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ABSTRACT

This study begins with the assumption that, in order to assure the maximum amount of psychological growth in the classroom with the use of humanistic education curriculum, it is first necessary to develop a climate which recognizes, acknowledges, endorses, and validates individuals. It is further assumed that certain humanistic teacher behaviors could be developed to enhance a teacher's facilitation of such a climate. The purpose of this dissertation was conceived in response to some particular concerns and issues that the author observed during the implementation of humanistic education in the Montague School System. These issues are not unique to this specific population. However, discussion of the conclusions of this study will only refer to the population that specifically participated in this experiment, thirty-three Montague elementary teachers.
Specifically, some of the concerns which arise repeatedly in the implementation of a humanistic education program are: What do teachers need? How does one establish norms for working with teachers? What criteria does one use to evaluate a teacher's performance? All of these concerns are relevant to the topic of humanistic teacher behaviors. In answer to the question, "What do teachers need?", experts in the field of implementing humanistic education, including the author, have agreed that teachers need to be able to diagnose the climate of the classroom and be in control of basic classroom management. In addition to this element, a teacher must have a commitment to one's self-knowledge as well as special instruction in the processes of affective education and ongoing training in professional growth. Ideally, the personal and professional growth should be ongoing throughout an individual's involvement in a psychological education program. It is the author's belief that, before instruction is given in the processes of affective education, certain behavioral prerequisites should be fulfilled. These prerequisites take the form of the teacher behaving in a manner in which one facilitates a humane classroom climate, a well-managed classroom, a classroom where students are recognized, confirmed, acknowledged and endorsed. It is the latter qualitative effects of teacher
behavior with which this dissertation is concerned.

Chapter I includes a detailed description of Project C.A.R.E., the humanistic education program in Montague, Massachusetts, as well as other background information relevant to the study.

Five general hypotheses are generated in Chapter II. These hypotheses are:

There are crucial behaviors which are necessary to build the proper climate in which psychological education can be most effective.

The presence or absence of these crucial behaviors can be determined by systematic observation.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behaviors and the positiveness of the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a positive relationship between the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education and the student's attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behavior and the student's attitude toward humanistic education.

Chapter II also entails the methodology which was used to arrive at the humanistic behaviors observed in this dissertation. The following is a list of the behaviors
observed in this study.

A.1 The teacher looks at the children when speaking to them.

A.2 The teacher smiles when responding to the children.

A.3 The teacher allows the children the option to pass on all activities in humanistic education.

A.4 The teacher does structure places in the classroom where children can be alone or in groups and be out of the teacher's sight.

A.5 The teacher will be teaching humanistic education for the full amount of time allotted for this purpose in the teacher's school.

The behaviors that have been selected to be variables in this study are categorized generally as those behaviors that would facilitate the kind of climate that will assure the maximum amount of psychological growth possible in a classroom. More specifically, the behaviors that this experiment is concerned with can be categorized as validating or, according to Evelyn Seiburg (1973), "confirming" behaviors. Seiburg's four categories of confirming behaviors are: Recognizing the other person's existence; Relevancy to other person's communication; Recognizing the person's emotional existence; and Willingness to affiliate. Chapter III discusses these categories at length as well as how the specific behaviors with which this study is concerned represent these categories.
The research design, that is, the development, field testing and administering procedures of the observation techniques and questionnaires, is attended to in Chapter IV. The observation sheets and questionnaires in their final form are also located in this chapter.

The data was computed to arrive at the correlations that the hypotheses suggest by the use of Pearson's correlation coefficient formula. In addition to the analysis of the planned research, exploratory research questions were generated in Chapter V. Multiple correlation procedures were used in the exploratory investigations.

In conclusion, the analysis of the data produced findings that suggest relationships between some specific humanistic teacher behaviors and student/teacher attitudes. The results have several implications that are relevant to teacher training programs for the implementation of humanistic education as well as programs which train individuals to teach other disciplines. There are also implications for further research in the area of humanistic teacher behaviors specific to the behaviors in this study as well as in a general sense.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The reader should be aware that the author has chosen, for the most part, to define terms as they appear in the body of the dissertation.

The author also wishes to state that there will be violations of the grammatical rule of using masculine pronouns to refer to words of which the gender is unknown. This is in effort to combat sexism in written and spoken language. When the gender of the word is unknown, the author will use the pronouns "one" and "they" appropriately. "She/he" is also used occasionally.

It is important to note that literature is referenced throughout the dissertation. Therefore, there is no chapter devoted solely to searching the literature. The author feels that the reader's understanding of the concepts is enhanced by citing documented resources in context.

The term "humanistic education" occurs throughout this dissertation. There are synonyms that are used for "humanistic education"; some of these are: affective education, psychological education, self-science education, implementation of psychological curriculum. Experts in
the field have precisely defined these terms pointing out their differences. However, the literature continues to use these terms interchangeably. These other terms also appear throughout this dissertation. The author does make an effort to use the term "humanistic education". This consistency is for the reader's ease, although it may sometimes be repetitious.

At this time a definition of "humanistic education" is appropriate. This definition is followed by briefly defining the other terms mentioned above.

**Humanistic education.** In order to clarify the frequent confusion in the usage of the terms "humanistic education" and "psychological education", Phillips (1970) states humanistic education is the broader term and is education which:

1. Helps individuals to acquire the information and skills which are necessary if they are to fulfill their basic physiological needs.

2. Helps to facilitate the development of individuals who are able to manipulate their environment in a way which insures their survival and happiness and at the same time, does not interfere with the survival and happiness of others.

3. Facilitates the development of individuals who accept responsibility for their own behavior.

4. Helps individuals to acquire self-knowledge.
5. Provides an atmosphere which fosters the growth of positive self-concept in students.

6. Fosters the development of sensitive caring human beings, who have the capacity for empathy, a sense of responsibility for others, and both the willingness and ability to act to help others.

7. Creates a climate in which individuals are free to express dissent and in which channels are available for transforming dissent into constructive action.

8. Learners are the major data source in determining educational objectives.

9. Provides a maximum number of learning opportunities which students can choose from in attempting to reach the same objective.

Psychological education is more narrowly defined as seen in the focus of the four goals defined for the field by Alschuler (1972).

1. To promote the existing aims of education, especially the often neglected psychosocial goals. Psychological educators attempt to teach positive attitudes, motives and values that facilitate learning among students.

2. To teach students effective and pleasurable processes to reach the goals they choose.

3. To teach positive mental health.

4. To promote normal development.

Self-science education involves programs for training learners in those skills, concepts, and attitudes that will expand their self-knowledge concerning their own unique style for being in this world. It is oriented primarily toward developmental and constructive skills rather than symptoms removal (Weinstein, 1973). This approach to humanistic education
is being developed mainly at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Affective refers to the feeling or emotional aspect of experience and learning. How a child or adult feels about wanting to learn, how she/he feels as she/he learns, and what she/he feels after she/he* has learned are included in the affective domain. (Brown, 1971)

Psychological curriculum is curriculum aimed at promoting psychological growth; curriculum that provides opportunity for one to develop self-maintenance; curriculum related to personal rather than external knowledge. (Weinstein, 1972)

At this time it is useful to define **Humanistic Teacher Behaviors**. Before specific humanistic behaviors can be identified, it is necessary to determine the goal of humanistic teacher behavior. This, for the purpose of this study, facilitates defining "humanistic teacher behavior".

The goal of humanistic teacher behavior in an instructional setting is to permit, encourage, and extend students' ability to be independent, self-directed, and responsible persons. It is to inspire and aid each student in his effort to develop those human qualities that she/he* possesses: thinking, valuing, and symbol creating. (Macdonald, 1969)

The criteria for meeting the goal of humanistic teacher behavior is also helpful in defining this term. The criteria which emerge from this goal (according to Zahirik and Brubaker, 1972) are:

*When Rogers, as many authors, refers to people, he uses a masculine pronoun although the gender of the subject is not known. In efforts to combat sexism, the author adds the feminine pronoun as well.*
1. **Receptive**

Teacher behavior must be open and receptive to students' ideas, feelings, and actions. It must encourage and be willing to deal with those matters that concern students. If the behavior is restrictive and closed, independent thinking, valuing and acting will be discouraged.

2. **Facilitating**

Teacher behavior must not only be receptive to students' ideas, it must also facilitate students' thinking and valuing. It must help students to develop those human characteristics each possesses.

3. **Personal**

The behaviors that the teacher uses in accepting and developing students' ideas cannot be stereotyped and routinized. Humanistic teacher behaviors are individual and unique for each student. They must be sensitive and responsive to the interests, needs and talents of each student.

4. **Genuine**

Not just superficial openness, but a genuine, honest and sincere interest and concern with the lives of students.

Carl Rogers (1969) developed similar criteria. He sees the facilitation of experimental learning as the goal of education. A facilitator has qualities and attitudes that facilitate learning. They are realness, acceptance, empathic understanding, and trust. A teacher who is real is aware of one's feelings and can accept and communicate them when desired. Prizing the learner is prizing one's feelings, one's opinions and personhood. Empathizing is being sensitive and aware of students' feelings and
reactions, how a learning experience seems to a learner. Trust means providing a person with the opportunity to develop one's own potential in one's own way.

It may be helpful to also examine how non-humanistic behavior is defined: Teacher behaviors that result in passive, dependent students incapable of independent thought, self-evaluation, or determining their own values is non-humanistic. (Zahorik, 1972)

Background of the Study and Description of Project C.A.R.E.

A description of Project C.A.R.E. is provided by Ms. Jones (1974) evaluation report on the Montague Humanistic Education Program. Project C.A.R.E. has been in operation as an ESEA Title III project in the Montague School System since August, 1972. However, interest and teacher training in humanistic education actually goes back to February, 1971, when the Montague School System first became affiliated with the Center for Humanistic Education at the University of Massachusetts. At that time it was one of several project schools trying out humanistic education curriculum being developed at the Center as part of a grant from the Ford Foundation under the direction of Professor Gerald Weinstein.

Enthusiasm in the school system for this pilot project led to the writing and subsequent funding of a Title III
ESEA grant which would expand teacher training and implementation of humanistic education to all teachers and students, grades K-6, during the 1972-73 school year.

The program design for that year included the following components:

1. **Teacher training**

   A two week training workshop in the congruent approach toward humanistic education was held in August, 1972, for 44 elementary teachers and administrative personnel. This workshop was designed and led by the humanistic education staff. This staff consisted of a team of five doctoral students from the Center for Humanistic Education, hired for the entire school year on a half-time basis. The author is a member of this team. In addition, a full-time program director was hired who is also a former student of the Center for Humanistic Education.

   Congruent courses attempt to teach a well-defined, limited aspect of psychological growth. (Alschuler, 1972)

   Its purposes were two-fold:

   a. To provide opportunities for elementary personnel to experience humanistic education.

   b. To provide the tools and skills for implementing humanistic education curriculum.
The content of the workshop focused on these areas:

- Creative Behavior
- Communication Skills
- Values Clarification
- Magic Circle
- Positive Self-Concept Activities
- Gestalt Awareness Activities
- Improvisational Theater
- Transactional Analysis
- The Trumpet (A framework for cognitively processing affective experiences)
- Gaming Techniques
- Teacher Processing Exercises

In addition to the summer workshop, nine monthly, two hour in-service training sessions were led by the humanistic education staff, expanding upon the ideas introduced during the initial workshop.

Four courses during the spring semester were offered, through the Continuing Education Division Department at the University, by humanistic education staff members for teachers who wished to work more intensely in specific areas of humanistic education.

2. Teacher support

In order to reinforce the program objectives stated earlier, an ongoing support system was developed. This support system became an integral part of the project. Each humanistic education staff member worked closely with a group of eight to twelve teachers comprising the staff of one school or two small schools. Staff members worked with teachers in their classrooms and in weekly individual
conferences. Support group meetings also provided an opportunity for staff members to meet with their group of teachers. These meetings, held weekly in the fall and less frequently in the spring, provided an opportunity for teachers to share ideas and concerns. A weekly newsletter was developed to provide still another way for teachers to share ideas. Teachers submitted suggestions and activities they had tried in their classroom and wished to share with the entire elementary faculty.

3. Classroom implementation

Humanistic education was taught throughout the elementary school system during the first half hour of each school day. During this time children were in "family groups" of two or three grade levels. In addition, four classes in humanistic education were offered each semester at the high school by teachers who had been trained at the time of Montague's participation in the Center for Humanistic Education's project. Because the high school classes were not included as part of Project C.A.R.E. during 1972-73, no attempt was made to include them in this study.

4. Parent and Community involvement

Both in the fall and spring, a ten week evening course was offered to interested parents and townspeople by the program director. A total of 74 people completed
these courses.

During the year, humanistic education staff members spoke at a number of school "open house" nights to acquaint parents with the program. The program director was guest speaker at various community meetings including Rotary, the County Mental Health Clinic and church groups.

In May, a group of parents who had completed the parent training helped to sponsor a series of "coffee hours" in the elementary schools to explain the program to other parents.

5. Changes in the program 1973-74

In the summer of 1973, the humanistic education program was refunded by federal authorities at the same monetary level as the previous year. In addition, the Gill-Montague School District had voted, in the spring of 1973, the sum of $10,000 in local funds to support the program.

The major thrust of the second year's activities was the expansion of the program to include grades 7-12.

A two week workshop was held in August, 1973, to train secondary personnel in the use of confluent education. The difference between this program and the training program of the year before lies in its focus. The congruent approach was used in the previous year's training. This approach,
as the reader recalls, sees the self as content and focuses on increasing the child's self-knowledge.

Since there were already a sufficient number of "Education of the Self" courses being offered to secondary students by teachers trained at University of Mass., it was felt by project staff members that a confluent approach (one in which cognitive and affective components of the curriculum are synthesized to make the lesson more relevant to the student's concerns) would be useful to teachers interested in becoming involved in the project. Trainers affiliated with the University of California at Santa Barbara, where most of the work in developing confluent education has been done, led this training.

One important change from the previous year was in making the secondary school part of the program strictly voluntary. At the end of the two weeks' training period, teachers were given the opportunity to involve themselves in the program to the degree with which they felt comfortable, ranging from joining a weekly support group, to working individually with staff members without the affiliation of a support group, or leaving the project altogether.

Additional training was offered to teachers during this year in the form of an "Education of the Self" course
taught by Gerald Weinstein specifically for Montague teachers. Twenty teachers elected to take this fifteen week course taught at the University of Massachusetts campus in Amherst.

Another change in the program in 1973-74 was the addition of an 8 session course for elementary and secondary administrators to give them additional training in evaluating teachers' competency in teaching humanistic education.

In the area of parent and community involvement, a Parent Advisory Council was formed and charged with surveying community attitudes towards the effectiveness of the program.

In the elementary schools an important change was that the "family grouping" concept was eliminated at the teachers' request, and a time for humanistic education was provided during the regular Language Arts period.

Measurement in Humanistic Education

1. **Summary of evaluation procedure and findings 1972-73.** For the 1972-73 evaluation of the project (Wightman, 1973), the following research design was used. Wightman's study examined a Self-Inventory of Teacher Attitudes and Behaviors. (Eberle, 1968)
RESEARCH DESIGN - CONCEPTUAL MODEL

**Pre-test**
Teacher Self Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors

**Post-test**
Teacher Self Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors

**Treatment**
Teacher Training and Classroom Implementation of Psychological Curriculum

**Pre-test**
Students Self Esteem Inventory
Primary Self-Appraisal Inventory

**Post-test**
Students Self Esteem Inventory
Primary Self-Appraisal Inventory

Staff Observation Self Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors
Staff Ratings
The inventory was given to the teachers before they were involved in the workshop which preceded their teaching psychological education, and again after the teachers had been involved in the project for one school year. The study sought to determine relationships between teacher's expressions on the post-test of the Self-Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors and rating made of them by a humanistic staff member using the same instrument.

The study sought to determine if there were important changes in the teacher's own perceptions of their attitudes and behaviors, as recorded on the Self-Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors, during a school year in which they have been exposed to considerable training in psychological curriculum and were teaching that curriculum in their classroom. The study then examined possible correlations between teacher's perceptions of their attitudes and behaviors and staff member perceptions of their attitudes and behaviors. Each staff member used the Self-Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors to rate the teachers they had worked most closely with throughout the year. Staff ratings were made at the same time that the post-test was administered to the teachers. At this time staff members were also asked to make a more subjective rating of the teachers with which they had worked. Staff members placed teachers
in one of three groups according to perceptions of the classroom climate created and ease in teaching psychological curriculum. Teachers in each group were then compared and correlations obtained between these groupings and other scores obtained.

The variances of students' scores on self-concept tests administered at the beginning and end of the school year were determined. Tests used for this purpose were, in the intermediate grades, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory; and in the primary grades, the Self-Appraisal Inventory.

Finally, comparisons were made between student self-concept scores and the measurements obtained from tests administered to teachers.

For a more detailed description of these instruments and the testing procedures used, see Implementing Psychological Curriculum: An Examination of Teacher Behavior and Student Self-Concept. (Wightman, 1973)

The results of this testing program showed that no significant change occurred in the pre and post-measurement of self-esteem in the primary group. In fact, mean test results were almost identical with a high positive correlation between both testings.

A slight decrease developed between the pre and post-test measurements with intermediate students. This decrease
proved not significant, however. No positive correlation existed between the two testings.

An analysis of the pre and post-reporting of teachers using the Self-Inventory of Attitudes and Behaviors resulted in no significant change being recorded.

In addition, in this study no positive correlation was found between teacher self-ratings on attitudes and behaviors and the self-esteem scores of the students in their classrooms.

The 1972-73 findings of "no significant difference" in the pre and post-testing of both teachers and students has a familiar ring to people involved in measuring affective education programs.

2. Shortcomings in the measurement tools for affective education. Wendy Gollub (1972), researcher for the Philadelphia Affective Education Development Program, cites these objections to the use of paper-pencil tests as measurement tools for affective education:

First of all, straightforward tests measuring awareness of feelings, understanding of self and others, sense of control, values and attitudes are just not available for use with large groups of students. Use of tests that measure affective variables indirectly seem to violate the values of openness, directness, and explicitness underlying the affective education movement...the only affective behavior reliably measured by most tests is compliance on the part of those taking the test.
Weinstein and Alschuler (1973), in assessing work done in the last ten years in developing and implementing humanistic psychological curriculum, find these problems in measurement:

Existing instruments, especially those measuring aspects of the affective domain are either insensitive or inappropriate for assessing the fundamental goals of development. The traits these instruments are assumed to measure are static, time-limited, situational, and fragmented. Self-concept measures are a prime example of the inadequacies of such approaches. In summary, self-concept measures exhibit the following weaknesses:

a. There is little empirical data establishing the equivalence of assessment procedures used in the various techniques.

b. A clear, concise definition of the variable (self-concept) being tested is unavailable. (Self-acceptance, self-esteem, self-regard, etc. are not synonymous but are subvariable.)

c. The parameters of self-concept are not sufficiently defined to permit valid sampling. (Bourisseau, 1972)

We might also add that most tests measure qualities of self-concept instead of its process, content and changing structure over time.

It should be obvious at this point that the definition and measurement of central developmental capabilities is the most important problem in humanistic education. If this can be accomplished, all other aspects of the field can be improved, thus more affectively promoting the psychological growth of students. Considering the lack of
significant findings from the 1972-73 evaluation, coupled with the present unavailability of more precise instruments, the project staff, in the fall of 1973, began to look for alternative ways to measure the effectiveness of Project C.A.R.E. (Jones, 1974)

With knowledge that the variable, humanistic education, can not, at this time be isolated to prove that it is responsible for any perceived attitude or behavior change on the part of students or teachers, and that reliable instruments are not available to measure the effects of humanistic education, this study focuses on the implementation of psychological education. More specifically, this study seeks to use observational techniques to examine correlations between teacher behaviors and student/teacher attitudes toward humanistic education.

The literature up to date does substantiate that teacher behaviors and styles do influence pupil attitude and resulting achievement. Flanders (1960) found that teachers could best influence students toward superior motivation, attitude and learning when:

1. The teacher was able to provide spontaneously a range of roles that varied from fairly active, dominative supervision to a reflective, discriminating support.
2. The teacher was able to switch roles at will rather than pursue a single interaction style to the exclusion of other possibilities.
There has been a great deal of educational research conducted on analyzing the patterns of both teachers' affective and cognitive verbal statements and their effects on the learning experiences of students. Much of this investigation into the nature of teacher communication behavior has involved the systematic analysis of teachers' verbal statements into categories of intent as it affects the climate of the classroom and student behavior. The research of Anderson (1939), Withall (1949), and Flanders (1964) has been influential in the area of classroom interactions as it pertains to the development of instruments in the systematic observation and analysis of teachers' affective verbal communication behavior.

In an anthology of twenty-six major classroom observation instruments, Simon and Boyer (1967) report that twenty-five of these instruments deal exclusively or primarily with the analysis of teachers' verbal communication. Seven of the instruments are designed to observe some aspects of nonverbal behavior. Those items classified as nonverbal refer to such behaviors as nonverbal writing, seat work, demonstrations, and illustrations. Only one instrument deals with the identification of gestural behavior as a mode of communication of an encounter. Gesture in this instrument is defined as "behavior charac-
terized by purposive body movement".

3. Goals and measurement in humanistic education.
Weinstein states in an interview in Volume I Ford Report 1973:

Q. What do you wish you had accomplished in the last three years, but didn't?

A. Three things: One is an evaluation instrument for measuring some of the outcomes. We're just getting to the point where we can talk about appropriate outcomes. Another thing is the application of humanistic education to minority groups. I wish we had done more in those areas. I also wish that we had developed organizational strategies—contextual strategies—for dealing with the system in which humanistic education takes place.

Q. You mentioned measuring appropriate outcomes. Has anyone made any effort to itemize the specific objectives of humanistic education so that they can be measured?

A. In a very sporadic way. That's what all our present and future work will be involved with. All three of those concerns I mentioned are part of our next three or four years' work. (Weinstein, 1973)

Weinstein goes on to say:

I think that every time we go into a system now, personal growth for teachers is going to have to be built in as part of the overall strategy. We already have professional seminars on how to apply the curriculum and on instructional problems, but we also have to give personal growth—and that may or may not have relevance to what's going on in the classroom. I—with all my years of experience—am constantly energized by my own personal growth experiences. I always get energized
and seem to have new creativity when I go back into the classroom. When I take a course for my own personal interests, I don't care if it has any professional applications, but it always has. I find myself getting stale and routine when I am not consistently engaged in self-knowledge for myself, personally. It seems to me that some people seem satisfied after they get a few miniscule experiences in personal growth—they are willing to let other people do the work for them, the work that they ought to be doing for themselves. It's a constant process. We have whole lifetimes of patterning to deal with, and it's a never-ending process.

I have also learned that we must humanize the context of the school system. It is a constant struggle, a drain of energy, for teachers to practice what we are trying to have them practice when the organization is in a very different place—or the rest of the school or the rest of the system. I think that we have to make better use of organizational development strategies, accompanied with our specific kind of training. There are three levels of training that must go on: organizational development, personal growth, and professional competency with psychological education. We have to work with all three arenas. And from here on in, any time we engage in a project, we will bring in the organizational development feature.

Also, I think that the whole EOM (Experience + Organizers = Created Meaning) has been a significant learning for us. Experiences without the organizers don't really lead to significant meanings. Or organizers without experiences really don't. Three years ago, we were too highly experiential. If kids don't know what they are learning or for what purposes and have no organizers with which to assimilate the learning, there will be very short term outcomes. The result will be arousal without long term internalization. The work we are doing now has the intent of making a better balance between experience and organizers, and hopefully will be yielding long term outcomes.
Unfortunately, we have no way of measuring that yet. That is related to the paper that Alschuler and I are working on now. Here's a brief excerpt from that paper:

As psychological educators, we have been consistently concerned about our goals. In surveying the field of humanistic education—our own contributions as well as others—it was evident that the goal statements of the various affective humanistic programs and curricula were, at best, too vague, poetic, fragmented, groundless, and non-measurable. Such typical statements as "helping people become more aware of themselves, more self-actualized, more open to experiences, more connected, and more powerful, more authentic, or genuine, more ad infinitum", sounded psychically more gratifying, but left us operationally confused. We thus began to find ourselves in agreement with such critics as Kohlberg and Sprinthal.

We are accusing Humanistic Educators of becoming romantics and simply offering a new bag of virtues as educational goals. We refuse to disidentify ourselves with "romantics" if that term means those that have a humanistic value frame—and I define what I mean by "humanistic value frame" as one who believes that the end point of education is the fulfilling of human potential—that we must help people become all that they can become. We refuse to disidentify with all that.

On the other hand, we would like to have a more solid basis from which that framework can be actualized. We are less than satisfied with the ephemeralness of the goals emanating from humanistic values. This desire for more powerful goals stems from the
fact that in our attempts to develop training, instructional, and curricular programs in humanistic education, we were constantly running into problems that seemed to be directly related to our lack of such goals. (Alschuler and Weinstein, 1973)

Establishing goals and tools to measure outcomes are the priorities of some leaders in the field of Humanistic Education, Gerald Weinstein and Alfred Alschuler. To develop a theoretical framework with empirical research is mandatory.

Meanwhile, as the research continues in operationalizing self-knowledge and viewing that construct developmentally, many humanistic teacher trainers are striving to develop training program goals which will enhance maximum psychological growth of students. These goals are arrived at somewhat intuitively, from literature and practical expertise in the field. Some of these goals for system intervention were stated above by Weinstein as: "personal growth for teachers as a built-in part of the overall strategy, organizational development, and professional competency with psychological education" (Weinstein, 1973).

Assuming that the first two goals have been met before implementing Humanistic Curriculum, we are forced to operationalize "professional competency with psycho-
logical education".*

At an administrative seminar in Montague, conducted by Doris Shallcross, Gerald Weinstein addressed the issue of "professional competency with psychological education"; he discussed evaluating teacher performances, teacher needs, and establishing norms for working with teachers. An outline of how Weinstein addressed these three areas follows:

I. Evaluating Teacher Performance

A. To what extent are the selves being validated in the classroom?

B. To what extent are the students feeling a sense of self-worth?

C. To what extent are tools used to cognitively process experiences?

Tools: ex. The language of Transactional Analysis. "Parent", "Adult", "Child" are defined ego states within each of us that work for or against us in different transactions. Therefore, experimenting with labeling the P-A-C, one's internal states, is an example of using a tool. A Humanistic Education exercise is merely a vehicle--a means--of providing a jumping off place toward awareness of our internal states and whether they are

*This is not the case in Montague, although Dr. Shallcross, project director, is engaged in many efforts to enhance system commitment to Humanistic Education, and offers programs for continual psychological and theoretical growth of the Montague staff and administration. Opportunity for the continuation of personal growth on behalf of the entire Montague staff and administration is also facilitated by the "Education of the Self" courses offered by Gerald Weinstein and staff at the University of Massachusetts.
functioning for us beneficially or detrimentally:
E + O = M
Experience + Organizer = Meaning
(exercise) (tool) (internalization)

II. Teacher Needs

A. A teacher must have some commitment to his/her own self-knowledge. Implication is on-going training in personal growth.

B. Human relations training
   1. Know climate
   2. Basic classroom management

C. Instruction in special processes in affective education. Implication is on-going training in professional growth.

III. Establishing Norms for Working with Teachers

A. Overall: Each teacher working at own comfort level

B. Stages of Development:
   1. Effective classroom management
   2. Humane Classroom Climate
   3. Humanistic Education Curriculum

      Note: Examples of Humane Classroom Climate are (1) clarity of expectations, (2) directness in dealing with children, (3) evidence of validation

C. Evaluation on a continuum: teacher and evaluator agree on rating.
   -One way to arrive at what should be evaluated is to come up with five minimal humanistic teacher behaviors that kids should be exposed to. Example: deferring judgement on kid's opinion.

These issues as well as others are all under the broad heading of "professional competency with psychological education".
This study concerns itself with the following selected areas of the above discussion:

I. Evaluating Teacher Performance
   --To what extent are the selves being validated in the classroom
   --To what extent are the students feeling a sense of self-worth

II. Teacher Needs
   --Human Relations training, specifically knowing the climate

III. Establishing Norms for Working with Teachers
   --Stages of Development:
      Humane Classroom Climate, specifically evidence of validation

Chapter IV Design of the Research Component addresses a priority in the field of Humanistic Education, measurement techniques, as it explains the measurement techniques used in this study.

Statement of the General Problem Area

The basic premise underlying this study is that there are minimal humanistic teacher behaviors that students should be exposed to and that these behaviors are a qualitative aspect of teacher communication in the classroom.

"Qualitative communication is characterized by the utilization of feelings, emotions and attitudes in the expression of ideas and, as such, is a significant dimension of teacher behavior in the teaching-learning process (of Humanistic Education)" (J. Victoria, 1970). Gerald
Weinstein (1973) makes several references to this premise in the 1973 Ford Foundation Final Report. Regarding teacher training, Weinstein says: "The way I see it is that at the minimal level there ought to be general humanistic training for all teachers, regardless of what they teach, so that the general atmosphere and the climate of the school, just the way they relate to each other and the kids, improves."

The objective of this study is to focus on some observable behaviors which have been suggested as crucial for the implementation of humanistic education in the classroom. The purpose of this objective is to determine whether there is a correlation between the existence, or lack of existence, of these behaviors and the attitudes of teachers and students toward humanistic education. As an aspect of the study, an attempt is made to develop techniques for the systematic observation of the behaviors suggested as crucial for supportive affective qualities in classroom situations.

Statement of the Specific Problem

This study is first concerned with the identification and description of some of the humanistic teacher behaviors, suggested as crucial, which students should be exposed to minimally before, and in order that psychological curriculum be used in the classroom. Secondly, the study is concerned
with the development of techniques for systematic observation of these humanistic teacher behaviors. Thirdly, this study will examine the correlation between these behaviors and student/teacher attitude toward humanistic education.

Justification of the Problem

1. Why problem is important. This section includes further exploration of the problem area and justification for choosing this area.

One of the first assumptions to be made concerning classroom situations where teaching and learning occur is that the pattern of behavior of the teacher affects the pattern of behavior in the learner. One way in which the active involvement and participation of the learner is elicited is the manner in which the teacher communicates within the structure of the classroom.

Since all communication is characterized by qualitative aspects that evoke or elicit qualitative responses, whether on a conscious or unconscious level, affective teacher communication is a significant area for investigation. (Victoria, 1973)

In this study the focus will mainly be on that specific aspect of communication identified as nonverbal communication as it relates to classroom situations in humanistic education.
Attention has been given to the various nonverbal aspects of communication behavior particularly in disciplines other than education. Hayes (1964) provides a summary of the basic assumptions concerning the communication aspects of body motion:

1. Like other events in nature, no body movement or expression is without meaning in the context in which it appears.

2. Like other aspects of human behavior, body posture, movement and facial expression are patterned and, thus subject to systematic analysis.

3. . . . the systematic body motion of members of a community is considered a function of the social system to which a group belongs.

4. Visible body activity like audible acoustic activity systematically influences the behavior of other members of any particular group.

5. Until otherwise demonstrated, such behavior will be considered to have an investigable communication function.

Some educators are viewing the role of research to be that of dealing with interpersonal relationships found in all classroom situations. Ecker (1966), an art educator, says "humans are component qualities - not of painting or sculpture, but of situations". Eisner (1968) makes the analogy between acting and teaching as evidence for developing the qualitative intelligence of teachers:

Intelligent control of qualitative elements necessary in acting is also necessary
in teaching insofar as teaching is partly a task of acting and achieving communication between teacher and individual and group. The qualitative controls that teachers employ can enhance teaching and can be instrumental to theoretical ends embodied in certain subjects and can also be used to achieve qualitative ends incorporated in other subjects. Teachers who are able to control qualities intelligently are probably better able to produce the kind of classroom atmosphere that will facilitate the type of learning they value.

Galloway (1968) points to the necessity for teacher awareness and control of their nonverbal behavior. He states that when a contradiction exists between what the teacher says and what the teacher communicates, pupils will attend to the expressive behavior of the teacher to check on the verbal. "If a difference exists between the two expressions, it is the nonverbal that is believed and accepted by the pupil as representing the authentic message." According to Galloway, it is particularly in those teaching/learning situations that are characterized by cultural differences between teacher and students that the influence of the nonverbal behavior of teachers is most apparent.

Especially important is the notion that nonverbal messages may be more significant to pupils than teacher verbalizations when they attempt to ascertain the teacher's true feelings and attitudes toward them. A predominant example of this phenomenon occurs with linguistically disadvantaged youngsters who are
bombarded by verbal avalanches of teacher talk in classroom settings, and who have no recourse but to rely on the nonverbal messages of teacher behaviors. It is the culturally disadvantaged child who understands the least amount of information that is transmitted verbally and who reads the most meaning into the nonverbal behavior of the teacher. (Galloway)*

2. Why this study is a contribution to the field.

The increase in the number of studies dealing with techniques for systematic observation and analysis of teacher verbal behavior has provided procedures for more objectively evaluating overt teacher behavior in order, hopefully, to create more effective classroom situations. Continuing investigation relative to the identification and analysis of nonverbal behavior is providing knowledge of an important aspect of communication behavior. However, an insufficient number of studies related to nonverbal communication and teacher behaviors seem to have been conducted and/or reported. The systematic observation of nonverbal

*In the last sentence of the Galloway (1968) quote, he uses the term "culturally disadvantaged". The author wishes to state that this term is a term developed by White Americans to refer to Third World people. This term reflects the values of White America and is a product of White Racism. The author would prefer the sentence read: It is particularly in classroom situations where the cultural background of the teacher and students differ and there may be students who understand little of the information that is transmitted verbally that these students read most meaning into the nonverbal behavior of the teacher. This alteration does not perpetuate "the rightness of whiteness" (Citron, 1969), but urges appreciation of differences.
teacher behavior constitutes an important dimension of interpersonal communication, particularly as it relates to humanistic education in the classroom.

Individuals at Harvard University, in a recent Division 8 Newsletter, have an article in the Research Commentary section, which also substantiates the importance of nonverbal communication in the classroom. In "Assessing Sensitivity to Nonverbal Communication: The PONS Test", Rosenthal, Archer, Korvumaki, DiMatteo, and Rogers discuss a program of research on the measurement of sensitivity to nonverbal communication.

This research program grew out of earlier work on unintended effects of psychological experimenters' expectations on their research subjects' responses and earlier work on unintended effects of teachers' expectations on their pupils' intellectual performance.

Much of the research on interpersonal expectations suggests that the mediation of expectancies depends to an important degree on nonverbal communication. Moreover, there appear to be measurable differences among experimenters, teachers, and people generally in the clarity of their communication through different nonverbal channels. There also appear to be measurable differences among research subjects, pupils, and people generally in their ability to understand nonverbal communications transmitted through different nonverbal channels. If we knew a great deal more about differential "sending" and "receiving" abilities, we might be able to learn what kind of person (in terms of sending abilities) can most effectively influence what other kind of person (in terms of receiving abilities)....
Ultimately, we would want accurate measurements of each person's relative ability to send and to receive information in each of several channels of nonverbal communication. It seems reasonable to suppose that if we had this information for two or more people, we would be better able to predict the outcome of their interaction, regardless of whether the focus of the analysis were mediation of interpersonal expectations or some other interpersonal transaction.

As a start toward this goal, we have developed an instrument designed to measure differential sensitivity to various channels of nonverbal communication. (Division 8 Newsletter, Division of Personality and Social Psychology, January, 1974)

This instrument, the PONS Test, will indeed be a contribution to researching the area of nonverbal behavior in the classroom. The reader might take note that this measurement tool reflects the effect of nonverbal behavior on "intellectual performance". Little has been done in the area of researching the effects of nonverbal behavior on students' and teachers' performance in the affective domain.
CHAPTER II
APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction and Formulation of General Hypotheses

There are many facets to implementing a Humanistic Education Program. The author is choosing to reflect on the training process that the Montague Humanistic Education staff used with the elementary teachers. The author found, during the first year of Project C.A.R.E., that many of the failures and disappointments that the teachers experienced were due to the teachers' implementing humanistic education material in the same way that they teach other disciplines. For example, the same attitudes, rules, and behaviors existed between the teachers and students during humanistic education as did exist during all other instruction times.

In order for humanistic education to be presented with at least a minimal amount of success, the "self" as topic for discussion and learning must be legitimized. This legitimacy, in part, is the children feeling that they are worthwhile. This feeling of worthwhileness can be promoted in many ways. If students feel recognized, listened to, and generally important, they are more apt to be willing to share information about themselves. This atmosphere also permits a feeling of safety which is necessary in order for self-discipline to occur. The study of "self" does
necessitate some change in the learning environment relative to what has become known as satisfactory for mastering cognitive material. Studies have shown that classroom climate has an influence on children's attitude toward themselves, their subject matter and consequently on their academic achievement.

The work of Benjamin Bloom (1967) has made a major contribution to our understanding of the relationship of classroom environments and the development of children. Bloom reported that the "early environment is likely to be the significant variable for the development of many of these characteristics" (general achievement, reading comprehension and vocabulary development).

Bloom also reported that the environment provides a system of focus and factors which surround the individual, and he wrote:

Although some individuals may resist this network, it will only be the extreme and rare individuals who can completely escape from these forces. The environment is a shaping and reinforcing force which acts upon the individual. (p. 187)

The literature provides much evidence that teacher behaviors are major contributing factors to classroom climate and that they have a great deal of influence on the way children feel about themselves, other children,
and their subject matter. A more detailed review of the literature regarding teacher behaviors is in Chapter III, Some Humanistic Teacher Behaviors. The author is focusing on critical teaching behaviors influencing attitude development of elementary school children toward humanistic (affective) education. This focus is of great importance in the implementation of humanistic education. In order for the results of psychological curriculum to be positive, one needs a trusting, creative, warm, open, non-judgemental, accepting climate. Some children have been conditioned to learn academic skills in other kinds of environments. Moreover, there are several studies which show that children who feel that the teacher does not like them achieve less and are less creative than children who feel the opposite. Children do not seem to be willing to participate in personal growth experiences in a climate that they perceive as psychologically unsafe. When children perceive their classroom as "unsafe" during humanistic education, it has been the author's experience that they may choose not to participate continually, may put each other down verbally and nonverbally as a defense mechanism, or may act out in other disruptive ways. Some of these actions may take place while other kinds of subjects are being taught for the same reasons, as well as reasons such as boredom and irrelevance of subject
matter to the student's everyday life.

There are many sources which substantiate the teacher being the most crucial figure in setting the climate of the classroom. Teacher behaviors are what effect children and the climate of the classroom. Combs (1965) and other experts who have researched behaviors discuss the many elements which contribute to the way a teacher behaves.

The author maintains that there can be an effective teacher training program in behavioral skills, and that this ought to be an important part of humanistic teacher training in order for teachers to create a climate that is conducive to facilitating maximum psychological growth.

This dissertation looks at some of the teacher behaviors that the author and her colleagues, as well as other experts in the field, consider to be important humanistic teacher behaviors. Before operationalizing humanistic teacher behaviors, it is necessary to define psychological growth. Shallcross (1973) refers to Weinstein in defining psychological growth:

*Psychological growth is maturation on the personal issues of identity, connectedness, and personal power.*

*Identity is a sense of self-valuing, self concept, and self-esteem.*

*Connectedness is a sense of the interpersonal competencies of an individual in the dynamics of interpersonal experiences.*
Power is a sense of agency, of personal competency in goal setting and achievement motivation. (Weinstein, 1972)

For the purpose of this dissertation, the author additionally defines psychological growth by using Hutchinson's (1971) Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts Methodology. The author uses this methodology to define humanistic teacher behaviors. It is through this methodology, the author's experience, and the literature that the specific behaviors with which this study concerns itself were derived. Therefore, it is appropriate at this time to describe the methodology. The following description and introduction to the methodology is from Hutchinson and Benedict's (1971) "The Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts".

After all these years, there is still a dichotomous trend in education...On the one hand there is Mager (1962), Bloom (1956), Popham (1969), and Popham and Baker (1970), all of whom represent a school of thought which would have us detail in minute, behavioral terms the objectives of whatever it is we are about, or else, they pose, we'll never know where we are going or where we have been. On the other hand, there is an increasing movement with spokesmen like Atkin (1963), Ausabel (1967), Raths (1968), and Eisner (1969) which questions the efficacy of the former school suggesting that when forced to operate along Magerian lines, the essence of what we are about may very well be lost, or that the behavioral objective approach is limited in its ability to deal with things that are really, or should be of concern and importance to us, e.g., affective goals. Despite Popham's (1968)
excellent refutation of this latter point of view, an uneasiness still remains with us about the efficacy and desirability of one or the other of these two seemingly polar opposite points of view.

These two positions may not be polar opposites. The problem may be that our abilities of conceptualizing are still in too immature a state to handle the non-Magerians' versus the Magerians' point of view simultaneously. The point is,

Evaluators, educators, all human beings, have enormous difficulties in reporting the sum and sweep of their objectives. We all have goals, and we consciously and unconsciously give priority to some goals over others. But we have few reliable ways to report them to others, or even to reveal them to ourselves. (Stake and Denny, 1969, pp. 375-376)

This is the crux of the matter. We all have goals, but getting from goals to verbalized or explicit statements of what these goals mean, not only to others but to ourselves, is the problem.

It is easy to communicate some to others with full understanding, as it is an easy task to determine whether, if and when, this objective is accomplished by the learner. However, this is not the case with a whole host of other kinds of goals, e.g., affective: 'The student shall be self-actualizing...', or 'The student shall value his/her self', and so on. These latter goals are difficult to communicate and understand, and yet a legitimate argument can and is made that these are goals.

Where is the solution? Can there be one? Is it true that without Magerian objectives we can not progress anywhere? Is it true, as the non-Magerians state, that putting content or goals into Magerian terms destroys that which is to be measured?
To date our conceptualization strategies have been limited. A possible bridge from the Mager to the Atkin position, i.e., a possible solution to this dilemma, may have been developed by Hutchinson (1969a, 1969b) ... .

Examine for a moment some of the beginning of this controversy. Why is it that objectives ever began? It could have started when evaluation or assessment of student achievement began.

"An evaluator's technical skill should help the educator convey his purposes, both those that quickly come to mind and those implicit in what he does. What are the present methods...Our methods now are crude, unstandardized and unvalidated. They should be more evocative, more sensitive than indicated by the bold request, 'Please state your objectives in the following space.'"

However, the above is not the only shortcoming of evaluators. A second is that of the subjective approach to evaluation, all too common a practice today. In this method of evaluation, the evaluator enters the situation and "feels" what is happening, or tries to sense some sort of global dimensions of what's happening, after which the evaluation is written. The problems with this approach are all too obvious.

Yet a third dimension, which contributes to the fear and anxiety associated with evaluations, is that the evaluator will use outside, unknown or irrelevant criteria to evaluate "my school" or "my course" or "ME".

Continuing with the description and introduction to the methodology, Hutchinson and Benedict (1971) go on to say:

These problems with the current state of evaluations need not be the case. In fact, the whole nature of evaluation, what it is and isn't, what it should and shouldn't do, is changing. (Stake, 1967, Stufflebeam, 1969, Scriven, 1967) Evaluation is headed for a
new definition for which it indeed is time. It is in this new movement of redefinition of the function of evaluation, and in developing a much needed methodology of evaluation consistent with this movement that Hutchinson has devised a procedure he has entitled "The Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts".

The following is a description of Hutchinson's methodology.

I. Choose concept to be operationalized.

II. Create a hypothetical situation. Imagine that the chosen concept is totally in existence situationally. Observe the situation and list those things you can observe that indicate that the concept is present.

III. Create another situation from which your concept is totally absent. List those things which definitely indicate to you that your concept is absent.

IV. Test of Completeness: get someone else to go through steps two and three. Three or four people should complete these steps.

V. Second Test of Completeness: recreate the hypothetical situation. Look again at the things you saw and didn't write down. Seriously consider the implication of these not being dimensions.

VI. For each item on the list one should ask: Can I observe that dimension directly? "Something that cannot be observed directly is called a fuzzy concept." For each item that is still fuzzy, the same sequence of steps above must be completed.

As stated earlier, the author uses this methodology to operationalize humanistic teacher behavior later in
this chapter. This procedure is also used to define the term "psychological growth" for the purposes of this study.

The elements of psychological growth listed below are those the author produced after completing Hutchinson's process one time. Although many of the items are not directly observable, the list is useful for the reader's understanding of the author's use of the term "psychological growth".

Psychological growth is:

- expanding knowledge of yourself
- becoming acquainted with one's own identity
- learning about one's subselves
- learning what makes up one's identity
- pushing boundaries of own identity
- risking being involved in new situations
- cognitively being able to conceptualize and evaluate how you operated (behaved) under various conditions
- beginning to recognize your patterns of behavior
- cognitively being able to select an alternative behavior that you feel will work best in a certain situation
- being aware of how you effect other people
- being aware that you can't always rely on people's perceiving your behavior in the same way you perceive your behavior at that time
- recognizing that you have powers to make other people feel and behave in various ways
- recognizing that you have control over your actions
predictability: being able to predict that you will behave in a certain way if such and such a situation arises
- being able to verbalize clearly the way that you feel
- becoming aware that you are partly responsible for the way you are treated
- becoming more and more able to express your needs
- being able to make demands on others to meet your needs
- realizing that you cannot expect others to know your needs if you do not take responsibility for expressing them
- considering yourself important enough to feel that your needs are legitimate and worth meeting
- taking responsibility for your own psychological health
- being willing to satisfy your own needs consciously
- being able to verbalize your fears
- being able to verbalize something that threatens you
- being able to deviate from what has been expected behavior of you
- having a repertoire of things available to relate to people in several situations
- being yourself in all situations and feeling good about it
- being comfortable knowing that everyone doesn't like you
- being able to handle rejection in a way that allows you not to consider yourself a worthless person
- being able to validate your own personal constructs
- being willing to test your personal constructs
- being able to ask for affection
- being able to express your anger
- being able to express emotion
- being able to cry
- being able to risk
- being able to take people's feedback, and evaluate its worth without doubting your own worth
- recognizing that on the other side of being helpful and giving is being helped and getting, not denying the recycling of energy back into yourself

As indicated earlier, one of the goals of a humanistic education teacher training program is to facilitate, through skill building, teachers' ability to create a climate that is conducive to the psychological growth of the students in their classrooms. Several people in the field have developed and implemented affective education strategies to use in the classroom. Due to the nature of this curricula, it is crucial that the proper climate prevail in the classrooms where teachers are instructed to use affective education strategies. A humanistic teacher is the major contributor to this desired climate.

Through examination of theory and empirical research, and through a process of logical deduction based on experience, the author has formulated the following general hypotheses.
These general hypotheses are:

There are crucial behaviors which are necessary to build the proper climate in which psychological education can be most effective.

The presence or absence of these crucial behaviors can be determined by systematic observation.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behaviors and the positiveness of the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a relationship between the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education and students' attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behavior and the student's attitude toward humanistic education.

What is a Humanistic Teacher Behavior;
The Selection of Some Observable Humanistic Teacher Behaviors

In order to focus on critical teaching behaviors which influence attitude development of elementary school children toward humanistic education, and which therefore minimize or maximize the amount of psychological growth that can take place in the classroom, "humanistic teacher behavior" must be operationalized. This dissertation is focusing on humanistic teacher behaviors during the period of time that humanistic education is being taught.

There are essential behaviors that are basic in order to maintain a viable classroom situation. Many of these behaviors overlap the behaviors that are crucial for
implementing humanistic education curricula. Because this dissertation is not focusing on basic classroom maintenance, the following is only a brief statement regarding this issue.

Marc N. Levin, Teacher Training Coordinator of the Affective Education Development Program in the School District of Philadelphia, summarizes some results of the affective program staff's experience with their teachers. (1972)

First, we have found that experienced classroom teachers master affective skills more successfully than student teachers or new teachers. It seems that teachers who have some time to experiment with and solve a variety of control problems and are relatively secure in the classroom, take more sensible, moderate risks, and therefore succeed more often. Second, we have found that good, open-minded, traditional teachers, who exert strong control in their classrooms, tend to be more successful in introducing affective elements than those who have been freer in the classroom to begin with and have established fewer defined boundaries.

The author's experience as a Humanistic Education staff member in the Montague school system is similar to the above findings. Classroom control, boundary setting, confidence and perception of the teacher to the child's needs are basic ingredients for developing a learning situation that relates, as Carl Rogers says, to the student "as a person, from the context of personal experience and personal learning". "Teachers are taught skills
to attend to the cognitive growth of children, but are given little more than an 'understanding of the affective needs of their students.'" (Levin, 1972) It is toward this end, providing teachers with skills to attend to the affective development of their students, that the author is working. A description of training programs for teachers in the affective domain will be briefly discussed in the final chapter of this dissertation. Many of the training programs now in existence do not pay specific attention to preliminary humanistic teacher behaviors essential to the implementation of psychological education. The following operationalization of "humanistic teacher behaviors" is an effort to provide substantiation that skills toward behaving humanistically in the classroom can be built into teacher training programs, and that these skills are essential in the development of a successful humanistic education teacher.

Hutchinson's Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts Methodology was used in defining some of the elements of the term "humanistic teacher behavior". Choosing the fuzzy concept is the first step in the methodology. The second step is: create a hypothetical situation; imagine that the chosen concept is totally in existence, situationally. Observe the situation and list those things you can observe
that indicate that the concept is present. The following is the results of taking "humanistic teacher behavior" through step two of the process.

**Humanistic teacher behavior is:**

- showing interest in children's thoughts
- asking children to elaborate on their thoughts
- asking clarifying questions
- allowing children to become involved at their own rate
- solving discipline problems with a perspective on children's feelings
- sharing own feelings in class
- changing curriculum according to children's needs
- changing physical environment according to children's needs
- changing schedule according to children's needs
- laughing with children
- structuring choice within the classroom
- smiling
- allowing children to design room plan
- asking open-ended questions
- having a positive attitude toward humanistic education
- taking opportunities to learn more about him/herself
- taking opportunities to learn more about the children
- working toward class becoming a close community
- eliciting feedback from the children
- making an effort to accept different beliefs and life styles of the children
- allowing children to consult freely with one another
- treating children with respect
- not being afraid of saying "I don't know"
- being comfortable with children having different philosophies
- sharing ideas with other staff members
- encouraging creative thinking
- having many techniques to teach basic skills
- considering oneself creative
- complimenting children
- trying alternative ways of doing things
- eagerly following suggestions from children
- having a flexible teaching style
- having flexible plans
- having good eye contact with children
- varying one's physical position in the class relative to whom one is talking
- encouraging children's responses and opinions
- offering children a voice in their learning experiences when appropriate
- being in control of the classroom
- making a constant effort to validate students
- being open to learning from the children
- stating that one is learning from the children
- attending to children according to their specific needs
- striving to relate to children on a personal level
- legitimizing learning and talking about the self in the classroom
- verbally making children feel worthwhile
- nonverbally making children feel worthwhile
Step number three in the operationalization methodology is: create another situation from which your concept is totally absent. List those things which definitely indicate to you that your concept is absent. In a classroom where no humanistic teaching behaviors were present the teacher would:

- have no control of class
- have one rigid physical classroom plan
- not adapt curriculum to individuals
- always have a stern face
- never smile
- state that laughter is disruptive and inappropriate in school
- state that learning can only take place in silence
- state expectation of silence and stillness in classroom
- not allow children to have a voice in classroom rules
- have expected answers
- have difficulty accepting alternative beliefs, life styles, etc.
- make judgements on children's opinions
- be reluctant to try new teaching techniques
- be leery of applying any structure to classroom activities
- attend to all children's problems in the same general way
- give a lot of busy work to keep children quiet
- give extra academic work as punishment
- consider all children's acting out as discipline problems
- use one program for all children
- structure environment and learning situations to arrive at a preconceived result
- offer own remedies to solve a problem rather than encourage individuals to discover their own workable process
- "overteach" (underestimate level of children, be condescending)
- structure many handicaps so children will not be successful readily
- constantly repeat own belief in or approval of certain behaviors, learning processes, values etc.
- be unclear about what is expected of children
- not set clear boundaries
- expect children to answer with ideas and opinions similar to own
- have a negative attitude toward humanistic education
- teach humanistic education in a dictatorial manner
- not allow feelings to be discussed in school
- not discuss own feelings in school
- use humanistic education to moralize
- use value clarification to instill desired values
- state that fun is not needed in school

Step three of the methodology gave the author an additional perspective on humanistic teaching behaviors.
Any attributes of humanistic teaching behaviors that were additions to those elicited in step two of the methodology were considered in the final set of elements. These additions were rewritten so that the behaviors ultimately considered were stated positively.

The test of completeness, step four, of the methodology, was completed by a variety of people: Montague school principals, teachers outside of the Montague Public School System, and students of and experts in the field of humanistic education at the University of Massachusetts. The literature was also consulted in completing this step.

The following list is of behaviors that would be present in a situation where the chosen concept is totally in existence. Behaviors that are duplicates on the various lists of those consulted for this test of completeness are included only once.

In a classroom where humanistic teaching behavior is totally in existence the teacher would:

- be a listening station
- be comfortable with quiet in a conversation
- not be putting words into children's mouths
- legitimize the expression of all feelings in the classroom, including anger, by displaying these feelings oneself
- praising the children verbally
- reprimand certain behaviors, but not whole child
- provide opportunities for children to explore several media to express themselves
- encourage children to have individual projects to relate to
- structure situations where children can share problems and where peers can engage in creative problem solving toward individual's concern
- provide situations where children can express concerns in an open forum
- not insist that everyone follow the same learning style
- provide time and space for being alone
- respect children's right not to participate
- make physical contact (arm around) with child
- not ridicule child
- provide vehicles for exploring source of a child's positive feelings
- provide vehicles for exploring source of a child's negative feelings
- provide vehicles for exploring ways of staying with positive feelings and working on negative feelings
- provide structures for children to be listened to by teacher as well as peers
- allow children to have a voice in setting class rules
- allow children to have a voice in judging whether a peer breaks rules
- respect children's answers
- validate children's responses verbally and non-verbally
Many of the responses were similar to the author's responses as shown in step two of the methodology. These behaviors are additions to those in step two. No significant additions were recorded during the test of completeness where the concept is totally absent.

Step five is a second test of completeness; the instructions are: recreate the hypothetical situation. Look again at the things you saw and did not write down. Seriously consider the implications of these not being dimensions.

The author's completion of step five resulted in the following:

In a situation where the concept of humanistic teaching behavior is totally present the teacher would be:

- attending to discipline problems in an individualized way
- listening to children
- trying on new behaviors
- readily expressing one's feelings in class
- allowing children to make class rules
- engaging in conversation with children
- touching children when appropriate
- paraphrasing what children say to demonstrate interest and listening
- paraphrasing what children say in order not to distort their meaning
- nonverbally attending to children in conversation and in responding
- careful not to ignore children
- verbally recognizing children
- making children feel worthwhile
- encouraging participation
- careful not to put child down for wrong answer (verbally or nonverbally)

The items on this list that have not previously occurred in any of the other steps in the methodology were the only ones that were entered as additional attributes of humanistic teaching behavior. These were considered in the final process of selecting observable behaviors for this study.

The instructions for the final step in the methodology, step six, are: "for each item on the list one should ask, can I observe that dimension directly? Something that cannot be observed directly is a fuzzy concept. For each item that is still fuzzy, the same sequence of steps above must be completed." There are many items in the lists resulting from steps three through six that are not fully operationalized. Due to time limitations, it is necessary to add another step on to the methodology, that of prioritization. The author categorized and prioritized the behaviors at this point in the process. This dissertation
is concerned with nonverbal and verbal behaviors that are directly observable. These behaviors are also important elements of broader categories of behaviors necessary to create a classroom climate that is conducive to the psychological growth of children through the implementation of humanistic education.

The observable behaviors the author is focusing on as a result of completing Hutchinson's process are:

A.1 The teacher looks at the children when speaking to them. For the reader's convenience, this variable will be referred to as "eye contact".

A.2 The teacher smiles at the children. This variable will be referred to as "smiling".

A.3 The teacher allows the option to pass on all activities during Humanistic Education. The short form is "option to pass".

A.4 The teacher structures places in the classroom where children can be out of one's sight; this will be called "structures places".

A.5 The teacher will be teaching Humanistic Education for the full time allotted for this purpose in the teacher's school. This variable will be referred to as "maximum use of time".
It is useful to consider the importance of these specific behaviors. There are three approaches to influence the affective development of the child. These are the congruent, confluent and the contextual approaches to implementing humanistic education.

Congruent courses attempt to teach a well-defined, limited aspect of psychological growth. Alschuler (1972) makes the distinction between two types of congruent courses:

1. **Lateral courses** attempt to expose students to alternative patterns of processes, motives or goals without trying to facilitate advancement in the hierarchy of developmental stages. This type of course increases lateral freedom by helping people explore and enrich their repertoire of options for action, response and enjoyment.

2. **Vertical courses** teach higher order capacities in developmental hierarchies. These kinds of courses almost always use methods that focus on conflicts between developmental stages. For example, the work of Blatt and Kohlberg (1970) focuses on fostering moral development by choosing moral dilemmas to be argued by two students who are at adjacent stages of moral development.

The contextual approach to a psychological education program involves means of improving school organizational and classroom climate to provide a more psychologically healthy environment. (Alschuler, 1972)

The confluent approach integrates vertically all subject matter areas to teach a wider range of emotional
responses, to help students confront value dilemmas and to help them develop information processing skills. "These integrations involve making the subject matter personally relevant here and now through the use of imagination, touching students' feelings and translating ideas into action." (Alschuler, 1972)

The lateral, congruent approach is officially being used in Montague, in grades kindergarten through six, in implementing Humanistic Education. The chosen behaviors apply to this approach.

"Eye contact" and "smiling" are nonverbal behaviors which are observable variables. These variables were operationalized fully after the Hutchinson methodology was used once. "Option to pass", "structuring alone places", and "maximum use of time" are behaviors which have verbal and nonverbal components. These variables do not appear in the lists as they stand after completing the operationalization process one time. After the elements were prioritized, some of the behaviors were further operationalized, and thus variables A.3, A.4 and A.5 were arrived at in their present state. Chapter III, Some Humanistic Teacher Behaviors, is a discussion of the behaviors with which this dissertation is concerned. Each of the five behaviors is discussed as representative of
broader categories of humanistic teacher behaviors discussed in the literature.

Thus far, preliminary ground work has been done for considering the first of the five general hypotheses formulated earlier. Through the literature and the operationalization methodology, the following hypothesis has found support: There are crucial behaviors which are necessary to build the proper climate in which psychological education can be most effective.

The second hypothesis will be tested by attempting to observe the behaviors chosen. The second hypothesis is: The presence or absence of these crucial behaviors can be determined by systematic observation.

The last three hypotheses attend to the relationship of teacher behaviors and teacher attitudes, teacher attitude and student attitude, and teacher behavior and student attitude. Teacher attitudes and behaviors are well researched areas. It is appropriate to discuss the interrelationship among these variables at this time.

Attitude Influence

The importance of considering teacher attitudes as well as behavior is stressed by Rubin (1971) and Allen (1971). Ruben (1971) refers to the teacher’s sense of motivation and commitment. He suggests that, “How a
teacher feels about something, how strongly and in what order of importance, are tightly interwoven with one's view of educational process. The desire to perform at an optimum level is rarely stimulated when the teacher does not believe in the worth of what the teacher does."

Allen (1971) expresses the view that, "personalological skills", how the teacher feels about oneself and the behavior one is expected to use in the classroom, are as important as performance skills.

The concept of attitudes has received a great deal of attention in the literature providing a variety of definitions and theories of attitude formation. In their exhaustive review of the literature on attitudes, Shaw and Wright (1967) suggest an attitude is "a relatively enduring system of evaluative, affective reactions based upon and reflecting the evaluative concepts or beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of a social object or class of social objects." Shaw and Wright (1967) delineate three primary variations in definitions of the term "attitude". Williams (1972) summarizes the theory of Shaw and Wright in the following manner.

One variation, the issue of specificity versus generality in the determination of behavior, revolves around whether or not
attitudes have a specific referent. The second variable in attitude definition, as postulated by Shaw and Wright, is found in definitions which would include any predisposition to respond, as compared to a more narrow view which would restrict the use of the term attitude to the predisposition to respond only to social aspects of the environment. The third variation in definition deals with the theoretical conception of the composition of attitudes.

Numerous definitions fitting each of these variations have been proposed for the term "attitude". For the purposes of this dissertation, an attitude will be defined as a disposition a person has to favor or not to favor a type of social object or social action. (Guilford, 1959)

Early investigation by Alexander (1950), McGee (1955) and Ryans (1960) demonstrate that teacher attitude scale scores are consistent with their classroom behaviors. Brown and Webb (1968) maintain there is a relationship between beliefs and behavior in teaching, but often no relationship is found between measured attitudes and observed behavior.

A more recent study by Mitchell (1972) investigated predictions of teacher behavior by attitudional variables. The study concluded that the best predictors of a single act of behavior is the corresponding behavioral intention, and that a general attitude measure can predict a multiple act criterion better than a single act criterion.
Clusters of attitudes and beliefs have been found to predict behavior more effectively than unitary attitude measures. Harvey, et al. (1968) devised a measure of four conceptual belief systems ranging from concreteness to abstractness. Teachers with a more abstract belief system were found to be more resourceful, less dictatorial, and less punitive than teachers with a more concrete belief system. Results also indicated that the classroom behavior of the teacher and of the students are significantly related. Murphy and Brown (1970) used Harvey's conceptual system as a measure of beliefs, and grouped teachers accordingly. It was then possible to predict teachers' verbal behavior for seven out of nine behaviors.

A study by Wightman (1973), of the Montague School System's Project C.A.R.E., used a general attitude measure as a self inventory of the teachers' attitudes and statement of their behaviors. The humanistic education staff members who observed these teachers used the same instrument to record their perceptions of each teacher's attitudes and behaviors. Unfortunately, a more detailed observation of teacher behavior was not possible in Project C.A.R.E. at that time.
Procedural Steps

After developing hypotheses, operationalizing humanistic teacher behavior, arriving at some observable behaviors, discussing the interrelation of attitude and behavior, a research design is formulated. The research procedures include: the formulation of systematic observation techniques to observe the five specific behaviors with which this dissertation is concerned; the development of a teacher attitude questionnaire and a student attitude questionnaire; a format and schedule for observing the teachers in the Montague School System and administering the attitude questionnaires. Upon completion of the data collection, the data is analyzed and the original general hypotheses are discussed. Some exploratory research beyond the original hypotheses is conducted as a result of the information available from the data collection. The conclusion of the dissertation includes a summary of the findings, limitations of the study, and implications of the study toward humanistic education as well as teacher training in general.
CHAPTER III
HUMANISTIC TEACHING BEHAVIOR

Some Broad Categories of Humanistic Behaviors as Found in the Literature

There is much in the literature and many ongoing studies regarding the kinds of specific communicative cues that people give to other people which contribute to the other person's feeling of self-worth or conversely to one's feeling of self-worthlessness.

This dissertation is concerned with the communication that occurs between teachers and students. Paulo Friere states that without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education.

Dialogue, according to Friere, is the encounter between (people)* mediated by the world, in order to name the world... Dialogue is thus an existential necessity..., this dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person's "depositing" ideas in another, nor can it become a simple exchange of ideas to be "consumed" by the discussants. Nor yet is it a hostile, polemical argument between people who are committed... to the imposition of their own truth..., it must not be a situation where some people name on behalf

*When Friere refers to people in general he uses the word "men". In efforts to combat sexism, the author substitutes the word "people" for "men" in these instances.
of others. It is an act of creation; it must not serve as a crafty instrument for the domination of one (person) by another.

Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of profound love for the world and for people.

Dialogue cannot exist without humility. At the point of encounter there are neither utter ignoramuses nor perfect sages; there are only people who are attempting, together, to learn more than they now know.

Dialogue further requires an intense faith in people....

Founding itself upon love, humility, and faith, dialogue becomes a horizontal relationship of which mutual trust between the dialoguers is the logical consequence.

There are many authors who discuss in detail the theme of impersonal communication vs. interpersonal communication. Evelyn Seiburg, of the University of Denver, presented a paper at the International Communications Association in Montreal in Spring of 1973. The title of her presentation is "Confirmation or Consternation". Seiburg does not refer specifically to interpersonal relationships in an educational setting; however, this dissertation has already maintained that the communication between teacher and students is an important dynamic in education, ranging from its influencing attitudes to academic performance, feeling of self-esteem, etc.

In addressing interpersonal confirmation, Seiburg refers to R. D. Laing, who defines confirmation as the process through which people are recognized, acknowledged,
or endorsed. Martin Buber, Erich Fromm, and Carl Rogers discuss "Elements of the Interhuman", love, and qualities of a personal encounter in a similar way, and their conceptualization of these activities coincide with Laing's definition. The author has chose Evelyn Seiburg's dimensions of interpersonal confirmation to categorize what elements must be in order that people's self-concepts are enhanced in communication. These categories are particularly useful in conceptualizing the preliminary humanistic teacher behaviors that are necessary to promote a climate conducive to psychological growth in the classroom.

They are as follows:

1. Recognizing the other person's existence; their existence as a human operating agent; not a thing, a human in interaction with another human being.

2. Relevancy to other person's communication; there must be a consistency between what speaker has said and what is said in response.

3. Recognizing the person's emotional existence; the listener must imply a recognition of the emotional condition of the other person; the other person must believe that the responder understands what is going on beyond the literal content of the message.

4. Willingness to affiliate; willingness on the part of the listener to become involved with the speaker, to treat the speaker personally.

In Seiburg's efforts to conceptualize confirmation
to the point where it is studiable, and coding devises are available to score interaction as confirming or disconfirming or any place along that continuum, the findings have coincided with the literature. "The absence of any one of the above conditions was mentioned as being associated with destructive or pathological communication." (Seiburg, 1973)

The dimensions of interpersonal communication stated above are the major themes of many scholars in their discussion of confirming relationships. At this point, some of the theories regarding confirming behaviors in interpersonal relationships will be discussed.

Seiburg (1973) says:

Interpersonal confirmation is a unitary concept, although it draws from a number of different disciplines and it can be conceived of as a series of meta-messages which relate first of all to the other person's existence, then to the person's attempt to communicate, then to self description and finally to willingness of speaker to relate.

The first and most primary theme throughout the literature is that of recognizing the other person's existence. It is interesting that many studies show that even the most viscous attack on a person is preferable to being impervious to another person. A "no response" response is the most devastating. Examples of imperviousness are found often in parents' relating to their children, and teachers to their students. The role of teacher as
facilitator, a listener, a person who helps children grow is addressed by Allen E. Ivey and Dwight W. Allen in "The Implications of Microcounseling for Teacher Education". Microcounseling consists of twelve skills organized in four skill clusters. The first cluster has skills that relate to the theme at hand such as attending behavior of which physical attentiveness and encouragement from nonverbal cues such as head nods and eye contact are skills.

In addition to setting specific behavioral ways to recognize the existence of the person with whom one is relating, the literature indicates that this primary theme is implicit in the philosophy which is necessary to facilitate confirming relationships. In summarizing a paper, "The Interpersonal Relationship: The Core of Guidance", Carl Rogers makes a statement regarding this philosophical base.

Certainly the professional person who holds the view that individuals are essentially objects to be manipulated for the welfare of states, or the good of the educational institution, or "for their own good", or to satisfy one's own need for power or control, would not experience the attitudinal elements I have described as constituting growth - promoting relationships.

In Martin Buber's "Elements of the Interhuman", he speaks of the importance of recognizing a person as an operating agent in interaction with another human being
and not as an object. Buber discusses the possibility of social relationships being very close, and goes on to say how the collective or the social surpasses individual persons, but in the interhuman.

The only thing that matters is that for each of the two (people)* the other happens as the particular other, that each becomes aware of the other and is thus related to the other in such a way that (one)** does not regard and use the other as one's object, but as one's partner in a living event, even if it is no more than a boxing match.

The second dimension of confirming interaction, relevancy to other person's communication, is dealt with extensively in microcounseling. In the first cluster of skills, it appears as "short statements"; that is, short statements which will assure the speaker that the listener is following the content of the communication. It is later treated more extensively with selective listening skills, such as reflective listening, paraphrasing, etc.

The fact that dialogue is more confirming than monologue has already been established. A situation where a

*See footnote on page 64.

**The gender of the subject is not clear in this quote; the author substitutes neuter words for masculine pronouns.
monologue is taking place in the presence of one or more people presumably talking to one another is a state of "no response" response as mentioned before. This state is included in the notion of imperviousness, and does not contribute to the speaker's feeling of self-worth. It is in this vein that Laing refers to "relevance" as the crux of confirmation: "Relevance accords recognition to the speaker's evocatory response." (Laing, 1967) Imperviousness implies limited existence, and recognition of existence is an indispensable element of a confirming relationship.

Recognizing the person's emotional existence is the third theme to consider in confirming communication. In microcounseling, counselors are taught to attend to emotional comments of clients and to their key facial and bodily expressions. Carl Rogers uses the word "empathy" to describe the listener's role in assuring that, as Evelyn Seiburg stated, "the other (speaker) believes that the responder understands what is going on beyond the literal content of the message." When empathizing, the listener is experiencing an accurate understanding of the other's private world, and is able to communicate some of this understanding. The listener senses the other's inner world of private personal meanings as if it were the
listener's own. Having a sense and an understanding is highly important; the communication of intent to understand is also helpful. This gets across the fact that the listener perceives the other's feelings and meanings as being worth understanding.

An element of recognizing the person's emotional existence is, "acceptance is more confirming than interpretation." (Seiburg, 1973) If what is acknowledged is only what the responder chooses to acknowledge, a pseudo self is confirmed, not what the self is really experiencing. Examples of this partial acceptance are: imposing one's own interpretation on meaning; accepting another person only to the extent that it meets with one's expectations of that person. Behaviorally, it takes the form of speaking for the other person and making statements which interpret what an individual is saying, feeling, etc.

Rogers discusses "positive regard" and "unconditional regard" as conditions for positive interpersonal relationships.

I hypothesize that growth and change are more likely to occur the more that the counselor is experiencing a warm, positive, acceptant attitude toward what is in the client. It means that the counselor prizes the client as a person,...prizing a client as a person regardless of his particular behavior at the moment. It means that the counselor cares for the client in a non-
possessive way, as a person with potentialities...what I am describing is a feeling which is not paternalistic, nor sentimental, nor superficially social and agreeable. It respects the other person as a separate individual, and does not possess him. It is a kind of liking which has strength and which is not demanding. We have termed it positive regard.

...the relationship will be more effective if the positive regard is unconditional.... (an example of unconditional regard is) the counselor does not approve of certain feelings in the client and disapproves of others. It means not making judgements. I believe that when this nonevaluative prizing is present in the encounter between the counselor and the client, constructive change and development in the client is more likely to occur.

Buber (1965) maintains that the chief requisite of dialogue is, "that each should regard his/her partner as the very one he/she is." The following quote attends to recognizing the emotional existence of a person.

To be aware of a person...means in particular, to perceive one's* wholeness as a person determined by the spirit; it means to perceive the dynamic center which stamps one's every utterance, action and attitude with the recognizable sign of uniqueness.

Buber also says that man does not exist alone but in the interhuman. In order for the interhuman to occur there must be genuine perceiving of the other and no imposing,

*See footnotes on page 69.
(both elements of the third dimension of confirming communication as Seiburg relates).

Erich Fromm's approach to discussing authentic communication is through describing the elements of a love relationship. One of the components of such a relationship, according to Fromm, that is particularly applicable to this dimension of confirming communication, is respect.

Respect is...The ability to see a person as one is, to be aware of one's unique individuality. Respect means the concern that the other person should grow and unfold as one is. Respect, thus implies the absence of exploitation. I want the loved person to grow and unfold for one's own sake, and in one's own ways, and not for the purpose of serving me. If I love the other person I feel one with him or her, but with them as they are, not as I need him (her) to be, as an object for my own use. (Fromm)

Willingness to affiliate is the final dimension of a confirming relationship. This is a willingness on the part of the listener to become involved with the speaker, to treat the speaker personally. "It is more confirming to treat a person personally than impersonally." (Seiburg, 1973) There are several aspects to treating a person personally. "Language construction" (Seiburg, 1973) is one. For example, the use of "I statements" is a way to personalize interaction. An indication of an unwillingness to be personal can be the use of collective or general terms in
expressing thoughts and feelings.

Another aspect of displaying the willingness to affiliate is the "content of the utterance", (Seiburg, 1973) whether or not there is any affect in the content. According to Sidney Jourard, the expression of feelings is an important aspect of self-disclosure, and a person who discusses one's own feelings leads to a reciprocal self-disclosure on the part of the other. Jourard maintains that the more people can express their feelings the more chance there is for intimacy in a relationship. Therefore, it is considered an affiliation tactic. Conversely, denial of feelings, unwillingness to express feelings, refusal to discuss feelings is perceived as a distancing tactic and an unwillingness for one person to relate to another with any degree of intimacy.

Nonverbal behavior has a great deal to do with people feeling that they are being treated personally. Eye contact is considered to be an indication of a willingness to affiliate. (Seiburg, 1973) The avoidance of eye contact has been continually associated with disaffiliation. Touching, gesture, and vocal quality are assumed to be affiliative; however, we do not know enough about them as of now.
...Skills of self-expression are included in microcounseling. Expression of feeling has proven a useful skill....Unless one can recognize one's own emotions, it is hard to recognize them in others and reflect or attend to feeling. Training in expression of feeling often increases interpersonal sensitivity. Possibly the most dramatic microcounseling skill studied to date is that of direct mutual communication. (Allen and Ivey, 1972)

Martin Buber and Carl Rogers express the willingness to affiliate aspects of communication in terms of the duality of "being and seeming" and congruence.

Congruence is a term Carl Rogers uses to describe the condition of the counselor being what she/he is.

...genuine and without front or facade, openly being the feelings and attitudes which at the moment are flowing in one*....It means that the counselor comes into direct personal encounter with the client, meeting on a person-to-person basis....it is hypothesized that the more genuine and congruent the therapist is in the relationship, the more probability there is that change in personality in the client will occur.

Buber's duality of "being and seeming" is similar to congruence. "Seeming" in a relationship involves being concerned with one's image - with how one wishes to appear.

"Being" involves the spontaneous and unreserved presentation of what one really is in personal dealings with the other. "Whatever the meaning of the word 'truth' may be in other realms, in the interhuman realm it means that people communicate themselves to one another as what they are."

*Again, in efforts to combat sexism in our language, the author substitutes the pronoun "one" for "him", given the unknown nature of the subject.
The Relationship of Some Specific Humanistic Teaching Behaviors Previously Outlined in this Study to the Broad Categories Discussed

Most of the literature on confirming communication and humanistic teacher behaviors deals with the philosophy of these areas and with placing behaviors in broad categories. More and more educators and academicians, teacher trainers, and psychologists are concerned with the skills that are necessary to put these broad categories of behaviors into practice. This task is a major concern of the author's and a major purpose of this dissertation. It is useful at this time to consider the behaviors that are specific to this study and how they are representative of the four categories chosen to conceptualize the necessary conditions to enhance maximum psychological growth for children in the classroom. The reader might recall that it is the author's opinion that the behaviors considered in this dissertation are necessary to create a positive climate prior to the teacher's using any formal humanistic education strategies. There are some basic classroom maintenance skills that must precede these behaviors; that is, the atmosphere must be controlled and manageable.

For the reader's ease the list of behaviors observed in this study is repeated here:
A.1 The teacher looks at the children when speaking to them (eye contact).

A.2 The teacher smiles at the children (smiling).

A.3 The teacher allows the option to pass on all activities during Humanistic Education (option to pass).

A.4 The teacher structures places in the classroom where the children can be out of one's sight (structures private places).

A.5 The teacher teaches Humanistic Education for the full time allotted for this purpose in the teacher's school (maximum use of time).

"Eye contact" is one of the variables in this study. This behavior recognizes the other person's existence, and has been proven to be an indication of the willingness to affiliate. "Eye contact" is also a useful cue to the receiver of the behavior toward recognizing the other person's emotional existence.

"Smiling" also recognizes the other person's existence and indicates a willingness to affiliate. The kind of smile that is meant here is smiling in the context of "congruence" and "being" (not "seeming") as a sign of pleasure, "recognition, acknowledgement and endorsement".

The "option to pass" represents, in this case, the teacher's recognition of the other person's emotional existence. The teacher is accepting the student as a person who has a choice of response according to one's emotional state.
"Structures private places" also attends to the realm of recognizing the other person's emotional existence. The teacher is recognizing that the need for various kinds of surroundings fluxuates with emotional as well as physical needs. "Structuring private places" also recognizes the existence of a student as a person with privacy needs.

"Making maximum use of time" does not apply to the confirming relationship that was described as being conducive to facilitating a sense of self-worth in the students. This variable is useful in determining what influence the presence or absence of this behavior has on the children's attitude toward humanistic education according to the attitude questionnaire administered in this study. Also, it can be determined whether there is any correlation between this behavior and the teacher's score on the attitude questionnaire.

The dimension of relevancy to the other person's communication has not been dealt with in this study. It is not one of the purposes of this study to determine whether all the dimensions of a confirming relationship exist between the teacher and the students. The conceptualization of the variables in this study, as part of these confirming behaviors, is to validate their potential as contributors to a positive, confirming, self-esteeming, trusting class-
room environment.

The operationalization of the behaviors observed in this study, as it appears in Chapter II, demonstrates the complexity of humanistic teaching behavior. The behaviors chosen for this study are representative of broad categories of humanistic teaching behaviors. They are not all inclusive, nor if people master these behaviors will they necessarily be humanistic teachers. If a person is without a philosophical base and a conceptualization of the larger scope of humanistic teaching behavior, and not familiar with the connection of these specific behaviors with the overall picture, the learning of these skills will have no significance toward creating a climate which promotes the maximum psychological growth of students.

The behaviors chosen for this study are discussed in terms of their presence or absence and that effect on children's attitude toward humanistic education. The author is thus addressing only humanistic education as curriculum content. The author does, however, feel that a validating climate that recognizes and confirms students will facilitate the maximum amount of learning that can take place, regardless of the subject matter. The variable, "option to pass", may have to be operationalized in the context of cognitive subject matter, but structuring choice as to
learning techniques, times conducive to comprehending various subject matter, as well as whether or not a person wishes to participate every time a subject is being taught would seem to enhance an individual's feeling of being accepted and validated. Therefore, although it is not the purpose of this study to discuss these behaviors in classroom situations other than when humanistic education is being taught, they do have implications for other classroom settings.
CHAPTER IV
DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH COMPONENT

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology of this study. The sample of elementary school classrooms and teachers is discussed. In addition, the process for data collection is delineated. The instruments used and their development are also described in this chapter.

Sample and Data Collection

The research that is undertaken in this study is descriptive. There are two essential aspects of the sampling procedures that need to be carefully noted in descriptive research: "(1) The method of sampling must be such as to eliminate bias, and (2) the sample must be representative of the population to which the researcher wishes to generalize." (Best, 1970) Both of these criteria are considered and met as shown in the following description of the sample.

The intention of the investigator was to select classrooms in which humanistic education is taught as a regular part of the classroom curriculum; classrooms where humanistic education is taught congruently. As a result of the Title III federally funded program Project C.A.R.E. (Curri-
culum of Affect for Responsive Education), instituted in Montague, Massachusetts in the summer of 1972, the elementary school teachers in this system teach humanistic education for one half hour a day. This half hour time period is at the beginning of each school day. Therefore, the elementary teachers in Montague are a prime population for the testing of the hypotheses delineated in this study. A description of the inservice training program that was conducted by the Project C.A.R.E. staff, of which the Montague elementary teachers were a part, is given in Chapter I of this study. The superintendent, Project director, and program director were aware of the normal classroom visitation procedures of the Project C.A.R.E. staff members. Four of the principals of the five elementary schools, that are part of the Montague School System, are teaching principals. Therefore, they also were ongoing participants in the regular teacher training observation feedback procedures around which the humanistic education program operated. The fifth principal was in full support of the program and its operating procedures. All the elementary teachers in the Montague School System participated in the study. There are thirty-three classes and teachers from whom the data were collected. It is this population of teachers and students that is of specific
interest to the researcher.

The author was assisted in the data collection procedure by a team of four observers who are also members of the humanistic education staff in the Montague School System. The intent was to have one observer observe each of the five behaviors in operation in as natural a situation as possible. To insure these natural conditions, the Project C.A.R.E. staff members observed the teachers they normally supervised in their respectively assigned elementary schools. The directions for administering the attitude questionnaires to the children were given to the teachers by their humanistic education supervisor. The teachers were also instructed to complete the Teacher's Attitude Questionnaire individually; no proctoring was provided for the completion of this questionnaire. Two seminars were conducted by the author to insure that the observation, as well as the administering of the instructions for the attitude questionnaires, was done in a uniform way. One seminar discussed the nature of the study focusing on the problem and purpose and an overall plan for data collection. The other seminar concentrated on the specific process of administering the instruments and possible problems that might arise.
At this training session the following instructions were issued in writing to the data collection team regarding the questionnaires.

**Instructions to Staff Regarding Attitude Questionnaire**

1. Take an Attitude Questionnaire Record Sheet
2. Take enough Teacher Attitude Questionnaires in manilla folders for your teachers. The folders are numbered. The Teacher Attitude Questionnaire is numbered.
3. Make sure that the numbers in the right hand corners of Teacher Attitude Questionnaire and the folders correspond.
4. On the Record Sheet write the name of a teacher next to a folder and questionnaire number; be certain that this teacher gets the correct numbered folder and questionnaire.
5. Take enough Children's Attitude Questionnaires for each teacher and place them in the appropriate folder.
6. Give packets to classroom teachers.
7. Make sure that you give a folder numbered with the same number as the Teacher Questionnaire.
8. Make sure you have recorded to whom a numbered packet is going.
9. Have teachers return all the questionnaires in their folders.
10. Primary teachers may read Children's Attitude Questionnaires aloud.

The "Teacher's Attitude Questionnaires" were distributed to the teachers at staff meetings on May second. The teachers were asked to ask questions regarding the questionnaires.

The teachers were given instructions for administering the children's questionnaire. They were asked to return their folders to their supervisors by May sixth. At this time the data collection team was to recheck the number of the folder with the teacher's name to be sure they had recorded this information correctly. From this point on in the data collection procedure the teachers were referred to by code number only. No names are used in the analysis of the data.

The following time schedule was presented for observing the humanistic teaching behaviors with which this study is concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Time Table</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable A.4 - May 9 thru May 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable A.1 - May 16 thru May 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable A.2 - May 23 thru May 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable A.3 - May 30 thru June 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable A.5 - May 30 thru June 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable A.5, "uses maximum teaching time", is the variable that requires the least amount of recording while in the classroom. In order to initiate this investigation in the least threatening way and to familiarize the teachers with an observer present who is making notations, the author began the observation procedure with this variable. Each of the Montague humanistic education staff members, including the author, observed the teachers in their respective schools for this variable during the week of May ninth.

Variable A.1, "eye contact", A.2, "smiling", and A.3, "option to pass", were observed by the humanistic education staff members during the weeks designated in the Observation Time Table.

Variable A.4, "structures alone places", was observed during the same week as the "option to pass" variable. The reason for the overlapping of these observation periods is that the observers would be able to determine the presence or absence of this variable quite easily in each of the thirty-three classrooms.

An obvious, but often overlooked, requirement for adequate descriptive research is that "the techniques used (data collection techniques) must be valid for the purpose of the study, or the data collected by means of their use will be meaningless." (Best, 1970) It is for this reason
that the author has chosen the techniques of **observation** and the administering of a **questionnaire** to collect the data for this dissertation. The following sections of this chapter describe the development, field testing procedures, and process of administering these research devices.

**Development of Observational Instruments**

"Observation as a research technique must always be expert, directed by a specific purpose, systematic, carefully focused and thoroughly recorded." (Best, 1970) The literature on research agrees on the above and also that research must be accurate, valid and reliable. Observation instruments are recommended in order to insure the possibility of making more refined observations than those made through mere sense. Authors who discuss observation as a research technique have similar criteria for successful observation. Albenson (1933) has outlined these criteria in a concise, easy to read fashion.

1. Observation should be pointed and have purpose.

2. The functions or purposes of the phenomena should be discussed.

3. The phenomena should be objectified as much as possible by using measuring instruments.

4. Elements to be observed should be clearly defined.
5. Efforts should be made to diminish varying personal conditions.

6. The researcher should work to eliminate undue influence of the presence of the observer.

7. When appropriate, the researcher should be employing accurate rating scales.

The importance of field testing the observation methods and tools is stressed repeatedly in the literature. The methods of observing for these variables in this study have been field tested. Several adjustments were made in the development of the observation sheets, and some variables, which at one time had been considered, were excluded from the set of observable behaviors to be measured.

The adjusted methods were found practical and easy for observing the behaviors in this study. One other variable that was originally considered was: "The teacher responds to the children in a nonjudgmental-clarifying manner." The following was the criteria for observing this behavior on the part of the teacher:

If a teacher's position on a given issue can be easily seen from the way he/she responds to a child then the response is not one to seek clarification.

If the teacher's response has an implicit right answer then again it is leading rather than clarifying.

Ex. "We don't do (say) that in school, do we?"
The author found in trying to observe this variable that although the processing of humanistic education activities is conducive to teachers responding to children in a clarifying, nonjudgmental way, often children processed the activities without the teacher. In order to guarantee the presence of the situation, one would have to structure the situation to the point where the observations would not be made under natural conditions. Even when the conditions were structured, the researcher found the variable to be of such a fuzzy nature that in order to observe situations in this area, the data collectors were using their own values to such an extensive degree that the coding would not be useful in the research. It was decided after these experiments not to use this variable in this study. An entire study could be conducted on whether teachers use clarifying, nonjudgmental responses in the classroom. Further operationalization of the concept and an extensive coding device would be some of the necessary elements of such a study.

Another variable considered was: "The teacher insists that everyone follow the same procedure in working through a task." When field testing the observation method for this variable, it was found that it was an unrealistic expectation to be able to observe whether or not a teacher
insists that everyone follow the same procedure in working through a task. For example, sometimes whole group games with a specific set of rules were being played. It is impossible to tell by observing a game whether or not any discussion of the original set of rules took place unless one is present when a new game is being taught. Four out of seven classrooms were doing activities during the humanistic education period that were conducive to observing for this variable. As a result it was decided to eliminate this teacher behavior from the study.

The next five pages of this chapter are the observation sheets in their final form. The data collection team was familiar with the instruments as they field tested the observation tools in each of their stages of development. The instruments were field tested at all grade levels in the elementary schools at Montague in randomly selected classrooms. At a humanistic education staff meeting on May sixth the finished instruments were distributed to the observation team. The directions for observing each behavior are printed on each sheet individually. The staff members were encouraged to ask questions, and the observation time table was reviewed at this meeting. The formal data collecting began on May ninth.
Name of Observer:__________________
Date:__________________

Observation Sheet: A.1

Variable: #A.1 The teacher looks at the children when speaking to them.

Minimum Observation Time: Ten minutes.

Coding Instructions: Please record each time the teacher speaks to a child in one of the following ways:
Place an (X) in the designated space for every time a teacher speaks to a student and does not look at him/her; place a (3) in the designated space for every time a teacher looks at a student when speaking to him/her; place a (0) in the space if you cannot see if a teacher looks at a child when speaking to him/her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X-teacher speaking</th>
<th>3-teacher looks while speaking</th>
<th>0-cannot tell if looking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not looking-no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Observation Period</th>
<th>Coding Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of Observer: ______________________
Date: ______________________

Observation Sheet: A.2

Variable: #A.2 The teacher smiles (number of times) when responding to a child.

Minimum Observation Time: Ten minutes.

Coding Instructions: Please record the number of times a teacher smiles when responding to a child by placing a (✓) check mark in the designated space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Observation Period</th>
<th>Coding Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name of Observer:**

---

**Observation Sheet: A.3**

**Variable:** #A.3 The teacher allows the children the option to pass on all activities during Humanistic Education.

**Minimum Observation Time:** One complete Humanistic Education time period.

**Coding Instructions:** Please record the number of times the teacher states that children have option to pass or allows the children to pass by placing an (X) in the designated space; please record the number of times the teacher does not allow the children to pass by placing a (0) in the designated space; also, record the number of times the teacher leaves the option to pass unsaid by placing a (3) in the designated space.

X-option to pass 0-does not allow passing 3-leaves option to pass unsaid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Observation Period</th>
<th>Coding Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observation Sheet: A.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Observation Period</th>
<th>Structures YES places</th>
<th>Does not structure NO places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of Observer: 
Date: 

Observation Sheet: A.5 

Variable: #A.5 The teacher will be teaching Humanistic Education for the full time allotted for this purpose in the teacher's school, (within five minutes).

Minimum Observation Time: One full Humanistic Education period.

Coding Instructions: Please write yes or no next to the teacher's name depending on whether one utilizes the total amount of allotted time for Humanistic Education (within five minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher</th>
<th>Length of Observation Time</th>
<th>Coding Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the Attitude Questionnaires

The questionnaire is a widely used and misused research device. A drawback of research conducted with questionnaires has been the negative impression previously left by poorly constructed questionnaires that have been circulated in great numbers. The data collected in this manner is often invalid due to the small number of responses, not to mention the often poor sampling and inadequate questions on the actual questionnaire form. The unfavorable reaction to questionnaires by the receiver is intensified when the form is long, the subject trivial in importance, the items vaguely worded, and the form poorly organized. Another limitation to the usage of questionnaires is according to Best (1970):

Unless one is dealing with a group of respondents who have genuine interest in the problem under investigation, who know the sender, or who have some common bond of loyalty to a sponsoring institution or organization, the results are frequently disappointing, and provide a flimsy basis for generalization.

Also, the measurement can be completely objective, but it is not always possible to determine if what is being measured is what one intends to measure. Sometimes, however, according to the literature (Cook, 1965, Best, 1970, Abelson, 1933), the research study itself will provide some
insight into the validity of the technique used.

And finally, Abelson makes an important point, "...it (the questionnaire) is precise in that the product of the performance is so scored as to give numerical expression of the amount or degree of the ability or characteristic measured; (however) it is indirect in that a symptom or outward expression of the trait, rather than the trait itself, is usually noted."

It is because of the latter point that the author chose to combine observation with a paper and pencil measurement.

On the other hand, questionnaires have been successfully and validly used in many research operations. The author of this study determined, after considerable research and consultation, that the use of a questionnaire would be an acceptable way to collect data on the Montague elementary school teachers' attitude toward humanistic education.

In order to avoid the usual pitfalls of developing a questionnaire, the following criteria were used as a guideline. The researcher found that several sources articulated these criteria.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. It deals with a significant topic, a topic the respondent will recognize as important enough to warrant spending his time in completing. The significance should be clearly stated at some point.

2. It seeks only that information which cannot be obtained from other sources such as school reports or census data.
3. It is as short as possible, only long enough to get the essential data.

4. It is attractive in appearance, neatly arranged, and clearly duplicated or printed.

5. Directions are clear and complete, important terms are defined, each question deals with a single idea, all questions are worded as simply and as clearly as possible, and the categories provide an opportunity for easy, accurate, and unambiguous responses.

6. The questions are objective, with no leading suggestions as to the responses desired.

7. Questions are presented in good psychological order.

8. It is easy to tabulate and interpret.

Questionnaires that call for short check responses are known as the restricted or closed form type. They provide for marking a yes or no, a short response, or checking an item from a list of suggested responses. Providing an "other" category permits the respondent to indicate what might be his most important reason, etc.

The open form or unrestricted type of questionnaire calls for a free response in the respondent's own words. The open form probably calls for greater depth of response; however, it is more difficult to interpret, tabulate and summarize.

Each type has merits and limitations. The author decided on the closed form to be most likely to supply
the information desired. The teacher's questionnaire developed for this study was revised and field tested. The statements were refined to provide optimumly useful information.

There are several reasons why questionnaires should be tried out in advance of the main data collection. One is so that the difficulties and ambiguities in the questions can be weeded out. The author also found it useful to administer a few questionnaires in person so that the respondents could ask questions and verbalize responses while the researcher observed what difficulties of understanding exist in the questions.

In order to make all possible efforts to insure that the teacher's responses would be honest, the author presented the questions in a negative fashion. The rationale for presenting the statements in the negative is to more easily legitimize answering counter to the norms the Humanistic Education Program in Montague has been trying to facilitate. The feedback received on the questionnaire in its final form is as follows: the statements being phrased in the negative caused more than half of the teachers to reread more than one-third of the statements. This would be a hindrance if there were more statements to which the teachers were being asked to respond; however, the whole questionnaire being on
one page adds to the teacher's willingness to complete the form.

The children's questionnaire was field tested and it was found that the statements that were phrased negatively were much too confusing for the children. Also, some of the statements were too lengthy. The author changed the statements accordingly and tested the questionnaire again in its new form. The questionnaire as follows was reportedly administered with ease and success.

A process similar to the operationalization methodology was used to select the questions for the attitude questionnaires. The author as well as the entire data collection team "brainstormed" aspects of a positive attitude toward humanistic education. These were prioritized by the author and rewritten as suitable questionnaire statements. The following two pages are The Teacher's Attitude Questionnaire and The Children's Attitude Questionnaire respectively.

Treatment of the Data

Significance tests will be conducted on the data only to indicate the strength of relationships, not to make inferences about some larger population than the actual subjects involved in the study. The subjects are not a random sample of a population; therefore, to make such
Teacher Attitude Questionnaire:

Please put a circle around YES if you agree with the statement and put a circle around NO if you do not agree with the statement.

YES  NO  1. School is not the place to talk about ourselves and dwell on personal feelings.

YES  NO  2. We spend too much time trying to make school physically appealing.

YES  NO  3. We would not have as many troublesome individuals acting out if we had a few more rules and spent less time encouraging children to think about themselves.

YES  NO  4. It is not the teacher's place to talk about his/her feelings at school.

YES  NO  5. Playing games is not a learning experience.

YES  NO  6. Children talking at the lunch table, in the corridor and lingering in the laboratories is evidence of a climate which is counter productive to academic progress.

YES  NO  7. Teachers should not deal with children on a personal level.

YES  NO  8. It is not an important thing to know if the children like a program or style of learning as long as they eventually master the material.

YES  NO  9. It is not one of my jobs as a teacher to learn about myself.

YES  NO  10. Teachers should not allow individual class members to decide when he/she will participate in humanistic education.
Children's Attitude Questionnaire:

Please put a circle around YES if you agree with the statement and put a circle around NO if you do not agree with the statement.

YES NO 1. School is the place to talk about yourself and your feelings.

YES NO 2. We spend too much time trying to make school look nice.

YES NO 3. We would not have as many trouble makers if we had a few more rules to obey and we spent less time thinking about ourselves.

YES NO 4. The teacher should talk about her feelings at school.

YES NO 5. Children can learn from playing games at school.

YES NO 6. If children are talking at the lunch tables, in the halls, and staying in the bathroom too long, it shows that not much learning is going on in the school.

YES NO 7. Teachers should try to get to know the children very well.

YES NO 8. It is just as important to like school work or the way the teacher wants me to learn as it is to finally learn the material.

YES NO 9. In school I should be learning about myself.

YES NO 10. During humanistic education the teacher should allow each one of us to decide if we want to join in.
inferences would be inappropriate.

Each behavior will be tested for its relationship with the attitudes of the teachers and the students. Attitudes will be discussed in terms of scores on the attitude questionnaires. Pearson's correlation coefficient will be used to compute the relationships. A multiple correlation procedure to find the extent that the five behaviors correlate with the attitude questionnaire scores is performed on the data as additional data analysis for purposes of exploratory research.
RESULTS OF THE PLANNED RESEARCH

The purpose of this section of Chapter V is to discuss the planned research in reference to the final three hypotheses generated by the researcher. These hypotheses are:

There is a correlation between the observable behaviors and teacher attitude toward humanistic education, according to the scores on the attitude questionnaire.

There is a correlation between the behaviors and the student attitude toward humanistic education, according to the scores on the attitude questionnaire.

There is a correlation between teacher attitude and student attitude toward humanistic education.

The following is a table of the variables observed in this study.

A.1 The teacher looks at the children when speaking to them.

A.2 The teacher smiles when responding to the children.

A.3 The teacher allows the children the option to pass on all activities in humanistic education.

A.4 The teacher does structure places in the classroom where children can be alone or in groups and be out of the teacher's sight.

A.5 The teacher will be teaching humanistic education for the full time allotted for this purpose in the teacher's school.
Findings in regard to the hypotheses that there is a correlation between the behaviors observed in this study and the teacher's scores on the attitude questionnaires were computed with Pearson's formula for arriving at correlation coefficients. The significant correlation coefficient for a sample of thirty-three is .335 for a .95 probability that R is not 0. The findings are as follows:

Variable A.1 with teacher attitude--------.36589
Variable A.2 with teacher attitude--------.07666
Variable A.3 with teacher attitude--------.09977
Variable A.4 with teacher attitude--------.04650
Variable A.5 with teacher attitude--------.23389

There is a significant correlation between the teacher's attitude scores toward humanistic education and the behavior, "the teacher looks at the children when speaking to them."

No other significant correlations occurred between teacher attitude as measured in this study and the variables observed as a part of this research. Variable number five, "the teacher teaches humanistic education for the full amount of time allotted for this purpose in one's school", does not correlate significantly according to the scale; however, the obtained coefficient is not near zero.

The results of testing the hypotheses that the selected observable behaviors correlate with the children's average
scores on the children's attitude questionnaire are delineated below. Here each variable is correlated with the mean score of the children's attitude questionnaire for each of the 33 teachers' classrooms.

Variable A.1 with mean score of children's attitude=.11290
Variable A.2 with mean score of children's attitude=.34562
Variable A.3 with mean score of children's attitude=.26070
Variable A.4 with mean score of children's attitude=.07798
Variable A.5 with mean score of children's attitude=.06138

Variable number two, "the teacher smiles when responding to the children", correlates significantly with the children's scores on their attitude questionnaire. There are no other significant correlations between the children's attitude toward humanistic education and the observable teacher behaviors considered in this study. The correlation between variable number three, "the option to pass", and the children's attitude scores is not near zero but not significantly different from zero at the .95 level of confidence.

The outcome of the hypothesis that there is a correlation between the scores of the teacher's attitude questionnaire and the scores of the children's attitude questionnaire, both of which attend to the above's attitude toward humanistic education, is .26151. This is not a significant correlation.
Some Implications of Research Results

The significant correlations and lack of significant correlations between the variables observed in this study and the teacher attitude scores on the humanistic education attitude questionnaire have several implications. Among them are that good eye contact may be a valuable asset to the classroom teacher. This study finds that eye contact and teacher attitude scores toward humanistic education correlate. The literature substantiates that teacher attitude and behavior are important elements of a teaching-learning relationship in the classroom. It seems therefore logical to say, even though in this study eye contact did not directly correlate with student attitude scores, that looking at children when responding to them is a skill that teachers, especially those who teach humanistic education, should develop. Eye contact is valuable in conveying that the teacher recognizes the existence of the children in one's classroom. Acknowledging the existence of individuals is one of the conditions of a confirming relationship as defined by Seiburg (1973). Teacher training programs would serve their inservice and preservice trainees well to include the practice of eye contact as well as other classroom behaviors. The author suggests that to facilitate the success of a teacher preparation program, the trainees should work on the
behaviors and the strong points of an individual's mode of operation in the classroom. It is therefore advisable to begin working on teacher behaviors by attempting to enhance a person's style of relating by focusing on personality and strengths rather than merely teach a specific behavioral skill which may be unnatural to the learner.

Eye contact, however, is common behavior in persons responding to one another and as a result of this, as well as other studies, it is recommended that this skill be incorporated into a teacher training program.

The fact that eye contact did not correlate significantly with the children's scores on the attitude questionnaire indicates that the individuals receiving the behavior may have a different perception of the meaning of this particular behavior at a given time. Eye contact is often used as a control mechanism, and although we have substantiated that control is necessary in the classroom, it may be perceived as negative by the children in the classroom. It has also been established previously that what may be perceived as a negative response by an individual is still more confirming than an impervious response. However, if the response is perceived as negative, often enough it may not necessarily facilitate children's positive attitude toward humanistic education. These possibilities lead the author
to recommend the possible inclusion of the receiver's perception of a behavior and/or in some way take into account the context of the behavior in further research in this area.

Other implications of the research results revolve around the significant correlation between the teacher smiling and the children's scores on the attitude questionnaire. Smiling as an isolated gesture has not been researched; at least to the knowledge of the author there are no reports of such studies. The author found one study which includes smiling in a set of behaviors known as "facial gestures". (Victoria, 1971) This study recorded nonverbal responses and grouped them into the following categories of qualitative effect: **Supportive**--enthusiastic, receptive-helpful, clarifying-directive; **Neutral**--no supportive or unsupportive effects; and **Unsupportive**--avoidance-insecurity, innatentive, disapproval. Facial motion, of which smiling is specifically included, correlated highly with the qualities "enthusiastic", "receptive-helpful" and, not quite as highly but significantly, with "clarifying-directive". Facial motion had no significant correlation, not even closely so, with the "neutral" category. Facial motion also had the lowest correlation of the gestural behaviors in this study, of which eye contact is included, with the category "avoidance-insecurity". Facial motion had no correlation at all with the reflective
quality "inattentive". This last finding is particularly interesting as it relates to this dissertation because of the prior established negativism of an "impervious response". (See Chapter III)

The author of this study categorized smiling according to Seiburg in the area of "recognizing the existence of a person" and also in "recognizing the emotional existence of a person". (See Chapter III) The fact that smiling correlated significantly with student attitude implies the strength of these two dimensions of Seiburg's Confirming Communication categories in a classroom situation. Smiling did not correlate with the scores on the teacher attitude questionnaire; and eye contact did not correlate significantly with the children's scores on the attitude questionnaire. This may imply that, as categorized, eye contact may not necessarily reflect the teacher's recognition of the "emotional existence" of the child. Also, smiling is a more explicit, normalized response of approval and recognition. Although smiling, as eye contact, may have various implicit meanings in different contexts, it was reported by the observation team that smiling was a behavior generally associated with approval.

Again, in a teacher training program that deals with classroom behaviors, it is not enough to teach the trainees the skill of training the facial muscles to smile. It is
crucial that the smile of approval be sincere. It is feasible, and advisable, in the author's opinion, to teach smiling as a way of expressing sincere approval in responding to a child in the classroom. This is evidenced in this study.

Smiling is representative of other nonverbal behaviors expressing approval, more specifically facial and head motions. Hopefully, as teachers experience positive interaction with the aid of smiling, they will expand their repertoire of responses in this area.

The implications of the teachers' scores on the attitude questionnaire not correlating significantly with the children's scores on their questionnaire are general but important. This aspect of the research, as did the eye contact with teacher attitude hypothesis, agrees with the previous research done in this area. These outcomes provide validation for the research design of this study. Moreover, the significant correlation between the attitude questionnaire scores, combined with the literature's reports that the attitude of children toward school in general has a significant effect on their learning, restates the importance of creating a climate where the children feel positively about learning and about their specific learning environment. In turn, this argument leads educators again to the "how" of
creating this climate, and ultimately recognizes the need for specific behavioral skills which facilitate a confirming relationship between teachers and students toward creating a climate where maximum psychological growth, as well as academic achievement, can occur. The results of this research contribute toward this goal.

It is interesting that variables A.3, "option to pass", A.4, "structures alone places", and A.5, "maximum use of time", are not significant predictors of teachers' or students' attitude toward humanistic education scores. The variable "the teacher teaches humanistic education for the full amount of time allotted for this purpose in one's school" correlates to some extent, but not significantly, with the teachers' scores on their attitude questionnaire. This behavior is most explicitly oriented to the reflection of attitude toward humanistic education. It seems logical that there would be a correlation between this variable and the teachers' attitude scores. For future investigation it may be useful to allow for more variance in this behavior. If the exact amount of time that humanistic education was being taught was recorded, rather than a yes/no response as in the case of this research, the correlation coefficient between the variables may have been higher.

The "option to pass" variable correlated to some extent,
but not significantly, with the mean scores of the children on their attitude questionnaire. It is interesting to note the variables that were predictors of the student attitude questionnaire results. These behaviors are "smiling" and "option to pass". They are in the categories of "recognizing the existence of a person" as well as "recognizing the emotional existence of the person". This phenomenon is pertinent to humanistic education in which self is the content of the curriculum and of which self-disclosure is a major part. The students must feel that the teacher has some understanding of their emotional self, approves of them, and will acknowledge them in order for the climate to be "safe" enough for their participation. If these elements are not present, humanistic education could become too much of a risk. Also, if humanistic education is attempted in such an environment, the attitude toward it may be negative.

Perhaps, in addition to systematically observing the variable "option to pass", more research should be conducted to measure whether or not this variable is a norm in the classroom. For these classrooms, the option to pass on all humanistic activities may or may not have been made clear, either implicitly or explicitly, before the observation period in this data collection procedure took place. An interview with teachers and/or children in the classes is
one possible way of adding to the data on such a variable.

"Structuring places where children can be out of the teacher's sight, alone or in groups", did not correlate to any large extent with either dependent variable. There is potentially more variance to observe than the particular method used in this study afforded. For example, a teacher was given a positive score for having a small, partially closed-off area, such as a folding screen effect, as was a teacher with several alternative "alone places" structured in one's classroom. In order to have a wider range of codes available for this variable, this attribute would have to be further operationalized.

Exploratory Research

Exploratory research is a situation where one simply takes available data and looks for interesting questions to pursue aside from the planned research. A limitation of exploratory research is that the results found may be artifacts of the particular sample of available data. Therefore, one cannot say that found relationships are generalizable, no matter what their significance appears to be. There is likely to be some apparent relationships in any data regardless of how random the data may really be. The rationale for doing exploratory research, in spite of the
limitations, is primarily for hypothesis generation. It is reasonable to formulate hypotheses and plan experiments based on exploratory research.

The procedure of exploratory research has a long tradition in the physical sciences. By doing exploratory research and using the results to plan experiments, the latter experiments themselves are chosen on the basis of empirical results rather than sheer speculation. Exploratory research has been less systematically used by social scientists. This lack of use and the resultant planning of experiments on the basis of whimsy may in part explain why social scientist's experiments often produce no significant results.

This brief explanation of exploratory research presents the argument that not only is this type of research permissible, but that one should conduct exploratory research on available data. In fact, it may be something less than good research practice not to do exploratory research.

What are the specific interesting questions to pursue in this study that were not in the planned research? There appear to be three questions:

1. To what extent do the behaviors as a set correlate with the teacher attitude measure?

2. To what extent do the behaviors and the teacher attitude measure as a set correlate
with the means of the student attitude measure?

3. To what extent do the behaviors and the teacher attitude measure as a set correlate with the standard deviation of the student attitude measure?

And finally, for each of these, in what order are the variables added in a step-wise regression?

The exploratory research will be done by means of conducting three step-wise regressions with the teacher attitude scores, the means of the student attitude measure, and the standard deviation of the student attitude measure as dependent variables respectively. The five behaviors, and then the five behaviors and the teacher attitude measure as a set, will be the independent variables. A step-wise regression is: a process where the predictor variables are entered into a multiple prediction equation one at a time and in the order of their contribution to the power of prediction.

In looking at to what extent the behaviors as a set correlate with the teacher attitude measure the following outline will be helpful.

When the variable, the teacher attitude questionnaire scores, is the dependent variable, the behaviors are entered in a step-wise regression as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Added</th>
<th>Value of R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A.1, eye contact</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A.2, smiling</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A.5, maximum use of time</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A.3, option to pass</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A.4, structures alone places</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the dependent variable is the means of the student attitude measure, the extent to which the behaviors and the teacher attitude measure correlate with this variable are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Added</th>
<th>Value of R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A.2, smiling</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(6), teacher attitude scores</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A.1, eye contact</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A.4, structures alone places</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A.3, option to pass</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A.5, maximum use of time</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do the behaviors correlate with the standard deviation of the student attitude measure? With the dependent variable, the standard deviation of the student attitude measure, the independent variables are added in as follows in the step-wise regression:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Added</th>
<th>Value of R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A.2, smiling</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(6), teacher attitude scores</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A.1, eye contact</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A.5, maximum use of time</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A.4, structures alone places</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A.3, option to pass</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attitude Scores as the Independent Variable</td>
<td>Means of Student Attitude Measure as the Independent Variable</td>
<td>Standard Deviation of Student Attitude Measure as the Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Variable Added</td>
<td>Value of R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are some specific observations that are worthy of discussion in regard to the implications of the multiple regression with the "teacher attitude scores" as the dependent variable. The discussion of these will be conducted in the order that the independent variables were added, stepwise. Some of the implications for predicting teacher attitude scores are that variables added into the regression after "eye contact" have no significant predictability. The size of the multiple coefficient at the level of significance is .36589. "Smiling" and "maximum use of time" added .019% prediction. The variables "option to pass" and "structures alone places" added no significant percentage of prediction.

Each of the observable behaviors have an effect on the teacher scores on the attitude questionnaire according to how they correlate with one another as used in this study. The number of times teachers look at children when responding to them reflects their attitude questionnaire scores. In other words, teachers who were observed to be engaging in more eye contact with their students scored higher on their attitude questionnaires. The number of times a teacher smiles correlated negatively with the teacher's attitude questionnaire scores. That is, the recorded higher scores on the attitude measure were accompanied by the fewer number of smiles recorded by the observers. The teacher's maximum use of time
allotted to teaching humanistic education correlated positively with the teacher scores. This demonstrates that when these teachers have a positive attitude toward humanistic education, they do make optimum use of the time at hand to devote to humanistic education. The more times the option to pass was explicitly allowed the higher the scores were on the teacher attitude measure. And finally, it was found that the teachers who structured alone places also scored higher on the teacher attitude questionnaire.

In spite of the positive correlation between many of these variables and the teacher's positive attitude toward humanistic education, these correlations were not all significant. The researcher, in line with this study and as a result of the exploratory research, recommends further experimentation with regard to the teacher scores on the attitude measure and the variables "eye contact" and "smiling". The rationale for an experiment with respect to these particular behaviors is that, although "smiling" did not add a significant percentage of predictability, there certainly is evidence of some prediction, and it has been established that "eye contact" does have a significant amount of predictability.

There are several points of interest to consider in regard to the multiple regression conducted with the mean
score of the children's attitude measure as the dependent variable. Again the discussion to follow will deal with the effect of the independent variables in the order that each was entered into the step-wise regression. However, it is appropriate to note that the multiple coefficient was significant all through the multiple regression; each variable added enough percentage of predictability to the mean score of the children's attitude measure. The multiple correlation coefficient at the level of significance is .612.

"Smiling" was the first variable entered in the regression. This behavior correlated positively with the mean scores of the children's attitude questionnaire. In other words, the higher mean scores on the children's attitude measure were accompanied by the teachers who smiled the larger number of times. It is interesting to note that once again it is a nonverbal behavior that contributes the most predictability. It is also interesting to recall that "smiling" did not correlate significantly with the teacher's scores on the attitude questionnaire. One of the categories in which "smiling" is categorized is: "recognizes the emotional existence" (Seiburg, 1973) of an individual. Some interesting experimentation may be conducted on the behaviors indicating the recognition of the emotional existence of a person being recorded as significant to the "receiver" of
the behavioral effects and not recorded as significant by the person "sending" the behavior.

The next variable entered in the step-wise regression is the "teacher attitude scores". In the same vein as the discussion above, it is advantageous to look at this variable as one that certainly falls into Seiburg's "recognition of emotional existence" category. In fact, the nature of the statements on the attitude measure specifically attends to the four dimensions of Seiburg's confirming behaviors. The teacher attitude scores added a significant percentage of predictability. It also correlates positively with the mean scores of the children's attitude measure; that is, the higher mean scores on the children's questionnaire in a particular classroom were accompanied by the higher scores on the teacher attitude questionnaire. The results of the exploratory research with regard to this variable support the author's suggestion for further experimentation on these behaviors that fall into the "recognition of emotional existence" category.

"Eye contact" is step three in the regression. It adds a high enough percentage to be of significant predictability. The correlation between eye contact and the mean scores on the children's attitude questionnaire is negative. This means that those teachers that the observers recorded as
looking at their students fewer times when responding to them had the children whose scores on their attitude measure were higher. The author speculates that the reason for this occurrence is that there may be too little variance in the questionnaire. The teachers may have also responded in a way that they suspected the program initiators would react favorably toward. Precautions were taken to eliminate this effect; however, they may not have been extensive enough. Another reason why eye contact and the mean scores of the children's attitude measure correlated negatively may be the teacher's varied use of eye contact in the classroom. As discussed earlier, eye contact may be used as a controlling or even a punitive tactic. Further qualifications of this behavior and its coding may be additions to further experimentation with this behavior in regard to categorizing its qualitative effect.

In step four of the regression "structuring alone places" was entered. This variable also added a significant percentage of predictability. "Structuring places" correlated negatively with the mean scores of the children's attitude questionnaire, which means that again high mean scores on the children's attitude questionnaire were accompanied by the teachers not structuring alone places for the children.
The "option to pass" was the variable entered next. This variable also represented a significant percentage of predictability. It correlated positively with the mean scores. That is, the higher mean scores on the children's attitude measure were accompanied by the teachers of those classes more frequently allowing the option to pass.

In the final step of this multiple regression "maximum use of time" was entered. This also added a significant predictability and correlated positively with the dependent variable at hand. This means that the children of the teachers who used the time allotted to teach humanistic education maximumly had the higher mean scores on their attitude questionnaires. This correlation is interesting because, although the "maximum use of time" and the teacher attitude questionnaire scores correlated positively, "maximum use of time" did not add significant predictability to the teacher attitude questionnaire scores in the multiple regression. However, it did add significant predictability to the children's scores. Again, the researcher can only speculate that the teachers may have taught humanistic education for the full amount of time because of the school system's pressure and being observed. This may not be a reflection of their true attitude, but this may account for the correlation between this behavior and their questionnaire scores.
However, the children could conceive of this "equal" treatment of the humanistic education curriculum as a reflection of the teacher's attitude and in turn consider it important, worthwhile and/or positive. Interviewing the children as to this concern may be a way to investigate this possible reason for the correlation of "maximum use of time" and children's mean scores on their attitude questionnaire.

The researcher also recommends that, on the basis of the significance of the multiple correlation on the mean scores of the children's measure, more experimentation could be conducted on all the variables in this step-wise regression in relation to the said dependent variable.

The final question with which the exploratory segment of the research deals is: to what extent do the behaviors and the teacher attitude measure as a set correlate with the standard deviation of the student attitude measure? Using the standard deviation of the children's attitude questionnaire scores by classroom, which is the square root of the variance of the scores, as the dependent variable, a step-wise regression was computed. There are six variables entered and the multiple correlation coefficient is only significant at the first level. That is, only the first variable entered, which is "smiling", had a great enough percentage of predictability to be significant.
"Smiling" correlated positively with the standard deviation of the children's scores. This means that the greater the number of smiles recorded for a teacher the higher the standard deviation.

The "teacher attitude scores" were entered in on step two. This variable correlated positively with the standard deviation of the children's attitude questionnaire scores.

In step three "eye contact" was added. "Eye contact" correlates negatively with the standard deviation of the children's scores on the attitude measure. Although the last two variables did not add a significant amount of predictability, they did add quite a high percentage of change.

"Maximum use of time" correlates negatively with the dependent variable at hand, which means that the more a teacher uses the time allotted for humanistic education to its fullest the lower is the standard deviation of the children's attitude questionnaire scores.

"Structuring alone places" and the "option to pass", which were added in as steps five and six respectively, both correlate positively with the standard deviation of the children's scores. That is, the teacher who structures alone places and the teacher who allows the option to pass was the teacher whose children's standard deviation scores were the
highest.

The author suggests that, in view of the results of this segment of the exploratory research, further experimentation be conducted on the first three behaviors entered into this step-wise regression. These are "smiling", the "teacher attitude scores", and "eye contact". These variables did add a considerable percentage of predictability, even though only "smiling" added a significant percentage. What the predictability of these variables may mean essentially is that when these behaviors and attitudes are in operation (smiling, positive teacher attitude toward humanistic education, and little eye contact) they produce a higher standard deviation that is more of a variance in children's attitude toward humanistic education according to the scores on the attitude measure used. This suggests that more eye contact, low scores on the teacher attitude measure, and little smiling may produce no growth in the student's attitude.

It is interesting to note that the same three variables were entered as variables one, two, and three respectively when the step-wise regressions were conducted on the mean scores and the standard deviation of the children's attitude questionnaire. These were "smiling", "teacher's scores on the attitude measure", and "eye contact".
This concludes the analysis of the data, analysis of the performed exploratory research, the implications of these effects, as well as a discussion of some of the limitations and recommendations for further experimentation. Chapter VI, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research, will attend to the implications, limitations and recommendations of this study more extensively.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of the findings of the present study, draws conclusions related to these findings, and suggests potentially important implications for teacher training, communication in the classroom, and further research.

Summary

This study was first concerned with the identification and description of some humanistic teacher behaviors which are considered crucial and to which students should be exposed before, and in order that, psychological curriculum be used in the classroom. Secondly, the study was concerned with the development of techniques for systematic observation of these humanistic teacher behaviors. Thirdly, this study examined the correlation between these behaviors and the student's as well as the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education. A total of thirty-three elementary teachers and six hundred and forty-three elementary school children comprised the sample. The particular school system that was chosen for this study was selected because of its Title III project to implement humanistic education. The project is: Curriculum of Affect for Responsive
Education. It is in Montague, Massachusetts, a small rural town in the western part of the state. After much pilot research and searching of the literature in the area of broad categories of humanistic teaching behaviors, as well as specific affective classroom behaviors, the author developed tools to observe teacher behaviors and attitude questionnaires for both students and teachers. In addition to the literature, prominent practitioners and theorists in the field of humanistic education, as well as the teachers and administrators in the Montague School System, were utilized as major sources of information.

Of the thirty-three teachers to whom the attitude questionnaire was given all of them responded. Each of these individuals was observed for the selected behaviors. All of these teachers' class members were given the children's attitude questionnaire. Those children absent at the original administering of the attitude measure were given an opportunity to complete the form at a later date.

Five general hypotheses were generated in Chapter II. These hypotheses are:

There are crucial behaviors which are necessary to build the proper climate in which psychological education can be most effective.

The presence or absence of these crucial behaviors
can be determined by systematic observation.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behaviors and the positiveness of the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a relationship between the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education and the student's attitude toward humanistic education.

There is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behaviors and the student's attitude toward humanistic education.

The behaviors that were selected to be variables in this study were categorized generally as those behaviors that would facilitate the kind of climate that would assure the maximum amount of psychological growth possible in a classroom. More specifically, the behaviors that this experiment is concerned with can be categorized as validating or, according to Evelyn Seiburg (1973), "confirming" behaviors. Seiburg's four categories of confirming behaviors are: Recognizing the other person's existence; Relevancy to other person's communication; Recognizing the person's emotional existence; and Willingness to affiliate. (See Chapter III, page 66) The attitude questionnaire also refers to the philosophy of confirming behavior in its development along with the general philosophy of human-
istic education.

The data was computed to arrive at the correlations that the hypotheses suggest by the use of Pearson's correlation coefficient formula. Exploratory research questions were generated in Chapter V. Multiple correlation procedures were used in the exploratory investigations.

The analysis of the data produced findings that suggest relationships between some specific humanistic teacher behaviors and student/teacher attitudes. The results have several implications that are relevant to teacher training programs for the implementation of humanistic education as well as programs which train individuals to teach other disciplines. There are also implications for further research in the area of humanistic teacher behaviors specific to the behaviors in this study as well as in a general sense.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research

The purpose of the present study and the five general hypotheses was conceived in response to some concerns and issues that the author observed during the implementation of humanistic education in the Montague School System. These issues are not unique to this specific population. In fact, in their efforts to delineate what procedures to
follow in order to assure the maximum amount of success in an affective education program, experts in the field have (in a general sense) referred to components in a teacher training program which would attend to teaching behaviors. (Weinstein, 1973, Shallcross, 1973, Levin, 1973) However, discussion of the conclusions of this study will only refer to the population that specifically participated in this experiment: thirty-three Montague elementary teachers.

Specifically, some of the concerns which arise repeatedly in the implementation of a humanistic education program are: What do teachers need? What criteria does one use to evaluate a teacher's performance? How does one establish norms for working with teachers? (See Chapter I, pp. 24-25) All of these concerns are relevant to the topic of humanistic teaching behaviors. In answer to the question, "What do teachers need?", Levin (1973), Weinstein (1973) and other experts in the field of implementing humanistic education, including the author, have agreed that teachers need to be able to diagnose the climate of the classroom and be in control of basic classroom management. In addition to this element, a teacher must have a commitment to one's self-knowledge as well as special instruction in the processes of affective education and ongoing training in professional growth. Ideally, the
personal and professional growth should be ongoing throughout an individual's involvement in a psychological education program. It is the author's belief that before instruction is given in the processes of affective education certain behavioral prerequisites should be fulfilled. These prerequisites take the form of the teacher behaving in a manner in which one facilitates a humane classroom climate, a well-managed classroom, a classroom where students are recognized, confirmed, acknowledged and endorsed. It is the latter qualitative effects of teacher behavior with which this dissertation is concerned. Through the literature, categorization of verbal and nonverbal behaviors as well as the methodology the researcher used in conjunction with the available research, the author found support for the first hypothesis. This hypothesis reads: There are crucial behaviors which are necessary to build the proper climate in which psychological education can be most effective. The unique way in which this study deals with these categories of behaviors is to narrow down the qualitative effect to be represented by one small behavior. That is, eye contact is one way of expressing that one individual recognizes another. This element of recognition is critical to confirming communication which has been established as being an indispensible part of humanistic education. The end product of opera-
tionalizing broad categories of behavior is that the resulting observable behavior can be used in a training program as a skill to adapt to one's style.

The second hypothesis generated in this study is: That the presence or absence of these crucial behaviors can be determined by systematic observation. This hypothesis was substantiated in two ways: first by the process of operationalizing "humanistic teaching behavior" to the point that its attributes appeared to be observable; second by actually observing these elements preceded by field testing, refining and finally developing observation instruments.

The final three hypotheses regarding the relationship of the observable behaviors and the teacher's as well as the student's attitudes were investigation through the data collection procedure. Each behavior was correlated with the student attitude scores and the teacher attitude scores. The teacher attitude scores were correlated with their respective classroom's mean scores on the student attitude measure. In the exploratory research the behaviors as a set were correlated with the teacher attitude scores. Also the behaviors and the teacher attitude scores as a set were correlated with the mean scores and the standard deviation of the student attitude measure. The following are the
results of these computations as well as some general conclusions relevant to the humanistic education program in Montague and applicable to other affective teacher training programs.

The following is a correlation matrix for the observable behaviors, teacher attitude scores, mean scores of the student attitude questionnaire, and the standard deviation of the student attitude questionnaire.

The third hypothesis, there is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behaviors and the positiveness of the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education, is the next hypothesis to be discussed. The data revealed that the observable behaviors correlated significantly with the scores of the teacher attitude questionnaire only in the case of eye contact where it is .95 percent sure that R is not zero due to the correlation coefficient being .36589. The significant correlation coefficient for n=33 at .05 is .335. The teachers' maximum use of time does not correlate significantly with the teacher attitude scores. However, the correlation is .23389. The other three observable behaviors, "smiling", "option to pass", and "structures alone places", had low correlations. "Smiling" correlated negatively with the teacher attitude scores; "option to pass" and "structures
### TOTAL CORRELATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 eye contact</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 smiling</td>
<td>0.08995</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 option structures to pass</td>
<td>0.26303</td>
<td>0.29226</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 places</td>
<td>0.15333</td>
<td>0.40263</td>
<td>0.32504</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5 use of time</td>
<td>0.39107</td>
<td>0.19117</td>
<td>0.28572</td>
<td>0.40379</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attit.</td>
<td>0.36589</td>
<td>-0.07666</td>
<td>0.09977</td>
<td>0.04650</td>
<td>0.23389</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means Stud.</td>
<td>-0.11290</td>
<td>0.34562</td>
<td>0.20670</td>
<td>-0.07798</td>
<td>0.06138</td>
<td>0.26151</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand. Dev. Stud.</td>
<td>-0.03722</td>
<td>0.28222</td>
<td>0.13313</td>
<td>0.15603</td>
<td>-0.04492</td>
<td>0.26090</td>
<td>-0.07458</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alone places" had a positive correlation.

This group of teachers contributed to the bank of research on the nonverbal behavior "eye contact" in such a way as to restate the findings of many other studies. Eye contact and attitude have correlated similarly in other experiments. The author has previously established the value of developing the skill of good eye contact as a teacher. There are some other conclusions about the relationship in the series described above. Perhaps, if the attitude questionnaire had had more variance, there may have been more significant correlations between the variables in the study and the attitude scores. It must be kept in mind, in addition, that the attitude scores alone are pencil and paper representations of the teacher's attitude toward humanistic education. This fact adds considerable stock to the author's selection of the present research design, a design that combines a paper and pencil test with direct observation.

Some of the strengths of the attitude measure are that it afforded the research a way to gather high risk information in an anonymous, relatively low-pressured manner. The statements on the questionnaire were a compilation of the results from several people in the field who prioritized points of an important philosophical base
from which a teacher should seek personal and professional growth. The limitations of the variables observed are that "option to pass", "structures alone places", and "maximum use of time" could have also had more variance. In addition, each teacher could have been observed by more than one observer and the results rated; or, each teacher could have been observed more times by the same observer.

The fact that "maximum use of time" correlated quite high with the teacher attitude scores indicates that the teacher does teach humanistic education for an amount of time that coincides with how one feels about its importance, etc. On the other hand, this result could indicate that the teachers could easily have answered the questionnaire according to how they assumed the author would approve, and when they were observed, taught humanistic education for the full amount of time allotted.

The interesting thing here is that, when referring to the correlation matrix, it can be seen that "smiling" correlates significantly with student mean attitude scores (.34562), and teacher attitude scores correlate not significantly but at .26151 with student mean scores. These results are particularly interesting because of the difference in perception of the sender and the receiver of the nonverbal behaviors in this study as to their signifi-
cance in creating a positive climate in the classroom. The computations verify a significant connection between "eye contact" and teacher attitude scores for this population as well as a connection between "smiling" and means of student attitude scores. A possible connection between teacher attitude scores and means of student attitude scores is made. This suggests to the author that there is a connection between "smiling" and teacher attitude as it is perceived by the sender, and is therefore a worthwhile recognition skill for a teacher to develop.

Again, in relation to the fifth hypothesis, there is a relationship between the presence of humanistic teacher behavior and the students' attitude toward humanistic education, the "option to pass" did not correlate significantly but it was not near zero at .20670. This indicates to the author that there is a pattern of behaviors that may be significant to the receiver. That is, behaviors that are in the categories of "recognizing a person's emotional existence" (Seiburg, 1973), may be highly contributory to children's positive attitude toward humanistic education. The author suggests further research in this area to examine this hypothesis more conclusively. However, given this data and the support of the literature regarding this category of behavior, it may be worthwhile to incorporate
these "recognizing the emotional existence" behavioral skills into a teacher training program.

The fourth hypothesis is: There is a relationship between teacher attitude toward humanistic education and student attitude toward humanistic education. This correlation was determined by the scores of the teacher attitude measure and the mean scores of the student attitude measure. The correlation is not significant but certainly not near zero at .26151. One implication of this correlation is that it coincides with the literature's case for the attitude of students being influenced by the attitude of teachers, and somewhat validates this study. At the same time it suggests that the attitude measure used in this experiment does need some improvement. The relevancy of the statements on the questionnaire, its brevity, its clarity, as well as its meeting several other criteria for questionnaire development (see Chapter IV) suggest that, with some alteration, this attitude measure may be quite useful.

A specific analysis of the exploratory research conducted in this study is in Chapter V. The following is a brief summary of the findings. Specifically, the nonverbal gestural behaviors, "eye contact" and "smiling" were the first behaviors to be entered in the step-wise regression
in each of the sets as they were computed to test for the way they correlated with the independent variables. These independent variables were teacher attitude scores, the mean scores of student attitude, and the standard deviation of the student attitude scores. This suggests that these behaviors are valuable skills to build into a teacher training program. Also, these skills, as representative of the broad categories of "recognition of existence" and "recognition of the emotional existence", perhaps could be expanded according to the particular style of the teacher. The author recommends that further research be conducted on the behaviors that added a percentage of predictability to the particular independent variables. There was a significant amount of predictability added to the independent variable of the teacher attitude scores up to the first level. "Eye contact" was the first entry. However, "smiling" and "maximum use of time" did add some predictability, even though it was not significant. This aspect of the exploratory research lends more toward the author's previous "soft" conclusions with regard to the "smiling" variable. Soft conclusions are conclusions made, not on the basis of hard facts, but on scholarly speculation based on experience in the field.

With the mean scores of the student attitude question-
naire as the dependent variable, all the behaviors added a significant amount of predictability. Therefore, as above, the author recommends further experimentation of these relationships. The order of entry was: smiling, teacher attitude scores, eye contact, structuring alone places, option to pass, and maximum use of time.

With the standard deviation of the student attitude measure as the independent variable, there was a significant percentage of predictability added only up to the first level. "Smiling" was entered first. It is recommended that further experimentation be conducted on the first three dependent variables added, which includes "smiling" as well as teacher attitude scores and "eye contact". It is interesting to note an almost identical entry order of these dependent variables to the order entered when the mean scores was the independent variable. The last three variables were "maximum use of time", "structures alone places" and "option to pass" respectively.

As a result of the planned and exploratory research there are many implications for further research. Some of these implications have been outlined in Chapter V and referred to in the final chapter in summarizing the results of the research conducted in this study. The author specifically recommends the following additional studies as a
result of the outcomes of this dissertation. Further research is needed in the area of nonverbal behaviors with specific regard to the varying interpretations of these messages of the receiver as well as the sender. Further investigation may have valuable implications for matching students and teachers in environments which maximize both psychological and academic growth for the child. (See PONS Test, Chapter I)

The research repeatedly indicated the importance of the behaviors categorized as "recognizing the emotional existence" of a person in influencing the student scores on their attitude questionnaire. Additional researching of the influencing of a validating, acknowledging, endorsing climate on the learner is needed. Information on this kind of climate would also be valuable in terms of its influence on the teacher. Also, the author recommends further operationalization of the "recognition of emotional existence" category of Evelyn Seiburg's elements of a confirming relationship as it applies to the classroom. The operationalization and further research of the other elements of a confirming environment, as Seiburg defines it, applied to the classroom, would be useful.

This dissertation began with the argument that the field of humanistic education needed improved measurement techniques. The author recommends observation of teacher
behaviors as a valid and useful method of assessing a humanistic teacher, classroom or training program. The following are capsulized responses by teachers who participated in the Philadelphia Affective Education Program regarding the observation component of their program.

Teachers praised the help they received from the trainers during observation in:
1) implementing specific new techniques,
2) and becoming more aware of their specific teaching behaviors and their effects on students.
(Evaluation of the Philadelphia Affective Program, 1972-73)

Classroom observation provides opportunity for the trainers: to operate with the same awareness of feelings and use of experiential techniques as they expect of the teachers; to provide continuity and follow-up support. (Philadelphia Affective Program Evaluation, 1972-73)

The most useful aspect was the implementation of the observation component of the program which helped teachers develop a greater repertoire of classroom behaviors consistent with program goals. If behaviors consistent with program goals are not in effect in the classroom, no significant effects on students can be expected. (Philadelphia Affective Program Evaluation, 1972-73)

It is the author's contention that, in order to build in the necessary components of a teacher training program in humanistic education, experts in the field must build a behavioral component into their training programs. It is in this manner that the issues of meeting teachers' needs, establishing norms for working in the classroom, and evaluating teacher performances, as described in Chapter I, will be attended. Classroom management, the ability to respond to student behavior, resolve conflicts, form boundaries and
facilitate confirming relationships in a classroom is the recommended order of objectives for a teacher training program. Behavioral skills need to be practiced to meet these objectives. When a teacher has been evaluated favorably in these areas, then professional and theoretical training is the next step for that individual. This professional training in affective curriculum should be administered with the teacher's level of development in each of the areas of classroom management, humane climate, and readiness to grow personally kept in perspective by the trainers.

The author strongly suggests that the observation-feedback-contract format be used to observe humanistic teaching behaviors. In other words, teachers who are being observed should be in agreement of what the criteria for being considered a humanistic teacher are. In operationalizing humanistic teaching behavior the issue of teachers allowing children to have a voice in rule making, etc., was continually brought up. The issue of a teacher having clear expectations of the children was also considered important. In the comments by the Philadelphia teachers they explicitly state that the trainers have continual opportunities to model the humanistic behaviors that are ideal objectives for behavioral development in the classroom. If the trainers are not the evaluators of the program, the
evaluators should participate in a process for learning a validating, constructive observation-feedback-contract format. The following observation sheets were developed cooperatively by individual trainers and the teachers they were in charge of in the Philadelphia Affective Education Program. These are examples of observation instruments that have been successfully used.

Finally, this study began with the assumption that, in order to assure the maximum amount of psychological growth in the classroom with the use of humanistic education curriculum, it is first necessary to develop a climate which recognizes, acknowledges, endorses, and validates individuals. It was further assumed that certain humanistic teaching behaviors could be developed to enhance a teacher's facilitation of such a climate. It is hoped that the present investigation will result in some contribution to the development of positive classroom climates and positive attitudes toward humanistic education and that the data will be useful to practitioners and theorists in the field. Lastly, it is hoped that further research will be stimulated by this study which is much needed in the area of humanistic education to substantiate its results, to provide more of an understanding of appropriate application, and to improve its techniques.
1. What did the teacher want you to observe specifically?

2. What specific behaviors did you notice in relation to the teacher's concerns?

3. How, when and where did you give the teacher feedback? Describe the feedback you gave that related to the teacher's concerns. What did you say?

4. What other feedback did you give, if any?

5. What feedback, if any, did you withhold?

6. How did the teacher respond to your feedback?

7. How did you and/or the teacher decide to follow up on the visit? What goals or plans did you make? What will the teacher be working on between now and next time?

TO BE FILLED OUT BY THE TEACHER VISITED:

In your view, was the feedback provided by the visitor:

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not usable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Record factual data
   a. name, date, time, type of class, etc.
   b. activity observed
   c. behavior or skill teacher is working on

2. Positive and negative behaviors observed relating to:
   a. teacher
   b. teacher/student interactions
   c. student/student interactions
   d. other feeling-producing phenomena (seating, etc.)

3. Feedback procedure
   a. What feedback did you give?
   b. How you gave it and how it was received.
   c. What, if anything, was withheld at this time?

4. Agreement/contract
   What will the teacher be working on between now and next time?
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