst and his associates (1946) in research dealing with the developing self (ideal self) during childhood and adolescence phrased a short essay topic as "The Person I Would Most Like To Be Like (p. 241)." Responses indicated a switch in identification from parents (childhood) to "an attractive, visible young adult (p. 256)" during adolescence. Havighurst saw the pervasive influence of modeled behavior as a fundamental influence on the choice of an ideal self image.

As the person seeks and gains increased self gratification from his relationships with others, he will increasingly be accepting of and not threatened by other, different selves. A positive reaction will take place in which the first person (self) will accept the second person (another self) leading to a reward for the first person's self-image and an impetus for the second person to reach out for a third and on and on creating a positive social climate.
Other psychologists such as Maslow and Gergen agreed. They found a strong relationship between high self-esteem and high acceptance of others. Therefore, the necessity of including esteem aiding techniques such as value clarification, in teacher education programs becomes apparent. When more confident in himself, the teacher becomes more accepting of others, especially of his students, and allows them to become themselves. Finding styles of value clarification comfortable to people with varied personality variables such as self concept, an offshoot of this study, would aid teachers in becoming more accepting of self and others.

Beginnings of Self Concept During Infancy

Most of our knowledge about the development of self concept during the period before and after birth is based on theory unsubstantiated by replicated research. Purkey told us that "the newborn baby is unaware of his existence as a unique and separate entity (p. 29)." His self is merged with his mother. Almost immediately, though, he experiences his environment as his senses record a myriad of messages. This process begins the forging of self.

In this infancy period, claimed Purkey, the self is most malleable. "It is remarkably plastic, changeable, and possesses infinite capacity for growth and actualization (p. 30)." The infant first conceives of himself when he becomes able to draw distinctions between his own bodily sensations and the outside things influencing his sensations through a process of discovery. As Jersild (1965a) conjectured, the child learns more about himself as he becomes aware both of his own body and other
bodies. This drawing of distinctions continues as the child compares himself with others and sees himself as a member of particular social groups.

Rogers (1951) referred to this process of segregating out experiences as the developing of the "me," the "I," and the "myself" (p. 497)." As the infant interacts with his environment, he parcels out data about himself and attributes values (positive and negative), to these experiences. He begins with an awareness of "I like" and "I dislike" and a valuing of self-enhancing experience. As his parents filter his experiences through their giving or denying of love, the child is forced to accept their perceptions and to reject his own, thereby rejected his own sensory opportunities for change and growth.

Here, in the child's rejection of his chance to come to terms with himself, is the root of latter feelings of loss, or not really knowing himself. As Rogers summarized, "Cut of these dual sources—the direct experiencing by the individual, and the distorted symbolization of sensory reactions resulting in the introjection of values and concepts as if experienced—there grows the structure of the self (pp. 498-499)."

During this beginning period of life, therefore, the person starts to experience, through his senses, a differentiation between his body and the environment. The infant begins to appreciate and depreciate the diverse aspects of his self. This child-to-be possesses all the potential to grow or to wither.
Childhood

It’s only natural that the mother is the significant person in affecting the emergence of the child's self. Unfortunately, we are almost completely ignorant about the relationship between experiences in the womb and later psychological development. We do know that the mother, as she relates to the child during the early months, "selectively" reinforces infant behaviors. Acceptance, expressed in a loving relationship, seems to be a key factor related to growth of self esteem.

As Felsenthal (1972) reminded us, the self concept is dynamic, is open and changing, especially during early childhood: "The self concept is not a constant; rather it is emergent, and it is thus amenable, especially in the young child, to environmental influences (p. 180)."

What conditions stimulate the growth of self esteem? Massad (1972) pointed to the importance of all types of communication to the child as he develops his self concept. She assumed that every child starts with two attributes: a unique potential and a residual capacity ("a little red wagon") for actualizing his self concept (pp. 50-51). The helping adult understands the potential of and maximizes the techniques of rewarding communication:

To promote the development of a healthy self concept in a child, adults first need to understand how the child feels about himself and his world; then, they need to communicate their support of and interest in him. Let him know that he is wanted and respected. A nod of approval, a smile, or an arm around the shoulder, a simple "Good work" or "Job well done" communicate a great deal (Massad, 1972, p. 51).
In spite of her acknowledgment of caution due to the lack of a body of research, Felsenthal (1972) offered two "prime" parental behaviors which help the child to develop his sense of worth: (1) consistent acceptance with respect and concern and (2) freedom and independence within carefully defined limits (p. 188)." She offered ten questions for parents which help them gauge the growth of their child’s self esteem. (See Appendix I).

Gergen (1971) found that the need for self-esteem is developed and nurtured during early childhood as parents communicate worth through the loving attention of caring activities. Soon, the child accepts the degree of worth offered by his parents. What then occurs is a conflict between two desires, for positive feedback and for accurate information. Everyone desires positive feedback but the higher the self esteem the greater the concern for accuracy at the expense of praise (p. 72).

Synder (1972) agreed that the environment of the home is the seedbed for the growth of the fledgling self concept. We find evidence which dramatically contrasts the effects of affective-rich versus rejection-rich homes. Children favored with a climate of affection and understanding develop self confidence and look on a failed task as one learning opportunity while children who experience a steady diet of parental rejection never develop adequate confidence in self and view a failed task as evidences corroborating their sad fate (p. 55).

Cultural differences prove to be a second environmental barrier to the development of a sense of adequacy. Studies of differences in
mother–child communication between middle class and lower class homes, showed that a child from a lower class home begins school with a "crippled ability" to function coupled with a negative self concept (Snyder, 1972, pp. 55-56). Maslow's need satisfaction hierarchical theory seems substantiated. Other reports show that "Often working-class mothers expect little of their children and cannot offer much help in the mastery of cognitive skills. Both these orientations are bound to feed negative self concept in children (The Self in Early Years, 1972, p. 212)."

The child, as we have learned, is most in touch with his self. He learns, as the author has learned, "to withhold," to present "a highly expurgated version of his self to others," or what Jourard (1964) called the "public self (p. 10)." In this and other ways, the child is continually influenced by the social environment, the culture. Unfortunately, American culture presents harmful influences, such as the necessity of competition and the rejection of the different. Yamamoto (1972) described how the craving for success and the dread of failure robs the child of much of his childhood and may result in the child escaping to a distorted, idealized self for protection (p. 10). The author remembers how he cringed when his mother asked him where the other three points were on an exam. He could never succeed unless he achieved the perfect.

Yamamoto (1972) bemoaned the fact that American society fails to offer sufficient avenues for self growth, "Clear models are not available to guide children in becoming a healthy being (p. 17)." Although he
believes that open and feeling teachers can help, he thinks the best action to be taken is inaction: "One of the best things we can do is to have faith in our children and, within certain limits, to let them be (p. 20)."

The second negative influence, rejection of the different, affects the child early. In her book, Race Awareness in Young Children, Goodman (1964) tells us that children become aware of race differences by age two or three and learn preferences between four and seven. The negative self concept owned by blacks hits home when we learn that black children develop a preference for white skin. These lessons in racism are taught early. Blacks are not the only ones who suffer from rejection. All minority groups live with a similar experience; they learn to be crippled.

We can now see the double-barreled importance of teaching value clarifying strategies to pre-service teachers as practiced by the author of this study. Teachers should be aware of the powerful and determining influence of the home on the developing self image of each student. Mastery of these techniques should enhance each teacher's possibilities for modeling positive behaviors and also will supply her with a ready made kit to aid students in the growth of their self concepts.

The School

Self-knowledge is the Forgotten Man of our entire educational system and indeed of human culture in general. Without self-knowledge it is possible to be erudite, but never wise. My challenge to all of us to have the humility to face this failure and to do something effective about it before it is too late. (Kubie, 1967, p. 71)
A school is not merely a teaching ship, it must transmit values and attitudes. It is a community in which children learn to live first and foremost as children and not as future adults. In family life children learn to live with people of all ages. The school sets out deliberately to devise the right environment for children, to allow time to be themselves and to develop in the way and at the pace appropriate to them. It tries to equalize opportunities and to compensate for handicaps. It lays special stress on individual discovery, on first hand experience and on opportunities for creative work. It insists that knowledge does not fall into neatly separate compartments and that work and play are not opposite but complementary.

(Plowden, 1967, p. 187)

Whether or not we acknowledge it, the experience of schooling, since it fills many hours of a person's life, influences the development of self. Hughes (1959), in her study of elementary school teachers, found that the teacher-student relationship mirrored the adult-child relationship within our culture. Truly, the surrogate parent plays an increasingly influential role. Combs (1965b) added his voice to others when he reminded us of the general process of becoming and the specific environment for its accomplishment:

People learn who they are and what they are from the ways in which they are treated by those who surround them in the process of their growing up. . . . We cannot rule the self out of the classroom, even if we wanted to. A child does not park himself at the door (p. 564).

Rogers (1951) agreed with Combs by defining the central goal of democratic education as the encouragement to students to recognize and respect the capacities inherent in their self. For Rogers, education becomes the task of allowing people to become individual:

. . . who are able to take self-initiated action and to be responsible for those actions;
who are capable of intelligent choice and self-direction;
who are critical learners, able to evaluate the contributions made by others;
who have acquired knowledge relevant to the solution of problems.

who, even more importantly, are able to adapt flexibly and intelligently to new problem situations;

who have internalized an adaptive mode of approach to problems, utilizing all pertinent experience freely and creatively;

who are able to cooperate effectively with others in these various activities;

who work, not for the approval of others, but in terms of their own socialized purposes (pp. 387-389).

Jersild (1965b) went even further than Combs and Rogers in specifically proposing that the school become a laboratory where the developing person is aided in finding out about his self. For Jersild (1965b) the child has the capacity and human institutions have the responsibility to aid in self discovery:

Each child is a student of human nature within the limits of his maturity level and what he has had an opportunity to learn. The home, the classroom, the playground, and other situations are psychological laboratories in which he is now a subject and now an observer. Child psychology will come into its own when it discovers the capacities children have for learning from these laboratories and explores the conditions under which these capacities can best be developed (p. 537).

What approaches to curriculum development will help establish the school as an institution facilitating this self discovery? Combs (1965b) suggested that we must eliminate those experiences which negate the self and expand learning opportunities which give experience with success. He suggested a criterion question as a guideline, "Let us ask about this school, this program, this policy, this method, this action, plan, or curriculum—does this help our students to feel more liked, wanted, acceptable, able, dignified, worthy, important, and so on (1965b p. 568)?" He advised us, moreover, to provide experiences, not
involved with grading, with which a student can sense his own worth through the expression of feelings (1965b, p. 571). For Combs, the natural relationship between the expression of values (behavior) and the thinking of values requires that we include more value clarification within the curriculum, "Since most human behavior is the product of beliefs, values, convictions, it is these values that must make up a larger and larger part of our educational experience (1965b, p. 574)."

In order to provide the child with feelings of competence and personal success contributing to the growth of self concept, the school curriculum must effectively interrelate cognitive and effective experiences. This view of integrating these twin domains of curriculum is the opinion of an unidentified contributor to Yamamoto's work on The Child and His Image:

What I mean is that we should be in a position to help students attain the feelings of adequacy through the mastery of technical skills and knowledge, and, in turn, use this competence in developing their humane concern and innovative potential. Cognitive and affective education must be an integrated whole. It is difficult for a child to sustain his sense of adequacy when he cannot in fact cope with challenges in his daily life (1972, pp. 217-218).

The investigator's experience in school, especially during his elementary school years, supports this conclusion. He usually received the message—leave your feelings on the playground or at home, for school is where serious business is conducted. School indeed, for him became a serious place and most of his life revolved around achievement in school.

Reports by Bourrisseau (1972) and Fink (1965), revealing the influence of the current school on a child's self concept, becomes
alarming when linked with studies which point out some non-facilitating influences of schooling. Term studies offered by Purkey (1970) support the conclusion that the child increasingly feels dissatisfied with school as time passes and, more significantly the effect of schooling is to interject "a sense of personal inadequacy to many students (p. 42)."

Jourard (1964) criticized this societal pressure (mirrored within the school) toward non-disclosure of self, "In a society which puts Man against man, as in a poker game, people do keep a poker face; they wear a mask and let no one know what they are up to (p. 4)."

We are faced with an all too present reality of a school climate which is less than friendly toward self revelation, and, by comparison, an alternative ideal which redefines the nature of curricula and personal relationships in an attempt to create a facilitating environment. Teachers must be ready and willing to employ learning opportunities which are rich in possibilities for self disclosure and growth. This investigator advocates such acquisitions.

Teachers

No printed work nor spoken plea
Can teach young minds what men should be,
Not all the books on all the shelves
But what the teachers are themselves.

Anonymous

The development of a collection of hypotheses about oneself, the self concept, is largely haphazard and the product of unexamined and unverbalized experience. Lacking the necessary skills for seeking and processing information about ourselves, it is any wonder that few of us
can construct relatively clear and unambiguous accounts of our goals, aspirations, values, traits, and abilities? And in the absence of learned skills necessary to the understanding of interpersonal interaction, is it any wonder that many individuals are confused about their relations with others (Sechrest and Wallace, 1967, p. 223)?

The conclusions we reach relevant to the influence of the school as a social institution are easily transferrable to teachers as professional helpers. How great is this need to have teachers act as facilitators of self expression? Combs, Avila, and Purkey (1971) responded to this question by noting that students do not leave their self concepts at the classroom door, "They bring them right in with them (p. 55)."

Snyder (1972) placed her faith in the coming "humanization of the schools" which will aid the teacher in providing a facilitating influence for the child. She relied heavily on Rogers in her description of the general process and product of such facilitating:

When the teacher guides and facilitates learning the child perceives of himself as a person who is free... and spontaneous, ... By these caring relationships, the self concepts of both teacher and children are enhanced. Out of such interaction will come young people who accept themselves, who have a genuine concern for others, and who can feel and think (p. 78).

What do we know of the qualities of teacher-student interaction which influence the developing self concept? Snyder pointed out that "not much is known." She did suggest "clues" available from the latest research (p. 164).
One such clue is that the sex of the teacher does influence the self concept of the students. Both boys and girls develop stronger self concepts when they enjoy teachers of their own sex. My own experience in elementary school leads me to agree with Snyder's (1972) conclusion, "The teachers and parents can benefit their children by foregoing premature sex stereotyping and providing diversified experiences for children of both sexes (pp. 66-67)."

Research reinforces what every teacher knows: that he influences the self concept of his students. Every teacher also is aware of the built in institutional frustrations which jeapodize his functioning as a happy being. Government reports frighten us with statistics revealing the numbers of emotionally disturbed teachers and students (Snyder, 1972, p. 63).

Too little is being done to help the teacher deal with his emotions. Snyder (1972) reported positive results from one in-service education program (yet unpublished) which aims at giving "the teacher enough control over the emotional environment of his classroom so that he can function effectively (p. 62)." This investigator agrees with this author's affirmation of Simon's goal of having a teacher with a positive self concept in every classroom, "He owes it to his children to acquire sufficient knowledge and understanding of himself (that is, his self) so as not to hurt them in the name of teaching (p. 64)."

A teacher's style relates directly to his students' self concepts. So reported Purkey (1970) in his finding that a supportive teacher fosters a positive concept while a threatening teacher stimulates a
negative one. He offered an attitude questionnaire which instigates teacher self awareness:

Am I projecting an image that tells the students that I am here to build, rather than to destroy, him as a person? Do I let the student know that I am aware of and interested in him as a unique person? Do I convey my expectations and confidence that the student can accomplish work, can learn, and is competent? Do I provide well-defined standards of values, demands for competence, and guidance toward solutions to problems? When working with parents, do I enhance the academic expectations and evaluations which they hold of their children's ability? By my behavior, do I serve as a model of authenticity for the students? Do I take every opportunity to establish a high degree of private and semi-private communication with my students (pp. 49-50)?

"Everything in the relation between a teacher and a student," noted Jersild (1965b), "has or might have a significant effect on what a child thinks and feels about himself (p. 542)." Thereby, within the school as we know it, the teacher as a source of authority and affection has a major influence on the developing self concepts of his students. Although Jersild does not explore the inverse relationship, students, particularly those with whom the author has become close, have had a continuous affect on his self concept.

Four studies support and explore the nature of the teacher's influence on the changing self concept of the child. Staines (1965), in his study of the effects of teaching styles on the self-images of students, reports that teachers do influence the development of a person's self-concept by means of comments and the social arrangement of students. The author concluded that "The self can deliberately produce by suitable teaching methods (p. 421)."
Davidson and Lang (1965) also found evidence to support the influence of the teacher on a child's self-perception. In a study involving elementary children in New York City schools, the authors found a strong relationship between student's perceptions of their teachers' feelings towards them and the student's self-perception. The child with the more positive self perception was the one who perceived the teacher's feelings as being positive (p. 437).

Similar strong relationships matching perceived teacher feelings with achievement and behavior compound the importance of the teacher as a major influence on the child's developing self. To a great degree, then, the child's future is determined by his teacher's feelings.

Perkins (1965) reinforced this influence of teachers on the development of self concept. He found in his study of elementary school children that girls develop a congruence between current self and ideal self faster than boys. Also, students of teachers who had participated in an in-service child study program generally reached a higher congruence. He concluded by claiming that schools must provide opportunities for experiences which "enable people to develop self-concepts for effective living (p. 544)."

In their work with seventh-grade urban white children, Brookover, Thomas and Paterson (1965) found a high correlation between "the perceived evaluations that significant others (father, mother, teacher, peer) hold of the student" and the student's self-concept. The composite image rather than a single image show the highest correlation (p. 1434).
Research, therefore, shows that a self-fulfilling prophecy is at work. Students work up to or down to the expectations set by their teachers. To a degree, self-concept is a trophy sitting somewhere in the teacher's closet.

What are the characteristics common to teacher-as-helpers? Since the teacher's influence on the changing self is so pervasive, the teacher-as-helper must be a revealing and patient person. The effective helper must be a "significant" person, a growing self in his own right:

Effective helpers must be significant people. They cannot be non-entities. One cannot interact with a shadow. The helping relationship is an active one. . . . The personality of the helper must play a vital part in any helping relationship. It is the helper's use of his self which makes the interaction whatever it is to become (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971, p. 57).

Once the teacher realizes his affect, how is he to maximize his helpfulness? To help means to understand and in order to understand the feelings expressed by students, the teacher must come to grips with his own feelings. As Jersild (1965b) stated, "A teacher's understanding of others can be only as deep as the wisdom he possesses when he looks inward upon himself (p. 542)."

How does one achieve this self-wisdom? Jersild advised that we must begin our introspection with "the courage to seek it and the humility to accept what one may find (pp. 542-543)." He spoke of emotionally-laden literature and group activities as feedback sources facilitating one's self understanding.

The implications for teacher training seem obvious. The teachers who teach teachers must be engaged in this process and the process must
offer alternative ways of seeking self. Because the process of self renewal is unending, in-service group opportunities must always be available. Such diverse opportunities as employed in this study seem appropriate opportunities.

Even if we fail to address affective education to this direct way, Jersild (1965b) reminded us that pure cognitive education usually has an affective link. That is, "What is called thinking is actually governed by undisclosed feelings. Logic is often ruled by desire; intellectual arguments are often the instruments of fear and anger (p. 544)." We must be aware, then, of the multifaceted nature of our motivation and expression.

Several authors have recently concluded that one characteristic common to teachers who aid children to grow is a willingness to be "natural," to be "authentic," to be themselves. The author, both in his experience as teacher and as learner, has felt the highest sense of reward when he attained communication on a person-to-person level rather than on a teacher-down-to-learner or learner-up-to-teacher level. During his teaching career these infrequent episodes generated a desire to keep trying. During his learning life, this type of contact has made each experience either worthwhile or something less than satisfying. Unfortunately, he can recall few of his teachers as real people.

Purkey (1970) went further than others in suggesting six qualities of a classroom atmosphere conducive to developing positive self concept. The following chart, Figure 5, summarizes his advise:
Teacher-influenced

challenge
freedom
respect
warmth
control
success

Student feeling

confidence
opportunity
worth and dignity
support
care
success

Fig. 5.—Teacher Induced Student Feelings

Rogers (1951), by comparison, saw teaching as the application of the therapy model to the classroom. He applied his hypotheses about self maintenance and exploration verbatim. The following quotations illustrate this transference:

A person learns significantly only those things which he perceives as being involved in the maintenance or, enhancement of, the structure of self (p. 389).

and

The educational situation which most effectively promotes significant learning is one in which (1) threat to the self of the learner is reduced to a minimum, and (2) differentiated perception of the field of experience is facilitated (p. 397).

Rogers went on to specify teaching techniques which will actualize a self-centered classroom climate. He offered a circular seating arrangement and inviting opening questions as examples. He reached for an atmosphere "of permissiveness, of acceptance, of reliance upon student responsibility... (p. 397)." For him the teacher is a leader who plans a democratic role of intervention, as questioner, arbiter, resource, and clarifier of feelings. His descriptions of model classroom dialogues emphasized the expression and acceptance of feelings. A curriculum of selves evolved.
Rogers (1951) found the need for consistency in curriculum and instruction as related to the self-centered approach:

If the purpose of the individual and the group are the organizing core of the course, if the purposes of the individual are met, if he finds significant learnings, resulting in self-enhancement, in the course; if the instructor's function is to facilitate such learning, then there is but one person who is in the position to evaluate the degree to which the goal has been achieved, and that is the student (pp. 414-415).

How important is the quality of the teacher's self concept in enabling him to best aid students in their growth? What do research and theory say to this point? One study by Gooding (1969) concluded that effective teachers, as classified by administrators, have a positive self concept characterized by identification with other people, by believing that they have the capacity to solve problems and by being liked by others. Combs (1969) also found that effective teachers, as defined by administrators and students, perceived themselves as "with people," "able," "dependable," "worth," and "wanted" (p. 33) all attributes of a self confident individual. These effective, high-self concept teachers, also found and promoted these characteristics in their students. The implication for teacher education programs is that teacher-interns must be exposed to social experiences which encourage these positive self-images. Combs (1969) also reached a like conclusion:

Teacher candidates, beginning early in their professional development, must be dealt with in their training as person of dignity, integrity, and worth. They must be provided with success experiences which will aid them in developing positive attitudes toward themselves (p. 34).
Effective teachers also are found to be sensitive to the feelings of students by both Combs (1969) and Gooding (1969). Implications for teacher education programs point to training in sensitivity skills in response to questions like: What is the child feeling now?; What does he seem to need? What are the clues?

Closely related to self concept and frame of reference is the teacher's perception of others. Teachers who were confident in themselves and sensitive to others also saw the same positive qualities in others. Here the implication is that student teachers must be offered a learning atmosphere in which they relate to other as helpers rather than as threats. Combs (1969) spoke for "rich opportunities for student teachers to interact with students in warm, friendly, cooperative kinds of atmosphere (p. 35)." Walberg (1966) in a study of pre-service teachers concluded that the "conflict between personality needs (to establish rapport with children) and role demands (to establish authority and discipline in the professional role of the teacher)" led to self depreciation (p. 254). Perhaps a stronger sense of self and techniques engendered in value clarification would help limit this conflict.

A positive sense of self, a high degree of self-esteem, frees one to respond to others and to events in a free and flowing way. Teachers who have their share of self confidence are more likely to act both as an independent spokesman and as a cooperative person. Teacher-interns, as they gain more self esteem, are more likely to be helpful to others, both colleagues and students.
A rewarding sense of self insures that the individual, through feedback, will become more and more confident. Teacher-interns who experience positive feedback from other interns, teachers, and students, will be more open and capable of responding to others in class. Therefore, teacher educators should be concerned with initiating self-enhancing activities within their programs. Combs (1969) agreed, "Teacher education institutions will need to consider the question of the attitudes and perceptions of teachers as significant aspects for the development of effective teachers (p. 36)."

As one's degree of self esteem increases, he is more willing to accept other people as themselves and to explore new and different relationships.

Conclusions

1. The "self" is an abstraction which refers to all the qualities which can be attributed to an individual.

2. The "self" has a dynamic character; change is constant in the growing individual.

3. An individual seeks to maintain a consistency of belief about his "self."

4. We can never completely know another's "self" and most people only partially reveal themselves.

5. "Self concept" refers to those perceptions I acknowledge about my "self."

6. An individual will report only those characteristics of self concept that he is comfortable with.

7. "Self concept: is probably an accurate predictor of success, especially in school.

8. The healthy individual constantly seeks to fulfill himself, to expand his self.
9. Trust in self is requisite to such growth.

10. A growing self is open to new experiences and to changing beliefs and values.

11. Growth is continuous and cyclical; an individual must work through conflicts as he matures.

12. Achieving a sense of self identity is the crucial crisis which is met during adolescence.

13. An individual learns more about his self by disclosing himself to others.

14. The individual seeks feedback from others. This appraisal helps the person arrive at his identity.

15. The infant works out his sense of self in relating to his mother.

16. The self is most open to change during infancy.

17. During childhood, parents are pivotal people in helping the person build his self esteem.

18. Children seek models for their behavior. They tend to find them in available helping adults.

19. A child is helped by a home environment which is rich in affection and attention but freeing in atmosphere.

20. Fear of failing, common to our culture, often limits the child's willingness to risk experimental behavior.

21. At an early age, the school and the teacher rival the home and the mother for influence on the developing self.

22. The school must take advantage of its pervasive influence on the developing self by offering curricula rich in experience rewarding self growth.

23. Parental attitudes are a major influence on self achievement in school.

24. Since children identify with members of their own sex, more thought should be given to the inclusion of male attributes within the school environment.
25. In-service self enrichment experiences should be available to teachers.

26. Teachers have a primary influence on children's self concepts.

27. Characteristics of teachers as helpers includes a willingness to reveal his self, a commitment to continue his process of working through his self, a sense of humility, and a great deal of patience.

SECTION B:
RESEARCH DEALING WITH CLASSROOM METHODOLOGY

As stated in Chapter I, the field of research dealing with classroom methodology shows minimal yield from multiple efforts. The investigator believes that the major reasons for this unproductive balance are the search for the optimal method of teaching coupled with a general disregard for the diverse personality traits of learners.

Early studies, such as those by Aiken (1942), Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939), and Anderson and Associates (1945-1946) were global in their concerns. The Eight Year-Thirty School Study, reported by Aiken, was sponsored by the Progressive Education Association over the period from 1933 to 1939. In this study, 1,475 pairs of students were matched for achievement, interests, and socio-economic status from the two environments: "progressive," where students were given more responsibility for decisions affecting them, and "traditional," where the decisions of others regulate student behavior.

In 1931, The Eight Year Study Commission drew up a list of improvements necessary for secondary school. How appropriate they remain forty years later! The ones quoted below pertain directly to our concern for the effects of the school experience on the developmental self of the students:
1. Our secondary school did not prepare adequately for the responsibilities of community life. Schools, generally were excellent examples of autocratic, rather than democratic, organization and living.

2. Schools neither knew their students well nor guided them wisely.

3. Schools failed to create conditions necessary for effective learning.

4. The conventional high school curriculum was far removed from the real concerns of youth. . . . Young people wanted to get ready to earn a living, to understand themselves, to learn how to get on with others, to become responsible members of the adult community, to find meaning in living. The curriculum seldom touched upon such genuine problems of living.

5. The traditional subjects of the curriculum had lost much of their vitality and significance.

6. Complacency characterized high schools generally ten years ago. Elementary education had been revolutionized since the beginning of the century, but the high school as still holding to tradition.

7. Only here and there did the Commission find principals who conceived of their work in terms of democratic leadership of the community, teachers and students (Aiken, 1942, pp. 4-5, 7, 9).

The investigator shares the concerns of the "progressive" teachers both for diversity of learner personalities and the development of each different self. Unfortunately, for the purposes of this study, the cumulative growth of materials dealing with the self is weakened due to the broadly drawn categories and the lack of duplicative findings.

A statistical comparison of the 1,75 matched pairs revealed that the Thirty Schools' graduates generally outperformed their "traditional" counterparts both academically (cognitively) and emotionally (affectively). Cognitive successes included higher grade averages and scores on
objective thinking. Affective successes included resourcefulness in meeting new situations, "capacity to work through problems of adjustment, and participation in "service" activities. Indeed the report of the College Follow-up Staff clearly commended the Thirty Schools for educating students in both thinking and feeling:

If colleges want students of sound scholarship with vital interests, students who have developed effective and objective habits of thinking, and who yet maintain a healthy orientation toward their fellows, then they will encourage the already obvious trend away from restrictions which tend to inhibit departures or deviations from the conventional curriculum patterns (Aiken, 1942, p. 111).

Other extensive reports by Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) and by Anderson and associates (1945-1946) retained this general concern for classroom climate and individual behavior without directly touching upon personal characteristics of the learner. Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) concluded that classroom climate did influence an individual's behavior as a member of a group; but, since these authors failed to explore the relationship between a participant's self view and his participation in his group, their findings are of limited value for this study. Similarly, Anderson and his associates (1945-1946) were strenuous in defining and relating teacher behavior patterns to student responses but did not consider the influence of the given learner's personality.

Over the long haul, though, scholars have not given up on this quest for an optimal learning environment even though their findings have been generally inconclusive. Several reviewers of research corroborated these negative results. Withall and Lewis (1963) in their
summary of the field during the 1920's and 1930's along with Wallen and Travers (1963) and Ebel's (1969) conclusions about the studies of the 1960's were consistent in concluding that there is no significant difference in learning outcome no matter what teaching method is employed. Typically these researchers sought a uni-causal relationship between the teacher as a person with cognitive skills, "devoid of any personal needs, purposes, or idiosyncrasies" and learners whose achievements can be measured cognitively while their psychological differences were ignored (Withall and Lewis, 1963, p. 709). As with the earlier studies, two limiting assumptions reappear: first, that there exists one illusive but superior method of teaching all learners and second, that the personality characteristics of learners can be ignored.

With monotonous repetition, however, educational research involving college teaching, reviewed by Good (1952), McKeachie (1961, 1962, 1963), and Dubin and Taveggia (1968), was consistent in finding little relationship between instructional method and learner achievement. The following conclusion was typical:

In the foregoing paragraphs we have reported the results of a re-analysis of the data from 91 comparative studies of college teaching technologies conducted between 1924 and 1965. These data demonstrate that there is no measurable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations (Dubin and Taveggia, 1968, p. 35).

For the above mentioned researchers, academic achievement was seen as a major consideration. Our concern is with one's view of self. Their efforts, though, do serve by stimulating reviewers to seek reasons for these repeated failures related to our current efforts. Goldberg
(1969) suggested that either the measurement instruments were faulty or that the involved inter-personal relationships were more complex than originally thought. McKeachie (1963) and Wallen and Travers (1963) reasoned (and this investigator agrees) that the assumption that there exists one elixir for all learners was false. Withall and Lewis (1963) complained (along with this author) about the lack of attention given the affective interaction between teacher style and learner personality.

More help may be found in the comparatively few studies which did show a clear concern for the condition of the learner. Significantly for this study, Murphy and Ladd (1941), in their study of college students, who were mostly females attending Sarah Lawrence, found that students who are less sure of themselves show more willingness to express themselves when presented with safe situations where they were free to move at their own speed. By comparison, the more secure, outgoing students were willing to undergo open conflict in direct challenge situations.

Flanders (1949) developed a study to investigate the influence of the style of teacher-student interaction on the achievement and feelings of students. High school students were placed in two distinct environments; one teacher-centered where the teacher's behavior supported himself first, the problem second, and the student third; and the other learner-centered where the teacher's behavior supported the student first, the problem second, and the teacher third.

Using Withall's Climate Index to measure the independent variable, climate, Flanders found that students' concern for interpersonal anxiety consistently took top priority over the learning of content. Moreover,
teacher-centered behavior (demanding, being directive, depreciating) stimulated student withdrawal, apathy toward achievement, and hostility. By comparison, learner-centered behavior resulted in less interpersonal anxiety, more concern for achievement, "and a degree of emotional integration (Flanders, 1949, p. 699)."

Perkins (1949) studied the teacher-student interaction with in-service teachers. He also used Withall's Climate Index to study the different effects of teacher-versus learner-centered classroom climates. He concluded that learner-centered group members exhibited both cognitive and effective superiority. Cognitively, learner-centered group members demonstrated sounder use of evidence and reasoning. Affectively, learner-centered people exhibited more warmth and greater concern for children.

Another study by Wispe (1951) employed TAT-like instruments in an attempt to find relationships between teaching method ("permissive-directive") and student personality ("independent-satisfied-insecure"). Unfortunately Wispe (1951) didn't clearly define these personality modifiers. Nevertheless, he did find that "insecure" students were less outgoing, less verbal and more comfortable in a "directive" situation. By contrast, "independent" students were more outgoing, more verbal, and seek more "permissive" teaching (p. 177).

Two studies complete in the early 1950's by McKeachie (1954) and Johnson and Smith (1953) offered even more advice about the relationship of teaching method to student personality. These researchers concluded that differences in student personalities rather than in
methods of teaching were influential in what a student gains from a college course. In a later study, Beach (1960) found a clear relationship between learner personality and the nature of a small group environment.

Two more recent researchers, De Charms (1969) and Alschuler (1972), reported more favorable results in positively influencing classroom climate. De Charms (1972) trained teachers to so change their presentation styles as to create classroom environments characterized by optimistic student attitudes. He concluded that "productive motivation is associated with realistic planning and goal setting and with a feeling of personal confidence (p. 406)." Alschuler (1972) with a similar concern "achievement motivation," also wrote with confidence of procedures which successfully helped teachers to reconstruct their "desired climate(s) (Chapter II, p. 25)."

Clearly, these nine studies give credence to the contention of this study that student self concept is a major determiner of the nature of a learner's response to a given mode of instruction.

Jacob (1957), in his thorough volume on college teaching and values education, seemed to reject this hypothesis. He found that "The method of instruction seems to have only a minor influence on students' value judgments (p. 8)." His concern was the relationship of the method of instruction to "the student's personal participation in the learning process," an emphasis close to this author's (p. 8). More specifically, he concluded that "The response of a student to a given type of instruction often reflects his personality or disposition previous to entering
upon the course (p. 8)." This is precisely the contention of this study, that the individual's view of himself, a product of past experience, is a fundamental influence of his "disposition" toward a particular mode of instruction. This author agrees with Jacob's claim that "The evidence is not conclusive that the potency of general education in influencing student values may be consistently strengthened by using a particular method of teaching (p. 8)."

Furthermore, Jacob concluded that college teachers of diverse personalities and backgrounds have little differing effect on the values of their students, "Yet, by and large the impact of the good teacher is indistinguishable from that of the poor one, at least in terms of the influence upon the values cherished by his students (p. 7)." The author admitted "that some teachers do exert a profound influence on some students..." and that these teachers "are likely to be persons whose own value commitments are firm and openly expressed, and who are outgoing and warm in their personal relations with students (p. 7-8)."

Since the major concern of this study is to seek relationships between teaching method and student personality rather than changing student values, this finding is not surprising. The similarity between Jacob's influential teacher and Simon's call for the teacher to live his values is worthy of note.

In their review of research dealing with teacher role, Amidon and Flanders (1963) took note of the multiplicity of teacher behaviors and other influencing factors, "None of the research ... concludes that any one pattern of teacher behavior is superior to another under
all conditions (p. 50)." Flanders (1963), in still another review of the literature, claimed a faulty but prevalent assumption that a teacher's professed attitudes and values will automatically be mirrored by his classroom performance. He arrived at the following "inevitable conclusion":

... namely, in many classrooms there is a significant discrepancy between a teacher's intentions—what he will acknowledge as his purposes or values—and his actions while teaching—what we can assess as overt behavior (p. 2).

The hypothesis that the same methods will affect diverse learners differently is a plausible explanation that has recently been cited in the research. McKeachie (1961) wrote:

One possible partial explanation for the meager findings ... is that teaching methods affect different students differently. Students who profit from one method may do poorly in another, while other students may do poorly in the first method and well in the second. When we average them together we find little overall difference between methods ... (pp. 111-112).

It is possible that one of the reasons for the host of experimental comparisons resulting in non-significant differences is simply that methods optimal for some students are detrimental to the achievement of others. When mean scores are compared, one method thus seems to be no different in its effect from any other.

More conclusively, McKeachie (1967) and Thelen (1967) offered more hope of relating learner personality to instructional method. McKeachie (1967) noted a recent tendency that "more and more evidence shows that different teaching methods work well for different types of students (p. 230)." In a study of students and teachers in diverse secondary schools, Thelen (1967) concluded that both student and
teacher best achieved when the method of instruction and characteristics of personality were matched.

At the heart of this interrelationship is the concept of an "aptitude-treatment interaction" proposed ten years earlier by Cronbach (1957):

My argument rests on the assumption that such aptitude-treatment interactions exists. There is, scattered in the literature, a remarkable amount of evidence of significant, predictable differences in the way people learn. We have only limited success in predicting which of two tasks a person can perform better, when we allow enough training to compensate for differences in past attainment. But we do find that a person learns more easily from one method than another, that this best method differs from person to person, and that such between treatment differences are correlated with tests of ability and personality (p. 631).

Cronbach (1967), therefore concluded from his review of literature that student needs, as an outgrowth of a developing personality, should determine the method of instruction. Pervin (1968), corroborated Cronbach's view in his summary of recent literature on "trait by treatment interaction" or what he calls "individual-environment fit (p. 56)." He expressed the assumption "that for each individual there are environments, both intra- and inter-personal, which more or less match the characteristics of his personality. A 'match' or 'best-fit' ... of individual to environment is viewed as resulting in decreased dissatisfaction and stress on the system (p. 56)." Snow (1970) similarly discussed differences between learners, some of whom were "good at" responding to a "facilitative model" while others reacted better to a "compensatory model (p. 78)."
In summary, most of the research directed solely at discovering an all purpose teaching method seems fruitless. Travers (1971) concisely summarized the major limitations of available conclusions from classroom studies as the tendency of each researcher "to use his own favorite language in naming variables. . . . (p. 33)" and the prevalence of findings stated as "rather vague generalizations. . . . (p. 32)," such as:

Teacher behavior variously described as authoritarian, structured, autocratic, controlling, direct, and so forth, is less favorable for the achievement of academic skills than is teacher behavior with opposite characteristics (pp. 32-33).

These failures, however, did contribute to the identification of alternative explanations out of which grew a new concern for the condition of the learner. During this early period, a few studies are marginally successful in relating some aspect of student personality with either classroom climate or instructional method. Contemporary emphasis is being placed on identifying and matching aspects of personality with alternative modes of instruction. As Smith (1971) pointed out, helpful research findings remain few in number:

With a few notable exceptions, researchers have not directed and sustained their attention to the study of changes, within a teacher education context, in the attitudes of the teacher candidate toward herself (p. 113).

This study will seek to build on the current thrust by interfacing one aspect of personality, self concept, with two distinct modes of instruction; thereby, beginning to fill a current research gap.
SECTION C:
REVIEW OF EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGIES

The Simon and Oliver approaches can be best compared around four categories which discriminate them; definition of "value," role of the teacher, role of the learner, and techniques of instruction.

Definition of value. John Goodlad (1966), a leader in devising curricula grounded on value consideration, defined value as "a belief that something is good or bad, desirable or undesirable." Simon (1966) was more rigorous in deriving his behavioral component of valuing:

Persons have experiences; they grow and learn. Out of experiences may come certain general guides to behavior. These guides tend to give direction to life and may be called values. Our values show what we do with our limited time and energy (p. 27).

Simon (1966) included cognition and action as requisite to valuing by indicated his seven necessary components of valuing:

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).

Simon and Harmin (1964) had emphasized that education for knowledge was not enough. Education for action clearly defined a true value:

We must strive to help students close the gap between what they say and what they do. We must encourage them to put deeds in line with creed. We must help out students to do something about what they value (p. 163).

By contrast, Oliver (1966) seemed content in defining value as an ethical standard by which an individual judges his words or behavior. He has much more concerned with the learner's cognitive behavior.
Role of the teacher. Simon (1971a) spelled out the role of the teacher as a facilitative influence: teachers are "to be open-minded, accepting and tolerant (p. 69)." A teacher must be very careful not to indoctrinate, not to impose his choice of values:

Value-clarification involves a series of strategies which are not guilty of forcing one set of right values down the throats of all students. Instead, it tends to raise issues, to confront the student with inconsistencies, and to get him to sort out his own values, in his own way, and at his own approach (p. 68).

Again in 1971, Simon insisted that the learner not be threatened but he given time and space to work through "... his own values in his own way and at his own pace (1971b, p. 21 emphasis mine)."

Simon offered a set of ground rules to help the teacher retain his responses within the facilitative realm. "According to Simon, the teacher should (1) Avoid criticizing or evaluating. (2) Allow students to defer, to pass. (3) Work at setting a non-threatening atmosphere, and (4) Offer to drop the dialogue.

Simon (1966) wanted the teacher to authentically express his value judgments but to do so in a manner and at a time that did not jeapodize his role as helper or the climate as safe. This manner and the climate are fundamental to the furtherance of a non-threatening atmosphere conducive to the free process of valuing:

It seems to us desirable that a teacher's ideas, feelings, and opinions are made known to students. This demonstrates to students that one can talk openly about such things. And this provides alternative for students to consider when making up their own minds. But if the teacher cannot do this without fear that students will copy those ideas, feelings, or opinions routinely and meekly, they might better be concealed—or even disguised—until the students learn to use the valuing process for themselves (p. 73).
In his review, Richard Nelson-Jones (1967) agreed that "the clarifying responses is a non-threatening, non-moralizing response by the teacher to a stimulus given by a child (p. 513)." By contrast, Oliver (1966) advocated the role of teacher as challenger. He described the role of teacher as a socratic initiator who is able to simultaneously switch from factual situations to matching value implications. This socratic teacher "is obliged to tolerate a variety of ideals, values, or creeds among his students . . . he must condone the constant battle among various groups within the society as they are represented in his classroom (p. 13)." At one point Oliver (1971) advocated that the teacher impose his values on a student who accepts a value position which the teacher sees as compromising the cardinal value of human dignity:

We must be willing to say, however, that this value is important, not just for us (authors) personally; it is good in a prima facie sense, for everybody, and we should be willing in some cases to 'impose' it on others who may not agree (p. 60).

Role of the learner. Simon's ideal was to equip the learner with a valuing process that will ease his advance toward self knowledge and individual happiness, "If children are helped to use the valuing process of this book, we assert that they will behave in ways that are less apathetic, confused, and irrational and in ways that are more positive, purposeful, and enthusiastic. And that hypothesis is readily testable by anyone wishing to do so (1966, p. 11)." Simon was therefore concerned with helping the learner work out a meaningful relationship with others and in so doing become more positive and proud of his...
practiced values. Harmin and Simon (1971) claimed that involvement with value clarifying experiences led to a "rationally self-disciplined" individual (p. 696). These positive characteristics can be represented on a continuum as illustrated by Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship of self to society</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Confusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Chronic role playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purposeful</td>
<td>Flighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Very uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>Very inconsistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overconforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overdissenting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6.—Clarity-Confusion Continuum

People never complete this process. The individual person must grow, must change, must rethink his value system and reconstruct it to meet new needs and challenges. As Simon said:

The development of values is a personal and life-long process. It is not something that is completed in early adulthood. As the world changes, as we change, as we strive to change the world again, we have many decisions to make and we should be learning how to make these decisions (1966, p. 37).

This process of valuing places heavy emphasis on the individual's capacity to choose, to change, and to make those choices which contribute to individual and community growth. Simon recognized that the individual must have a sense of self before he chooses amongst competing values. This requirement bears obvious significance for this study. In his review, Richard Nelson-Jones reasoned that involvement in value clarifying will positively affect the learner's sense of self. Simon and Harmin (1964) noted that living one's values is likely to enhance
one's self concept:

... to act upon their knowledge. ... provides students with a taste of how much they can actually do to shape their world and thus also provides them with feelings of worth and significance ... (p. 164).

By contrast, Oliver offered a highly cognitive model generously flavored with the method of socratic dialogue. He described his dialogue as "adversarial" in which the teacher presses the student to state his position on an issue and then to identify the referent value. This dialogue was the key process rather than the position or value referred to. In short, "the socratic teacher. . . . tends to ask for value judgments or decisions and to challenge them. Factual claims will function mainly as background and as support for value statement (1966, pp. 177-178). Teaching the socratic process becomes truly successfully at those points when the student initiates dialogue with the teacher and with other students and when the involved students seek supportive information. Oliver sees this learner at the point of "takeoff (p. 146)."

The teacher irritates the student to the point of accepting a verbal duel, "the model of teaching we are presenting here comes to life only when the student reacts to a challenge—when he encounters the teacher or other students in a critical dialogue (pp. 149-150)." Oliver denied the central importance of content whether it be a problem, an issue, a point of view in favor of actual involvement in the cross-fire of argument. It is in the head of conflict, that his process reaches its critical mass:
The approach comes to life only when the student reacts to a challenging confrontation. In a real sense the, instruction begins, not when the student begins to read about the problem, but when he becomes personally involved in dialogue about it (1966, pp. 149-150).

Oliver summarized the steps of this process of challenge and response well:

One is thus 'driven' to the process of qualification by a series of antecedent intellectual operations. The person (learner) states a general policy with respect to a given case. He then encounters a similar case in which his decision is reversed; opposite values are supported in the two cases. He then tries to find some general characteristics about one situation which make him judge it to be 'good' while at the same time rejecting the other situation as 'bad.' Finally, he arrives at general policy statement, including the qualification, which will anticipate future cases and how he will deal with them, e.g., 'I will support a violent revolution only when and if it can be shown that all reasonable hope of governmental reform is gone (1966, pp.128-129).'

What are the characteristics of the learner who is successful at the dialectic? Oliver described this person as being "persistent in what he does and objective and 'thick-skinned' about himself and his ideas (1966, p. 320)." He found that the self confident extrovert, the person with a high self concept, the one who has a "tendency to be outgoing and persistent in an interpersonal setting" will thrive (1966, p. 319). What about the individual who is less outgoing, not as sure of himself, low self concept? Concerning him, Oliver reported that the "less outgoing and aggressive students were more inclined to pursue a subject if exposed to it in a less threatening manner (pp. 309-310)." This is another conclusion directly supportive of to the author's hypotheses.
In a more recent article, Oliver began to question his process which rewards cold, rational discourse. In reviewing the results of the application of his cognitive model in the teaching of moral reasoning, Oliver admitted doubts: "Primarily we are troubled by the fact that we have not dealt with non-rational moral sensitivities (Oliver and Bane, 1971, p. 252)." Therefore, in his writing he has raised questions about his own conflict strategy.

Oliver and Bane suggested two major problems which challenge the success of his "rational" model as the students not investing themselves in the discussion process and not transferring preferred values, identified by classroom statements, to behaviors of non-school life. He advocated expansion of radical change of the model to emphasize the affective domain both in the choice of content and process of discussion. He suggested that questions "be phrased in personal, rather than general terms: 'Should you participate in civil disobedience in protest against the Vietnam War?' rather than 'Should peace groups use illegal means in pursuit of their aims?.'" He goes even further than accepting the "you" questions central to the lives of learners which could be explored "in individual and social terms (pp. 260-261)."

Therefore, in thought he has moved toward Simon's thinking.

Oliver and Bane in their discussion of "the limits of reason" revealed some dissatisfaction with the Kohlberg scheme and spoke for learning opportunities which will work towards a sense of community: "We believe that education should encourage people to examine the relationships of men to their societies or to the universe not only
through the rational analysis of 'case studies,' but also through the genuine attempt to create and wonder about a profound, perhaps religious, experience (1971, p. 265)." Oliver now believes that vital, morally educative experiences can only come about in a learning environment which, in its emphasis on self search and group process, smacks of approaches central to the Humanistic Center of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts:

We feel that the exploration of one's self, one's values, and one's personal relationships can be promoted by membership in a group of people who hold different views of reality but who are constantly engaged in a search for a truer and more personally relevant view. A group's interaction forces each of its members to respond to some way to the views of the others whether by rejection, assimilation, or accommodation. For the group to be influential, it must be important enough to the individual that he takes the thoughts and feelings of the others. The situation must be comfortable enough that each person can reveal himself to some degree to the others. The relationship must be open and egalitarian. No member's thoughts should be rejected out of hand, nor should be accepted uncritically (1971, pp. 266-267).

Oliver and Bane (1971) favored a restructuring of schools to serve this "more humanistic" education which would be based on the freedom of groups to choose their own curricula, schedules, and learning environments. They saw the freedom of the planning-learning group as central: "We feel, then, that procedural freedom and freedom from traditional status distinctions are necessary to create mutually trusting groups in which real moral education—the examination of deeply rooted and important values, can take place (1971, p. 268)." Oliver thus has broadened his focus to include the total learning environment. He accepted Havighurst's premise that developmental stages and human needs continue until death and proposes revolutionary changes in
curriculum and learning experiences to satisfy human needs. Specifically, he redefined the nature of the school as community without walls based on age, occupation or status.

Oliver's earlier approach has come in for criticism on points other than his cold, rational approach. In his review, Lawrence Metcalf (1967) mentioned the lack of criteria values and a clearly defined supportive philosophy as areas in need of improvement. These limitations are not crucial to this study.

Techniques. Is Simon's emphasis on establishing a non-threatening climate in which the teacher helps the learner to identify, choose, and confirm values reflected in his strategies for teaching? Both in the style of questioning and responding and the choice of open-ended discussion areas, Simon complimented his principles with the reality of classroom procedures.

.. Specifically, Simon advised us to reject judgmental, right-wrong questions in favor of open-ended questions to which "There is no right answer (1971, p. 71)." He also urged teachers to respond in such a way that the student further considers his feelings and thoughts about any opinion or behavior. In this way, the subject matter is the student and his activities. In a similar fashion, the "value sheet" is made up of a provocative value statement followed by a set of clarifying ("you") questions. The source areas for these value sheets and for other modes of discussion are obviously rich in questions for personal consideration:
1. Money, how it apportioned and treated.
2. Friendship, how one relates to those around him.
3. Love and sex, how one deals with intimate relationships.
4. Religion and morals, what one holds as fundamental beliefs.
5. Leisure, how it is used.
6. Politics and social organization, especially as it affects the individual.
7. Work, vocational choices, attitudes toward work.
8. Family, and how one behaves within it.
9. Maturity, what one strives for.
10. Character traits, especially as they affect one's behavior (1966, pp. 105–106).

Oliver defined the three basic aspects of his model project, the Harvard Social Studies Project (federally sponsored curricula units) as: (1) analyzing public issues, (2) learning strategies which help clarify individual views on these issues, and (3) an in depth emersion in "the discussion process" as a person works through these issues. In the choice of techniques, did Oliver apply his emphasis upon cold conflict and choice?

Both in the selection of subject matter and choice of methods, Oliver did apply his emphasis on conflict and choice. This conflict model of interaction has the chief criterion for selecting societal situations which are pregnant for student interaction. Oliver and Bane (1971) spoke of clarifying definitional strategies such as validating sources or defining terms but are sold on "the analogy" as a tool which "Provokes discussants to make distinctions and qualifications that strengthen and clarify value positions (pp. 256–257)." Oliver (1966) found an additional value in the analogy strategy in "pointing up a latent value which the person would just as soon play down or ignore" while facing a value dilemma (p. 124).
Oliver's favorite technique was to present students with a value continuum along which he must confront several representative cases in which he sees inconsistencies and ultimately qualifies his stand:

"Thus to clarify the depth of our own commitment to a particular value (1966, p. 119)." Oliver therein saw "the use of analogy (as) the most effective way to test the consistency of a student's policy stand and to show him that the major problem of justification is rationalizing inconsistency rather than learning how to be consistent (1966, p. 120)."

He accepted the ultimate values of the American Revolutionary creed (due process of law, freedom of speech, equal protection of the law) as value tenets to which all conflicts between subsidiary values can be appealed for solution. Oliver both admitted and revealed in the generality of these constitutional terms.

At this point, the following chart (Figure 7) is an easy means of summary and comparison of the two approaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Oliver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>non-threatening</td>
<td></td>
<td>conflicting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of teacher</td>
<td>to make comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>to challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desired responses of learner</td>
<td>to identify, choose, and affirm values</td>
<td></td>
<td>to engage in socratic dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typical learning opportunities</td>
<td>&quot;you&quot; thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criterion values (to be learned)</td>
<td>individually chosen</td>
<td></td>
<td>conflicting dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject matter</td>
<td>value strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>preselected:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>human dignity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other democratic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>socratic dialogues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7.—Comparison of Approaches
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Rationale for Procedures

Relying on the statement of the problem set forth in Chapter I as well as the review of related literature presented in Chapter II, this chapter focuses on the explanation and clarification of the subjects involved in the study, procedures used, reasons for selecting the instruments, description of the experimental design, a discussion of the variables, a presentation of procedural problems, and an explanation of the significance of this study, and a summarial listing of main variables and treatments.

Subjects

The samples examined in this study were taken from the total population of undergraduate, pre-service teachers who were involved in methods "Potpourri" courses at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst, during the Fall semester of the academic year 1972-1973.

Of the 50 people involved, 46 were female and 4 male. The author involved self selected populations. Therefore, random sampling was not employed in the choice of these people, so generalization to a broader population than self selecting students is not clear. Randomization to experimental treatment of subjects selecting "Potpourri" courses was used.
All subjects were given the Berger Self Acceptance Scale and the Phillips Self Questionnaire. The Berger Scale was administered by mail to all those voluntarily enrolled in "Potpourri" Methods courses before the commencement of classes. Based on scores derived from this first pre-test (Berger Scale), subjects indicating a desire for experiencing "value clarification, methods for the classroom" were randomly distributed by rolling dice into two experimental groups meeting for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours during consecutive 6 week periods. More specifically, six participants were assigned to each experimental group from both the higher self concept range (Berger raw score 49–74) and lower self concept range (Berger raw score 79–126). A history group, made up of self selecting enrollment in a different Methods "Potpourri" class was matched with each experimental group based on the similarity of scores registered on the first Berger (pre-test) Scale.

Demographic information was also obtained from University records for each subject.

**Procedures**

Each experimental treatment was administered over different 6-week periods. Class met for $1\frac{1}{4}$ hours, twice a week in line with the accepted standards for "Potpourri" classes. Each experimental group was taught a different method of value clarification. The history groups experienced other "Potpourri" courses not involving explicitly value clarifying strategies.
Characteristics attributed to self acceptance are easily transferable to self concept. Measurement specialists Robinson and Shaver (1969) agreed by defining these common characteristics of faith in one's capacities, a sense of responsibility, and a sense of worth. Therefore, self-acceptance and self concept are interchangeable terms.

The author chose the Berger and Phillips scales because they have been successfully field tested. Both scales were administered to college populations similar to the one involved in this study. Both Berger and Phillips reported consistency of repeated trials. The Berger scale was found to be reliable from .74 to .89 and the Phillips at .74. Most importantly, the Berger scale correlated highly (.73 at the .01 level) when matched with Phillips' questionnaire (Robinson and Shaver, 1960). Berger (1952) reported a marginal effort at validating his test relative to the broad abstraction of self acceptance. Twenty subjects wrote self descriptive essays which were scored for self acceptance by four judges resulting in an intercorrelation between the Scale and the ratings of .90. Phillips (1951) did not give an account of his attempts at validation. Lastly, Best's (1970) criteria for a desirable scale, such as shortness, clear directions, and ease of scoring were also satisfied.

Experimental Design

Following both Best's (1960) and Campbell and Stanley's (1963) suggestions, a design was developed for this study. Best (1960) derived a "preobservation, postobservation, equivalent groups design"
(p. 151) which was not used in this study because non-equivalent control groups were involved. Therefore, this investigator arrived at the following preobservation, postobservation, non-equivalent groups design (Figure 6). This design identifies the selection of subjects (SR) and (S), the relationship between variables (X and C), the involvement of tests (O1-O6): distinguishes between equated and non-equated groups: and shows the degree of gains over elapsed time. The following symbols are helpful in clarifying this design as symbolized in Figure 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Stratified, random selection of subjects or assignment of treatment to experimental groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁, X₂</td>
<td>Experimental variables manipulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁, C₂</td>
<td>History variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Observation or test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Experimental Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR O₁ X₁ O₂</td>
<td>X₁ gain X₂ gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR O₃ X₂ O₄</td>
<td>O₂ - O₁ O₄ - O₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**History Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O₅ C₁ O₆</td>
<td>C₁ C₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₇ C₂ O₈</td>
<td>O₆-5 O₈-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8.—Preobservation—Postobservation Design

The design of this study is better understood by visualizing the "nonequivalent control group design" proposed by Campbell and Stanley.
These authors point out that with nonequivalent control groups randomization is not involved (as in Figure 9) and they are therefore possibly not equivalent to the experimental groups. Here threats to external validity are present. Employing symbols similar to Figure 8, the following figure can be understood.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0_1 & X & 0_2 \\
0_3 & 0_4
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 9.—Nonequivalent Control Group Design

A more inclusive way of charting comparable experiences is presented in Figure 10. The two experimental groups were stratified randomly by rolling dice. The history groups were selected on the basis of an equivalent number of high (Berger scale range 49-74) and low (Berger range 79-126) self concept scores.

**Variables**

There were two kinds of variables involved in this study: the dependent variables were made up of the Berger and Phillips scale scores together with the demographic variables (chosen because of easy availability) and the independent variables consisting of the value clarifying experiences or experimental treatments.

**Self Concept Measures**

Self concept was equated with self acceptance and measured by two scales as follows:
Berger Self Acceptance Scale. This scale was made up of 36 questions with 5 possible responses ranging from "not at all true of myself" to "true of myself." For each question, a "not at all true of myself" response, or 1 score, was the highest or most positive self concept score. Questions 2, 15, 19, 25, 27, and 32 were stated in inverse order so that conversion of these scores was necessary before summing a compositive score. (See Appendix A for copy.)

Phillips Self Questionnaire. This scale was composed of 25 questions with the same range of responses as the Berger Scale. All questions were stated in a positive way. (See Appendix B for copy.)

Demographic Measures

There were eight of these variables included. They were used in an attempt to establish internal validity, to check as to whether they might influence results, to report on possible differences between groups, and as potential additional predictors of treatment success in terms of individual differences.

Two of these variables, grade point average (GPA) and age are continuous variables with ranges of 2.05 to 3.75 and 22 to 27, respectively.

The remaining variables lacked a continuous range and could be expressed in either/or categories. These non-continuous variables include sex, geography (in state or out of state), transfer status (non-transfer or transfer), marital status (married or single), and membership in campus fraternity organization (non-member or member). Further detailed distributions will be presented in Chapter IV.

This information was obtained from University of Massachusetts records.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Experimental Treatment</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berger Scale 1</td>
<td>Berger Scale 2</td>
<td>Simon method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Experiment (Simon) (SER)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First History (SH)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Experiment (Oliver) (OER)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second History (OH)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior to involvement</td>
<td>1st 6 weeks</td>
<td>2nd 6 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 10.**—Experimental Design
Procedural Problems

The implementation of a developmental research study, such as this, often leads to procedural problems. These problems involved both the accuracy of measurement and comparability of the experimental treatments. Psychologist Whitfield Bourrisseau (1972) acknowledged the difficulties involved with the measurement of self concept in spite of increased concern reflected in volumes of studies. He noted that "The research in relatively limited, standardized measurements are largely non-existent, and terminology is obscure (p. 81)."

Moreover, we can never truly measure the self concept directly but only the behavioral manifestation coincident with the measurement device. Bourrisseau relates this difficulty to the term, self concept, as a reification:

Because the self image is a concept and not a concrete reality, an appraisal of the self image can be accomplished only by observing the behavior that allows insight into the system determining the behavior. In other words, self concept per se cannot be directly measured (p. 83).

One insight provided by psychologists aids measurement. Since people tend to be consistent in their expressions of behavior, periodic measuring may give us some indication of how they view themselves. Bourrisseau agrees. He suggested that given the difficulties inherent in the definition of measurement of self concept, we should put our hope in periodic measurement. He noted that "Periodic assessments over a period of time give the most valid information (p. 83)." In order to compensate for this, the study followed Bourrisseau's advice by
employing two instruments, the Berger and Phillips Scales, which correlate highly as pre- and post-tests, respectively.

Another measurement concern is the possible problem of rater-bias involved with the inclusion of a place for the subject's name on the pre- and post-scales. To correct this, subjects' names were replaced with code numbers prior to scoring.

The second major problem, that of comparability of treatment, stemmed from the involvement of the investigator as the instructor of both experimental groups. The danger was that the results would be a self fulfilling hypothesis, in terms of investigator preference influencing his instructing behavior and thereby would affect the results. Pre-test scores were not known to the investigator in setting up the experimental groups, since numbers were substituted for names by an uninvolved observer. Uninvolved observers, using the Flanders Interaction Analysis System, scored a sample classroom from each experiment to differentiate the treatments on the basis of the proposition that the Simon treatment would allow for more student talk than the Oliver treatment. This proposition was confirmed. (See Appendix C.)

Listing of Subjects, Treatments, and Major Variables

We can now summarize, in the following list, the major factors discussed in this chapter.

1. Subjects (numbers 1-50)
2. Treatments (Simon or Oliver)
3. Age
4. Sex
5. Geography (in- or out-of-state)
6. Transfer status
7. Marital status
8. Fraternity/sorority status
9. Grade point average
10. First pre-test (Berger Scale)
11. Second pre-test (Berger Scale)
12. Post-test (Phillips Scale)
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the author will present the data and statistical computations used to confirm or reject the hypotheses involved in the study.

Hypothesis 1

For those persons experiencing either the Simon or the Oliver value clarification treatment, there will be self concept improvement as defined by gains in scores from the Berger pretest to the Phillips posttest.

In order to confirm or reject this hypothesis, five statistical measures were employed: frequency distributions, T-Test by variable, T-Test (pretest to posttest), multiple stepwise regression, and a test of parallelism of regression.

Frequency Distributions and T-Test by Variable

Looking at the combination of frequency distributions and T-Tests by variable (Tables 1 through 9), we can describe the intragroup and intergroup relationships. Tables 1 and 2 show that possible predictor variables, sex and marital status, were dropped from this study since there were less than 10 per cent males and since single persons both predominated over married persons and were not distributed alike across groups. As illustrated by a T-Test by variable, the remaining variables
were found to be statistically unrelated between the Simon Experimental (SER) and Oliver Experimental (OER) groups.

Only one pretest (B Pre) was used in this analysis. Since B Pre correlated highly (p < .001) with A Pre, only B pre results will be cited.

Tables 3 through 9 illustrate more detailed relationships about the makeup of all four subgroups. Considering age (Table 3), OER people were older than SER, SH (Simon "history" people) older than OH (Oliver "history" people), although not at a statistically significant level.

Table 4 shows differences in geographical distributions. There were more in-state than out-of-state people in SER and OER while there was a higher preponderance of out-of-state over in-staters in SH and OH, though not at a statistically significant level.

Table 5 (transfer status) shows us that there were more transfer people in both OER, OH, and SH than in SER. Tables 6 through 9 confirm the fact that groups had similar distributions of the last four variables, fraternal status (Table 6), grade point average (Table 7), pretest scores (Table 8), and posttest scores (Table 9), although not at statistically significant levels.

Overall, therefore, there is no statistically significant difference between SER and OER. The T-Test by variable approach confirms that these variables were not statistically significantly related.
### TABLE 1

**DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.0 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.0 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = not significant

2.0 = p < .05
### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In State</th>
<th>Out of State</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. S. = not significant

2.0 = p < .05
### TABLE 5

**DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR TRANSFER STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-transfer</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-1.8 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

**DISTRIBUTION IN GROUP AND T-TEST FOR FRATERNITY MEMBERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.48 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. S. = not significant

2.0 = p < .05
TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.05-2.50</th>
<th>2.61-2.93</th>
<th>3.00-3.75</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>280.25</td>
<td>49.77</td>
<td>-.59 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>290.42</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>275.92</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>277.29</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>280.82</td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR PRETEST (B PRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower SC (79-126)</th>
<th>Higher SC (49-74)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>-.06 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.67</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87.90</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. S. = not significant
2.0 = p < .05
## TABLE 9

**DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS AND T-TEST FOR POSTTEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Lower (69-100)</th>
<th>Higher (31-66)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>N. S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.17</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61.26</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N. S. = not significant

2.0 = p < .05
T-Test: Pretest to Posttest

In what way does the second T-test, comparing mean scores from the pretest and the posttest, aid the consideration of Hypothesis 1? As indicated in Table 10, we did get a significant difference pretest to posttest for OER ($p < .001$) but at a lower level of significant than for SER ($p < .0001$) and for "history" group OC ($p < .0001$). Although this T-Test did show a mean difference between the pre- and post test to the .001 level for OER and to the .0001 level for SER, we should remember that this is a mean comparison.*

Therefore, all groups did gain and Hypothesis 1 is thereby confirmed. History groups SH and OH also gained at statistically significant levels.

A required assumption related to this confirmation is that students enrolled in introductory psychology classes at an unspecified university (Berger pretest sample) are equivalent to students enrolled in education classes at George Washington University (Phillips posttest sample). Insofar as these samples are from a similar population, then this T-Test comparison of pretest to posttest scores is meaningful.

Multiple Regression

In order to more fully understand Hypothesis 1, which expected gain scores from pretest to posttest, a multiple regression analysis was used. This test (Tables 11 through 15) confirms Hypothesis 1, that

*On the average, a slippage of four points occurred between pre- and posttests.
all subjects, no matter what treatment they experienced, gained from pretest to posttest.

As can be seen in Tables 11 through 15, the influence of predictor variables was of major importance in the regression formulas. When examined alone, the pretest variable scores produced $R^2$'s of .67 (all groups), .92 (SER), .50 (OER), .64 (SH), and .90 (OH) with the criterion measure scores. By comparison, several predictor variables including age, transfer status, geography, and grade point average had to be added to the pretest in order to explain 65 per cent of the variance within OER.

Similarly, Tables 14 and 15 report the differences between "history" groups SC and OC. It was necessary to include variables pretest, transfer status, geography, and GPA, in order to explain 80 per cent of the variance for SC while the pretest alone accounted for 90 per cent of the variance for OC.

With regard to the prediction of the criterion posttest score, then, the pretest proved significant for every group. In addition, age was a significant additional predictor only for the total group.

As illustrated by Figure 11, participants in both experimental groups improved their self concept scores from pretest to posttest.

On the strength of the above computations, this investigator confirms Hypothesis 1 in terms of gains from pretest to posttest for all participants.
### TABLE 10

A COMPARISON OF SELF CONCEPT SCORES FOR ALL GROUPS:
PRETEST VS. POSTTEST* (THE LOWER THE SCORE THE HIGHER THE SELF CONCEPT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean B Pre Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Post Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.48xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.26xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87.66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.36x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.45xxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .001  
*** p < .0001  
**** p < .00001

*On the average, a slippage of four points occurred from pretest to posttest.*
### TABLE 11

**STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF POSTTEST FROM POPULATION OF ALL MAJOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label of Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>RSQ Increase</th>
<th>F in/out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>111.62 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>10.24 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05
**** p < .0001

### TABLE 12

**STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF POSTTEST FROM POPULATION OF ALL MAJOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES**

**OER Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label of Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>RSQ Increase</th>
<th>F in/out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6.22 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
### TABLE 13

STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF POSTTEST FROM POPULATION OF ALL MAJOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES

**SER Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label of Variable</th>
<th>R SQ.</th>
<th>RSQ Increase</th>
<th>F in/out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b Pre</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>112.64****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .001

### TABLE 14

STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF POSTTEST FROM POPULATION OF ALL MAJOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES

**SH Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label of Variable</th>
<th>R SQ.</th>
<th>RSQ Increase</th>
<th>F in/out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b Pre</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>9.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
TABLE 15

STEPWISE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF POSTTEST FROM POPULATION OF ALL MAJOR PREDICTOR VARIABLES

OH Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label of Variable</th>
<th>R SQ.</th>
<th>RSQ Increase</th>
<th>F in/out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>33.19****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .001
Fig. 11.—Test for Parallelism of Regression on
Pretest to Posttest for SER versus OER

Group | Slope
--- | ---
SER | .72
OER | .54
Hypothesis 2

There will be an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments. Correlation matrices, parallelism of regression, and rank order distributions will be used to confirm or reject this hypothesis.

Correlation Coefficients

Correlation coefficients are helpful in delineating interrelationships between the variables. Correlation matrices (Tables 11 through 15) provide information from both the Pearson (p) and Spearman (s) formulas such that all of the included figures are taken from the Pearson unless otherwise noted by the symbol (s).

Tables 16 through 20 show high correlations between pretests and posttests for all groups. For people in these groups, those that initially scored high in the pretest, scored high in the posttest.

Tables 16 through 20 show additional significant correlations within the subgroups which are lost when averaged into the total group. For instance, for both SER and SH, there was a positive relationship ($r = .67, p < .01$). For SER and $r = .68, p < .01$, for SH between living in-state (geog) and non-fraternal membership. Within SH, the positive relationship between transfer status (trans) and grade point average (GPA) is artifactual because all subjects were non-fraternity members.
TABLE 16

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR ALL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geog</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Frat</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sss = Spearman, p < .001
ppp = Pearson, p < .001
# TABLE 17

**CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geog</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Frat.</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ss = Spearman, p < .01

sss = Spearman, p < .001

pp = Pearson,  p < .01

ppp = Pearson,  p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geog</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Frat</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>22.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ssss = Spearman, p < .0001
pppp = Pearson, p < .0001
sss = Spearman, p < .001
pp = Pearson, p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geog</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Frat</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.68&lt;sup&gt;ss&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.74&lt;sup&gt;ss&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80&lt;sup&gt;ssss&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>87.66</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68.16</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ss = Spearman, p < .01
sss = Spearman, p < .001
pp = Pearson, p < .01
ppp = Pearson, p < .001*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geog</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Frat</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.54^p</td>
<td>.62^pp</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.52^ss</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59^s</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.71^ss</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95^sss</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

s = Spearman, p < .05
ss = Spearman, p < .01
sss = Spearman, p < .001
p = Pearson, p < .05
pp = Pearson, p < .01
ppp = Pearson, p < .001
Similarly, Table 18 illustrates that within the one subgroup not yet discussed, OER, there is a one to one positive relation \( r = 1.00, p < .0001 \) between non-fraternity membership and higher GPA. Again this is an artifactual relationship. No other variables were significantly related in this correlation matrix.

**Parallelism of Regression**

Figure 11 and Table 21, for parallelism of regression, both illustrate the following distinctive movements within SER and OER. We can see that the SER higher self concept people moved up more dramatically, as indicated by the steeper SER regression line slope of .72, and in parallel order, as shown by the rank orders pretest to posttest, when compared with the OER higher self concept people who improved but in a less dramatic fashion on the average, as indicated by a lesser slope of .54, due to greater differential movement or rank order crossing prevalent within this group. Table 21, the F ratio test for parallelism, confirms that no interaction between treatments occurred at a statistically significant level. The lines can therefore be expressed as roughly parallel (see Figure 11).

Therefore, concerning Hypothesis 2, we accept the null hypothesis, for no significant interaction occurred between initial self concept level and the two treatments.
TABLE 21

TEST OF PARALLELISM OF REGRESSION RESULTS BETWEEN THE PREDICTOR VARIABLES AND THE POSTTEST FOR SER VS. OER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frat</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Rank Order Distributions

The rank order distributions provide us with rough numerical estimates about the interaction between self concept level and treatment. Table 23 confirms the view that people undergoing the Oliver treatment (OER) were most unpredictable in outcomes as evidenced by the greatest rank order alternation. By comparison, Table 22 shows that persons experiencing the Simon treatment (SER) and those in the "history groups" SH, Table 24, and OC, Table 25, tended to improve in a more rank order fashion.

However, although there was differential movement within the groups, there was no significant interaction and Hypothesis 2 must be rejected.
### TABLE 22

RANK ORDER OF RAW SCORES BETWEEN PRETEST AND POSTTEST FOR SER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>B Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25

RANK ORDER OF RAW SCORES FROM
PRE TO POST TESTS FOR OH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>B Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 2A**

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the higher the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely there will be no difference between the two treatments.

Parallelism of regression and a $T$-Test, pretest to posttest, will be used to test this hypothesis, that either treatment will be of benefit to higher self concept people.

**Parallelism of Regression**

Figure 11 indicates that higher self concept people improved their self concepts in both treatments as evidenced by the positive linear slopes of both lines. As indicated by a steeper slope (.72 for SER, .54 for OER), higher self concept people tended to improve their scores more with the Simon treatment than with the Oliver treatment.

Therefore, Hypothesis 2A is confirmed; either treatment is of benefit to higher self concept people.

**Hypothesis 2B**

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale
pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments such that the lower the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely one would succeed more with the Simon treatment than with the Oliver treatment.

Parallelism of regression will be involved in the consideration of this hypothesis.

**Parallelism of Regression**

Figure 11 shows that the slopes of the regression lines do not cross indicating a lack of differential movement between higher and lower self concept people.

There was a near parallel movement between SER and OER such that the lower self concept people improved as a result of both treatments. Figure 11 shows that lower self concept people improved as a result of both treatments. As indicated earlier in the discussion of Hypothesis 2A, the regression line slope is steeper (.72) for SER than for OER (.54) showing a greater rate of improvement for people experiencing the Simon treatment. However, we must qualify any conclusion because of the small number of subjects involved in these subgroups which is less than the number normally used in regression analysis. This small number could cause unusual results.

Therefore, Hypothesis 2B is rejected, for lower self concept people do not improve differentially at a statistically significant level of comparison between treatments.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the self concepts of pre service teachers are influenced by two different value clarifying strategies. One strategy, the Simon, invited the learner to articulate and organize his own value system at his own pace. The other, the Oliver, demanded that the participant compare his choices to the absolute hierarchy of democratic individualism.

Procedures

Fifty undergraduate, pre-service teachers, involved in methods "Potpourri"* courses at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst during the Fall semester of the academic year 1972-1973 participated in the study. Randomization of subjects selecting "Potpourri" values clarification to experimental treatment was used. Two "history" groups, also consisting of students who selected "potpourri" methods courses other than values clarification, and who met at times coincident with the experimental groups were obtained.

* "Potpourri" is a name used to describe a variety of limited teacher education learning experiences which students may elect to supplement their other experiences.
All participants were given the Berger Self Acceptance Scale as a pretest and the Phillips Self Questionnaire as a posttest. These measures were chosen because they had been successfully field tested with similar subjects and were highly correlated with each other. Based on scores derived from the Berger scale pretest, subjects choosing a value clarifying course from the "Potpourri" offerings were randomly distributed into the Simon and Oliver experimental groups each of which met for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours during consecutive six week periods.

Basically, a preobservation—postobservation design was used.

Two kinds of variables, predictor and criterion, were employed in this study. The predictor variables included the pretest, along with measures of age, sex, geography, transfer status, marital status, fraternal membership, and grade point average. The criterion variable was the posttest.

The Conclusions

Hypothesis 1

For those persons experiencing either the Simon or the Oliver value clarification treatment, there will be self concept improvement, as defined by gains in scores from the Berger pretest to the Phillips posttest.

Five statistical measures (frequency distributions, T-Test by variable, T-Test (pretest to posttest), multiple regression and a test of parallelism of regression) were employed to consider this hypothesis.
Multiple regression analysis (Tables 11 through 15) specifically illustrates that we are less able to explain changes in the Simon group than in the Oliver, based on the predictive value of the pretest. That is, of the two value clarifying experiences, the Oliver seems to have had a more unpredictable influence. Therefore, a suspicion expressed earlier (Chapter 1) by the author is somewhat confirmed; that is, some people are more shaken or "threatened," by a direct, openly challenging method, than by one which is less so.

These computations illustrated that persons in both experimental groups gained from pretest to posttest and therefore Hypothesis 1 is confirmed.

It seems that participation in value clarifying experiences contributes substantially to one's affirmation of self. Furthermore, improvement of self image occurs independently of teaching method. This conclusion confirms a belief stated earlier by this author; namely that value clarifying experiences, whether taught separately or embedded within another course of studies (a possible explanation of growth in the history groups), stimulates growth in self concept. Professionally, such courses should be considered as a basic ingredient of any teacher preparation program.

Hypothesis 2

There will be an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale, pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments.
This investigator used three computations (correlation matrices, parallelism of regression, and rank order distributions) to consider this hypothesis.

We can conclude that the Oliver treatment may have contributed to the more erratic effect amongst both higher and lower self concept persons. This statement seems reasonable because it takes into account the contention that different people will react differently. This movement, pretest to posttest, was in different directions within the OER group since some of the people with lower pretest scores moved up in post score rank while some of the people with higher scores moved down. In a sense, there occurred a crossing of individual difference movement within the OER group.

These distinctive rank order changes in OER are not reflected in the correlation matrices. Significant correlation from pretest to posttest show up in both the Pearson and Spearman correlation matrices. This finding illustrates that there was a similarly predictable relationship between the pre and post tests for both SER and OER and that no significant interaction occurred between initial self concept level and treatments.

To summarize, the T-Test by variable from pretest to posttest has indicated no differences between subgroups. Both the Pearson–Spearman correlation coefficients and the test of parallelism of regression show that there was some internal movement or crossing within the groups which a comparison of the mean averages would not indicate. Some of the people moved up in rank order while others either held their own or dropped back. However, these movements within OER were not statistically significant.
Therefore, the occurrence of an interaction between self concept level and treatment (Hypothesis 2) was rejected.

It appears that people will benefit from involvement with any value clarifying treatment. The lack of differential interaction between experimental methods, which has been repeatedly scored in the research literature, is confirmed. We haven't yet successfully articulated or defined those elements of the teaching-learning interaction which will best allow us selectively to fit alternative methodologies to alternative learning styles. When we do, we will be better able to predict with confidence success for learners involved with individualized modes of instruction.

**Hypothesis 2A**

There will be differential self concept gains, as defined by scores on the Phillips scale, posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger Scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the higher the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely there will be no difference between the two treatments.

This investigator employed two computations (parallelism of regression and a T-Test, pretest to posttest) to test this hypothesis. The author confirmed this hypothesis on the strength of results of the test for parallelism of regression, and the T-Test. Higher self concept people improved similarly as a result of both experimental
treatments. It may be that people with a greater sense of self worth have a better chance of benefitting from either a more challenging or less challenging experience than do those with a lesser degree of self acceptance. Generally, involvement in teacher preparation courses seems to have strengthened one's self concept.

**Hypothesis 2B**

There will be differential self concept gains as defined by scores on the Phillips scale posttest, based on an interaction between initial self concept level, as defined by scores on the Berger scale pretest, and experience, as defined by the Simon versus Oliver value clarification treatments, such that the lower the pretest score a person obtained, the more likely one would succeed more with the Simon treatment than with the Oliver treatment.

The author employed parallelism of regression to treat this hypothesis. This test (Figure 11) showed that a differential interaction between people from both experimental groups did not occur.

Thus Hypothesis 2B is rejected; for, the lower self concept people improved in a near parallel manner as a result of both treatments.

Overall, from an Aptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI) perspective, (see Chapters 1 and 3) if future replication done with a larger number of people indicates that interaction does occur, then differential assignment to the two treatments based upon scores on the pretest would give one greater outcomes by using both treatments (Oliver for lower self concept people and Simon for higher self concept people) than by
using only one treatment for all people. Therefore, individual learning from these two treatments may be operational even though this conclusion is not supported by the results of this limited study.

The gains made by people in all involved groups, both experimental and "history," has led this author to affirm strongly the positive value of being involved in a diverse teacher preparation program like that which is evolving at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. The failure of prior studies seeking an all purpose methodology and the need for newer studies concerned with alternative methods and the interaction between the personality styles of teachers and students seems confirmed.

**Relationships Between The Conclusion of This Study and Conclusions of Earlier Studies**

Earliest research concerned with teaching methodology, such as that by Aiken (1939), Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939), Anderson and Associates (1945-1946) sought relationships between classroom climate and learner behavior without directly touching upon personal characteristics of the learner. This study went further in seeking interrelationships between teaching and learning styles. Several reviews of research literature were in agreement in suggesting that no one best teaching method existed but that personality characteristics of the learner were probably central determiners in the choice of treatment.

With increasing frequency, researchers such as Flanders (1949), McKeachie (1954), and Beach (1960) sought relationships between student personality characteristics and teaching methods.
This study built on these attempts by incorporating a theory of interaction, Apptitude-Treatment Interaction, proposed by Cronbach (1957). By 1967, Cronbach had advanced the theory that student needs should determine the choice of teaching method. The present study fails to validate the assumption that students with differing levels of self confidence will profit in a significantly manner different from experiencing varied learning environments.

This study offers implications concerning theories of instruction; specifically, teachers should adapt methods to serve student needs. Three researchers had earlier completed studies touching upon the need to fit a teaching method to a student's personal needs. Gage (1956) in his study of elementary school children came to the conclusion that student images of their teacher were influenced by whether the student saw their teacher as asking for "affective" or "cognitive" responses. In studies of college students Wispé (1951) and Smith (1955) agreed that different students, as classified by personality tests, respond in varied ways to the same teacher.

Another major consideration, the possible explanations for lower self concept students responding favorably to a threatening treatment (Oliver experience), has plagued the author. The investigator informally explored at the end of the course possible explanations for this finding. Conjecturing that the higher frequency of absence among Oliver treatment subjects might be an answer to this problem, he discussed this concern with those students. In their explanations none of the students offered any reason resembling threat for their absence. In
fact, as shown by post-course evaluations conducted independently by the organizer of "Potpourri" courses, students from both experimental groups viewed the investigator-teacher as a non-threatening person (see Appendix G). Flanders (1963 b) offered a plausible explanation in his conclusion that students develop a shared image of the teacher which colors all subsequent experiences:

As a result of participating in classroom activities, pupils soon develop shared expectations about how the teacher will act, what kind of person he is, and how they like their class. These expectations color all aspects of classroom behavior creating a social atmosphere or climate that appears to be fairly stable, once established (p. 38).

Further, the remarks volunteered by students at the end of the Oliver experimental group experience led this author to see possible relevance in the conclusion of Spaulding (1963) who claimed: "Positive relationships exist between pupil self concepts (in twenty-one elementary schools) and teacher behavior characterized by a high degree of private or semi-private communication with children, of overt facilitation of task oriented behavior, of concern for divergent responses in children [and] of attentiveness to pupil needs. . . . (p. 119).

Perhaps, the work of Festinger (1957) dealing with cognitive dissonance bears application. If the lower self concept people could explain away their possible fears when confronted by threat, then they might easily avoid exposure by absenting themselves from class and thereby avoiding the challenge as well as rationalizing away the reasons behind this avoidance. This remains as an alternative plausible explanation for the rejection of Hypothesis 2B. Still another
intriguing explanation is offered through the application of Thelen's (1967) thinking that there exist aspects of teaching style, independent of instructional methodology, which when defined, could be successfully matched with learning styles. Payoffs may result from future articulation of elements of teaching style which could be subsequently tested.

**Limitations**

Since this study involved self selecting populations, generalizations to a population broader than self selected students is not clear. Due to the special nature of this study population, the following related limitations evolved:

1. Threats to internal validity are present since non-equivalent control groups, "history" groups, are involved.

2. Threats to external validity are present since generalization must be limited to a population similar to those persons selecting "Potpourri" methods courses at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, at Amherst.

3. Self concept is an abstract personality construct which is difficult to measure by paper and pencil tests such as those involved in this study.

4. Possible subject-bias was involved since a place for the subject's name was included on the pre and post tests. An attempt was made to correct this by having an independent person replace names with code numbers prior to scoring.

5. The danger that the results would be a self-fulfilling prophecy because the investigator-teacher taught both groups exists.
6. Any of these exploratory conclusions must be qualified because of the small number of subjects involved in each of the groups making statistical results questionable.

**Recommendations**

1. The use of a stratified random distribution into experimental and control groups for all variables involved in this study with a larger population in order to both validate these results and seek the relationship of alternative variables to the unexpected improvement of lower self concept people involved with a threatening environment.

2. The search for alternative measures, other than written ones, which could describe self feelings with greater accuracy.

3. More explication should be done concerning the components of the abstraction known as self concept.

4. Answers should be sought as to whether particular aspects of a teacher's personal style, other than teaching method, encourage or discourage growth in self confidence.

5. Attempts should be made to apply Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance directly to the issue of threat in the classroom in order to seek an explanation for the lack of differential improvement amongst lower self concept people.

6. A study should be attempted to establish the validity of the Berger and Phillips questionnaires.

**Parting Comments on Significance**

Given the limitations mentioned above for this study, this author believes that he has contributed to the research in the following ways:
1. That new ground has been broken by helping establish a new area of literature which relates learner self concept to the mode of teaching value clarification.

2. That the literature dealing with classroom methodology has been defined by the matching of two methods of value clarifying instruction with one aspect of personality, the learner's self concept.

3. That the assumption that every teacher should first become familiar with the personality of the learner before choosing a suitable mode of instruction has been supported.

The experience of exploration involved in this study has reinforced the author's personal contention that many teachers-in-training and teachers-in-the-field need training in ways to clarify their own values and to aid students in clarifying their values. These pre- and in-service teachers need to learn methods of applying available clarifying procedures as well as models for developing alternative strategies, if they are to continue growing while challenged by the highly conflicting situations inherent in teaching. They need to apply and devise tools for collecting feedback from students and they need a supportive environment in which to practice their procedures, if they are to be encouraged in attempts at implementing these new and often questioned procedures.
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APPENDIX A
BERGER SCALE PRETEST

This is a study of some of your attitudes. It is being done as part of a research study. The results will be kept confidential. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

Name_________________________ Age_________ Write your response to each question in the space before each statement according to the following scheme:

1. Not at all true of myself 2. Slightly true of myself 3. About half-way true of myself 4. Mostly true of myself 5. True of myself

Remember the best answer is the one which applies to you.

__1. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

__2. I don't question my worth as a person, even if I think others do.

__3. When people say nice things about me, I find it difficult to believe they really mean it. I think maybe they're kidding me or just aren't being sincere.

__4. If there is any criticism or anyone says anything about me, I just can't take it.

__5. I don't say much at social affairs because I'm afraid that people will criticize me or laugh if I say the wrong thing.

__6. I realize that I'm not living very effectively but I just don't believe I've got it in me to use my energies in better ways.

__7. I look on most of the feelings and impulses I have toward people as being quite natural and acceptable.

__8. Something inside me just won't let me be satisfied with any job I've done—if it turns out well, I get a very smug feeling that this is beneath me. I shouldn't be satisfied with this, this isn't a fair test.
9. I feel different from other people. I'd like to have the feeling of security that comes from knowing I'm not too different from others.

10. I'm afraid for people that I like to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me.

11. I am frequently bothered by feelings of inferiority.

12. Because of other people, I haven't been able to achieve as much as I should have.

13. I am quite shy and self-conscious in social situations.

14. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

15. I seem to have a real inner strength in handling things. I'm on a pretty solid foundation and it makes me pretty sure of myself.

16. I feel self-conscious when I'm with people who have a superior position to mine in business or at school.

17. I think I'm neurotic or something.

18. Very often I don't try to be friendly with people because I think they won't like me.

19. I feel that I'm a person of worth, on an equal plane with others.

20. I can't avoid feeling guilty about the way I feel toward certain people in my life.

21. I'm not afraid of meeting new people. I feel that I'm a worthwhile person and there's no reason why they should dislike me.

22. I sort of only half-believe in myself.

23. I'm very sensitive. People say things and I have a tendency to think they're criticizing me or insulting me in some way and later when I think of it, they may not have meant anything like that at all.

24. I think I have certain abilities and other people say so too, but I wonder if I'm not giving them an importance way beyond what they deserve.

25. I feel confident that I can do something about the problems that may arise in the future.
26. I guess I put on a show to impress people. I know I'm not the person I pretend to be.

27. I do not worry or condemn myself if other people pass judgment against me.

28. I don't feel very normal, but I want to feel normal.

29. When I'm in a group I usually don't say much for fear of saying the wrong things.

30. I have a tendency to sidestep my problems.

31. Even when people do think well of me, I feel sort of guilty because I know I must be fooling them—that if I were really to be myself, they wouldn't think well of me.

32. I feel that I'm on the same level as other people and that helps to establish good relations with them.

33. I feel that people are apt to react differently to me than they would normally react to other people.

34. I live too much by other people's standards.

35. When I have to address a group, I get self conscious and have difficulty saying things well.

36. If I didn't always have such hard luck, I'd accomplish much more than I have.
**APPENDIX B**

**PHILLIPS SELF QUESTIONNAIRE**

This is a study of some of your attitudes. It is being done as part of a research study. The results will be kept confidential. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

Name________________________ Age__________ Write your response to each question in the space before each statement according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all true</td>
<td>1 of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slightly true</td>
<td>2 of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>About half-way</td>
<td>3 of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mostly true</td>
<td>4 of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>True of myself</td>
<td>5 of myself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My own decisions regarding problems I face do not turn out to be good ones.

2. I find that I feel the need to make excuses or apologize for my behavior.

3. If someone criticizes me to my face it makes me feel very low and worthless.

4. I change my opinion (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else.

5. I regret my own past action I have taken when I find that my behavior has hurt someone else.

6. It worries me to think that some of my friends or acquaintances may dislike me.

7. I feel inferior as a person to some of my friends.

8. I have to be careful at parties and social gatherings for fear I do or say things that others won't like.

9. It bothers me because I cannot make up my mind soon enough or fast enough.

10. I feel that I have very little to contribute to the welfare of others.

11. I feel that I might be a failure if I don't make certain changes in my behavior (or my life).
12. It takes me several days or longer to get over a failure that I have experienced.

13. When meeting a person for the first time, I have trouble telling whether he (or she) likes (or dislikes) me.

14. I become panicky when I think of something I have done wrong (or might do wrong in the future).

15. Although people sometimes compliment me, I feel that I do not really deserve the compliments.

16. I regard myself as different from my friends and acquaintances.

17. I keep still, or tell "little white lies" in the company of my friends so as not to reveal to them that I am different (or think differently) from them.

18. My feelings are easily hurt.

19. As I think about my past there are some points about which I feel shame.

20. I think I would be happier if I didn't have certain limitations.

21. I doubt if my plans will turn out the way I want them to.

22. I think that I am too shy.

23. In class, or in a group, I am unlikely to express my opinion because I fear that others may not think well of it (or of me).

24. I criticize myself afterwards for acting silly or inappropriately in some situations.

25. If I hear that someone expresses a poor opinion of me, I do my best the next time I see this person to impress him (or her) as favorable as I can.
APPENDIX C

FLANDERS INTERACTION ANALYSIS
WORK MATRIX
SIMON EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix Total

| Total first obs. | 9  | 28 | 35 | 61 | 158 | 95 | 4  | 10 | 562 | 57 |
| Total second obs. | 7  | 30 | 31 | 63 | 160 | 39 | 10 | 9  | 560 | 60 |

Teacher Talk: Columns 1-7 = 280 = 31% (first observer)
Teacher Talk: Columns 1-7 = 280 = 31% (second observer)
Student Talk: Columns 8-9 = 572 = 62% (first observer)
Student Talk: Columns 8-9 = 569 = 62% (second observer)
## FLANDERS INTERACTION ANALYSIS

### WORK MATRIX

**OLIVER EXPERIMENTAL GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Talk:** Columns 1-7 = 561 = 63% (first observer)

**Teacher Talk:** Columns 1-7 = 561 = 63% (second observer)

**Student Talk:** Columns 8-9 = 202 = 23% (first observer)

**Student Talk:** Columns 8-9 = 194 = 22% (second observer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total first obs.</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>244</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>194</th>
<th>122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total second obs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matrix Total = 885
APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF TEACHING METHODS

SIMON TREATMENT

Detailed descriptions of the following techniques are available in Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) and in Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (1972)

List of Techniques by Use

1. Name Cards
2. Values sheet—Sandcreek Massacre
3. Focus game—crying, money, birth control
4. Values card
5. I learned statements
6. Values card
7. Here and now wheel
8. Brainstorm—use of values cards
9. Values sheet—Vietnam
10. Values sheet—Indians
11. Activities list
12. Name tag (agitations)
13. Values sheet—disclosure
14. Values card
15. I learned statements
16. Values continuum—sexuality
17. Board of directors
18. Values sheet—ecology
19. Here and now wheel
20. I learned statements
21. Values cards
22. Privacy blocks
23. Public interview
24. I learned statements
25. Values card
26. Forced choices
27. "Skin hunger" discussion
28. I learned statements
29. Alligator river story
30. Value survey
31. Rogerian listening
32. I learned statements
33. What kind of building are you?
34. Coat of arms
35. What's in your wallet
36. I learned statements

OLIVER TREATMENT

Detailed description of involved questioning techniques are available in Oliver and Shaver (1966).

List of Issues by Use

1. Rank order-teacher priority questionnaire
2. Cartoons - Vietnam
3. Article - pledge of allegiance
4. Case study - loyalty
5. Statistics - blacks versus whites
6. Case study - free speech
7. Case study - Indians on Alcatraz
8. Case study - abortion
9. Case study - grading
10. Case study - student rights
11. Case study - teacher involvement with students
12. Case study - conformity

* These techniques are presented in detail in Appendices E and F.
APPENDIX E
EXAMPLES OF SIMON TEACHING TECHNIQUES

I. I Learned Statements

I learned that I . . .
I re-learned that I . . .
I noticed that I . . .
I discovered that I . . .
I realized that I . . .
I was surprised that I . . .
I was pleased that I . . .
I was displeased that I . . .

II. Coat of Arms

1. What do you regard as your greatest personal achievement to date?
2. What do you regard as your family's greatest achievement?
3. What is the one thing that other people can do to make you happy?
4. What do you regard as your own greatest personal failure to date?
5. What would you do if you had one year to live and were guaranteed success in whatever you attempted?
6. What three things would you most like to be said of you if you died today?
III. Values Sheet

ECOLOGY AND ITS IMPLICATIONS*

In Malaysia recently, in an effort to kill the mosquitoes, American technologists sprayed woods and swamplands with DDT. Result? Cockroaches, which ate poisoned mosquitoes were so slowed in their reactions that they could be eaten by a variety of tree-climbing lizard which, sickened in turn could be eaten by cats, which promptly died of insecticide poisoning. The cats having died, the rat population began to increase, as rats multiplied, so did fleas: hence the rapid spread of bubonic plague in Malaysia. But this is not all. The tree-climbing lizards, having died, could no longer eat an insect which consumed the straw thatching of the natives' huts. So as Malaysians died of plague, their roofs literally caved in above their heads.

Peter A. Gunter, North Texas University, writing in THE LIVING WILDERNESS, Spring 1970

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Questions to think about and to write about:

1. Write your reaction to the above paragraph. Do it quickly. Don't even write full sentences.

2. What implications does this have for your own life?

3. Can you list some things you did in the past which might well have broken the delicate balance of nature?

4. What changes have you made in your life because of increased awareness of ecological factors?

*Courtesy of Sidney Simon
APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF OLIVER TEACHING TECHNIQUE

CASE STUDY – INDIANS ON ALCATRAZ

ALCATRAZ RETAKEN FROM INDIANS

United Press International

SAN FRANCISCO – A seven-man government task force liberated Alcatraz Island yesterday from 14 young American Indian demonstrators who laid claim to it over night, offering to buy it for $24 in beads. . . .

Tom Hannon, regional director of the U. S. General Services Administration, caretaker John Hart and some GSA building guards reclaimed the island. The Indians, including three girls, went back with him to the mainland on a Coast Guard boat. . . .

They had claimed Alcatraz under a past treaty which specifies Indian right to land. . . .

Alcatraz has been a prison in 1963.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Were the Indians justified in seizing the island? Why or why not?
2. (To a second person) Do you agree with that position? Why?
3. Were the government officials justified in removing the Indians? Why or why not?
4. (To another person) Do you agree with that point? Why?
5. Under what conditions, if any, is one justified in seizing another's property?
6. Is the government justified in taxing the people? Why or why not?
7. How is this tax issue similar to or different from the Indian issue?
8. What value(s) seem to be most influential in your decisions?
APPENDIX G

INFORMAL WRITTEN EVALUATION OF SIMON TREATMENT

"Would you please evaluate the course or course you have taken during the last six weeks. List what you have liked and found useful about each course, and what you feel can be improved or have not liked in each course. Let us know if you feel the course should or should not be repeated.

We welcome any other remarks pertaining to the Methods Potpourri and its courses."

*very good

informal atmosphere—no one felt out of place
friendly leader—made himself part of the class

interesting material—much of it will be useful when I'm teaching
thought-provoking—made me think about my opinions, beliefs, values, etc.
I'd recommend this course to everyone.

It was okay, but I don't think I'd use much of the stuff we did. I'm sure this is only my personal opinion because I know most of the other kids really liked it.

The 1st couple of sessions were exciting—direct, relaxed, and informative. After the 2nd week, we got bogged down in trying to define whether we were a class or really a sensitivity training program—I lost interest, feeling that Dick was showing a few simple exercises but that was it—if the course is to be continued, it should definitely be strengthened by a "meaties" Program. I would suggest some required reading so that some discussion might be possible. Dick is a good person but the course fell very short of his initial expectations, as well as mine.

I enjoyed the class very much, especially it's smallness and closeness. I felt that it could have been more involved—more—session so that more ideas for actual classroom activities (i.e. exercises geared for kids) could have been thrown around. I did find myself becoming clearer in the picture of myself and what value I hold and this awareness will aid my teaching I'm sure.
I found it really interesting, because we were never limited on subject matter—we talked about anything and everything. It gave me a chance to study my own values, plus realize other's values.

I liked the fact that the class was small in size. I learned many techniques and exercises that can be used in the classroom. I think this is a valuable course and should be continued.

Dick was really fine in bringing all the people in the class together with one another. Of course, it should be repeated. Easy going class. Ideas, conflicts, classroom situations pertaining to what went on. It was/is/will be useful, easygoing fun and I met some fine people.

This was my favorite methods course I have taken. It was very informal and the teacher got to know all of us. And we all got to know him and each other. It helped me realize my values and I learned how values are important to children and in the classroom.

Good course—Dick really was concerned about his students learning. He was very receptive and eager to hear criticism. He was always well prepared. However, I felt the material was not applicable enough for the classroom situation. It was geared too much toward us as individuals. This course should be offered again.

Good class, interesting, relevant, and fun. Good books suggested, teacher-student rapport, techniques developed worth a good deal and see the chance to use them effectively.

**INFORMAL WRITTEN EVALUATION OF OLIVER TREATMENT**

A worthwhile course for finding out "where you're at" with regard to personal values. Little practical methods for use in the classroom, however.

1. enjoyed very much—learned a lot about myself
2. more specifically oriented toward topics covering use of values and their effect in the classroom.

Values in the Classroom was very interesting. I enjoyed the class discussions. We talked about many current issues.

The instructor seemed very dedicated and certainly knew his material.

I liked the teacher and everything that was done in the class.
I learned how hard it is for me to define, then defend, my values. I was often bored with little anecdotes (which Dick encouraged) and annoyed with his constant continuums on the blackboard. But really I'll miss all the rapping—it was interesting and I feel that I've learned something about myself.

Interesting. Some good discussions. The only thing I didn't like was the way he tried to pinpoint where on the median a person's values stood. I don't like dissecting them but I guess that was the purpose of the class.

no use for teaching methods
mostly a "rap session"
I expected to learn various values exercises to use w/ kids (sid simon's type) and was disappointed not to.

I also took values in the classroom which I really didn't care for. Being a Hum. Dev. major I do not feel that I'll come across many problems dealing with values with 3 and 4 year olds.

The course was well presented. I like Dick's approach, and I admire his concern for his students. I had hoped that we would cover more ground in our discussions but in a 6 week period with 2-1 hour sessions that might be too much to ask. On the whole very good.