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Abstract

The dissertation which follows was a study designed to provide means for final evaluation of the author's administrative performance as a change agent in a secondary school setting. The author tested various aspects of contemporary leadership and change theory in action and thereby attempted to further the development of knowledge in an action situation. A seminar was developed and offered on a voluntary basis to fourteen secondary school teachers.

Participants in the project kept journals, as did the writer. These materials constitute the basic data of the study and are presented in Chapters II through VI.

The fact that teachers began, of their volition, to use the ideas learned in the seminars in their respective classes was a substantially significant event given the writer's stated purposes. It was noteworthy that the classroom changes which occurred after each of the seminars seemed to happen in an immediate, natural and sequential way.

As a consequence of the author's intervention, the ongoing classroom experiences of children in the school were affected by the knowledge, attitude and behavior changes of their teachers. These changes were particularly significant when considered as the results of a participative change paradigm (described in Chapter I).

The author experienced an unexpected problem resulting from
a role conflict between his seminar leader position and his vice-
principal position in the school in which the project took place.
Since the author was called upon to initiate change using unilat-
eral administrative fiat, the coercive change paradigm (described
in Chapter II) intruded itself in a way that could not have been
anticipated in the earliest weeks of the project. These problems
are discussed in the concluding chapter of the dissertation.

The author has attempted to deal with three situational
problems which he has labelled isolation, insensitivity, and lack
of curriculum flexibility. The suggestion that these problems
must be carefully reckoned with by any school interventionist is
advanced in the final chapter.

The steps taken in the project, the foci maintained, and the
objectives sought were particularly appropriate to the author's
personality and administrative style and the reader is cautioned
to keep these facts in mind when attempting to apply the author's
project to his or her own organizational setting.
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CHAPTER I
Background of the Problem

All the evidence that we have (mostly clinical evidence, but already some other kinds of research evidence) indicates that it is reasonable to assume in practically every human being, and certainly in almost every newborn baby, that there is an active will toward health, an impulse toward growth, or toward the actualization of human potentialities. But at once we are confronted with the very saddening realization that so few people make it ... This is our greatest paradox ... I remember an old textbook of abnormal psychology ... The lower half was a picture of a line of babies, pink, sweet, delightful, innocent, lovable. Above that was a picture of a lot of passengers in a subway train, glum, gray, sullen, sour. The caption underneath was very simply, "What happened?" This is what I'm talking about. (McGregor, 30, p. 25-26)

The problem of individual human growth has been, in one form or another, of central concern to many theorists in fields which are either human-oriented (such as education, anthropology, and psychiatry) or whose practice involves a prolonged manipulation of human beings (such as business administration or public policy). For whether the focus has been on the nature of individual growth (e.g. the works of Dewey, Kohlberg, Mead, Maslow, Piaget, Bruner), on the cultivation of individual growth (e.g. the works of Illich, Postman, Weingartner, Skinner, Rogers, Argyris, McGregor), or the impediment to growth (e.g. the works of Holt, Silberman, Reisman, Farber), it is generally agreed that the level of individual growth and development within the members of a society is a necessary condition for potential growth and development within every larger unit of that society. That is to say that an organization cannot attain a higher level of development than has already been attained by the individuals who are members of that
As Robert Townsend sees it:

There's nothing fundamentally wrong with our country except that the leaders of all our major organizations are operating on the wrong assumptions. We're in this mess because for the last two hundred years we've been using the Catholic Church and Caesar's legions as our patterns for creating organizations. And until the last forty or fifty years it made sense. The average churchgoer, soldier, and factory worker was uneducated and dependent on orders from above. And authority carried considerable weight because disobedience brought the death penalty or its equivalent.*

*Dismissal and blacklisting brought starvation to an industrial worker; excommunication brought the spiritual equivalent of death to a churchgoer. (62, p. 119)

What are the assumptions which leaders use in our present system relative to human behavior? Douglas McGregor calls them the Theory X assumptions. Let's look at them:

1) The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

2) Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

3) The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all. (32, p. 33-34)

In order to create a parallel set of assumptions for our schools one needs to adapt Theory X by substituting the word "child" for "human being" and "school and schoolwork" for "work."

That this organizational theory is applicable to educational organizations as well as others is not surprising since, after all,
the school is obviously an organization, in fact, one of the most dominant ones in our society.

McGregor offers a set of assumptions he calls Theory Y which may hopefully serve someday as the archetypical assumptions of future organizations. They are the following:

1) The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2) External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3) Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. (The most significant of such rewards, e.g., the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of effort directed toward organizational objectives.)

4) The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. (Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics.)

5) The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

6) Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized. (32, p. 47-48)

Using the words "children," "school," "schoolwork," and "educational" in place of "man," "work," "organizational," and "industrial" gives one a Theory Y for schools of the future.

We will assume at this point that the need for change in our
schools has been well established. In addition to the implications of the preceding example we refer the reader to the writings of Silberman, Holt, Postman, Weingarten, Kozol, Schrank, Goodman, and Toffler. And this list would only serve for openers. Illich, Freire, Yette, and Cleaver could add some more insight. The film "High School" by Fred Wiseman would add a cinema verité frame of reference. A day or two observing almost any public school should erase any lingering doubts.

It has even been seriously proposed by several highly regarded authors (Holt, Goodman, Freire, Illich) that on the basis of what we know in concrete, replicable terms about intelligence, human development, learning, acquisition of information, problem solving, etc., we could never justify having any schools. The author doesn't believe in this nihilistic approach to problem solving. For that reason, he chooses to attempt a strategy of change in schools which will not destroy or impair the workings of the school.
Approach to the Study

As a practitioner the author has long favored active participation in the life of schools, departments of education, and business organizations, not only to assume maximum commitment to organization goals, but more importantly to facilitate organizational growth, renewal, and change.

In view of the above it was natural, then, to take advantage of the project dissertation option at the University of Massachusetts, School of Education. Drs. Flight, Blanchard, and Rudiger agreed that the Harvard project model designed for doctoral candidates in education administration at Harvard, and which Dr. Rudiger had followed in his own work at Harvard University, would serve as an exemplary model for the author to follow. The following purposes adopted from a Harvard statement relative to the project dissertation model were utilized by the candidate and his Dissertation Committee:

1. To provide means for final evaluation of the candidate's administrative performance in dealing with a significant educational problem.

2. To provide a setting for the analysis of educational and administrative problems in an organizational context which will allow the candidate to test theory in action and to further the development of knowledge in an action situation.¹

¹Copies of the statement called "Statement Concerning Administration 400 Project" are available from Dr. Walter McCann, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts. "Administration 400 Project" is the label used to refer to the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Administrative Career Program, project dissertation.
As further elaborated in the previously cited statement, the expectations for the candidate were as follows:

The candidate is expected to map an approach to the development of a project, to define pertinent study and inquiry, to consider and undertake other needed preparation, to act, and to review and evaluate these activities. The project should be concerned with the solution of a significant problem related to the needs of a particular institution and to education in general.²

The theoretical basis upon which the author proceeded to set up a group and to work with the group to induce change is described by Hersey and Blanchard as the Participative Change Cycle and is illustrated in Figure 1.

²Ibid.
The participant group, or simply, the participants, exhibit changes in attitude and behavior, discernible within the data recorded by the participants, which are the results of an imparting of knowledge in a seminar experience under the tutelage of the candidate. In this way the candidate is able to demonstrate his own impact in utilizing personal power (as opposed to position power) to bring teachers through the first three levels of the participative change cycle: knowledge, attitude, and individual behavior change.

What we have looked at are the behaviors of participants who are teachers and whose relevant behavior changes are classroom oriented. There is some evidence that in addition to knowledge, attitude, and individual behavior changes, some of the effect of the candidate's work has contributed to group behavior changes. What we find inappropriate to the particular set of circumstances under which this project takes place is the change cycle Hersey and Blanchard refer to as coercive. It is illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Coercive Change](15, p. 160)
As is apparent in this illustration, change is initiated in an expedient manner by a person with ultimate authority. Furthermore, it is not necessary that the attitudes of those whose behaviors are changed be commensurate with the changes. The reason for disagreement over the need for such change may be the result of a lack of knowledge necessary to this understanding.
The Research Problem and Objectives

The problem of the dissertation was to effectuate an intervention into a social system (namely the school) through the creation of a temporary, voluntary, social system (namely a group of participants within a seminar setting who agreed to work within the project because it was meeting their needs).

More specifically, in addressing the research problem as stated above, the study sought the following outcomes:

1. Development of a model whereby teachers expect to receive advice and help from their peers and their supervisors without anticipating failure and/or a negative evaluation.

2. Development of a model which encourages a self-renewing change process as illustrated in Figure 3 on the next page.

As the reader will note starting at the top of the flow chart (Fig. 3) we begin where the participants are, with the present assumptions, goals and objectives that underly their work. We begin to address the need for change by undertaking a diagnosis of what's happening. The problems thus uncovered through the diagnosis then lead to the identification of a whole set or range of problem solutions, one with an inherent probability of success and one or more inherent consequences. One or more of these solutions become the basis for a plan. Once the plan is implemented a new set of assumptions, goals, and objectives becomes evident. As these are fed back into the original system and evaluated, the loop is complete and the cycle can begin to repeat itself; it is a self-renewing process.
FIGURE 3
The Organization Setting

There are three problems in most school settings which were recognized by the candidate and which he attempted to account for and, in part, deal with throughout the implementation of the project.

The first problem was designated isolation. The administrator and the teacher are often unable to develop any more of a relationship than that which can thrive in the morning bulletin, monthly calendar, half-hour faculty meetings, and three or four individual conferences a year.

In the typical American school, as Seymour B. Sarason, director of Yale University's Psycho-Educational Clinic, has documented, teachers are alone with their problems in the classroom. They are not given, and normally do not expect to receive, any help or advice from their principals or other supervisors; nor does the culture of the school encourage teachers to discuss their educational problems with one another except on the most superficial level. As a result, a teacher generally, and the beginning teacher in particular, "tends to anticipate failure, is plagued by all kinds of doubts, fearful of a negative evaluation, thankful for her relative isolation due to fleeting and infrequent visitations by administrative superiors, and yet acutely aware that she needs and wants help, guidance and support uncomplicated by the implied threat of a negative evaluation." Only someone who has no evaluative function, and who is not competing with or threatening the teachers in any way can break through the teacher's loneliness and isolation. (49a quoted in 54, p. 321)

The second problem might be called insensitivity in the classroom. The solution requires that teachers and administrators be aware of the needs of their students, develop an attitudinal response and (most importantly) an affirmative plan of action to respond to the sociological climate in their classrooms and to adjust their classroom processes accordingly.
The results of ten years of research in the schools ... give major support to the desirability of vigorous efforts on the part of the school and the teacher to understand and improve the mental health and learning climate of the classroom. The research has found that the mentally healthy student does learn academic subject matter better. Teachers who can diagnose and improve the learning atmosphere of their classroom can thereby be better teachers. Accordingly, the teaching profession would be wise to extend its understanding of classroom social procedures and the techniques for dealing with them, while at the same time exercising caution so that the use of these techniques is not extended beyond the teacher's competence and the limits of the educational environment.

(Robert Fox et al, 12, p. vii in preface)

The third organizational constraint which had to be reckoned with is the lack of curriculum flexibility. Teachers had to be able to modify their course content objectives if it were to be possible to solve problems as they were diagnosed.

It is important to be aware of the situational variables which are unique to the district in which the project took place. The towns of Charlton and Dudley are located in the southern part of Worcester County in Central Massachusetts. 1970 census figures list a total of 4,654 residents in Charlton and 8,023 in Dudley. Although once rural farming towns, today Charlton and Dudley are fast becoming residential communities.

On August 1, 1972 the newly formed Regional District Committee assumed jurisdiction over the schools of Dudley and Charlton. Having formed a unified regional school district serving almost 3,000 pupils, the new district opened a new high school (grades 7-12) accommodating up to 1500 pupils. The old Charlton High School and Dudley Junior High were eliminated, and the high school
students of Dudley were no longer "tuitioned out" to neighboring towns or to a private academy in Woodstock, Connecticut.

In the five years prior to regionalization, Charlton High School had five principals (the author was the last one). In Dudley, where 55% of the staff had been teaching 10 years or longer, field trips could not be taken without prior approval of the school committee. In Charlton, the school committee had to approve all activities such as school dances, and school plays. The main assumptions of the leaders in both towns seemed to follow McGregor's Theory X, namely, that teachers are to be directed, controlled, persuaded, rewarded and punished in order to accomplish anything.\(^1\)

On July 1, 1973 the candidate was appointed Assistant Principal of the Shepherd Hill Regional High School in Dudley, Massachusetts.

As Assistant Principal, the candidate assisted the principal as administrator and educational leader of the school. He was involved in all aspects of the school and the program, working with the staff, students, and the community.

Since the Shepherd Hill School began its first year of operation in September of 1973, the candidate had major responsibilities in the development of the following: the instructional program, the student handbook and the teacher handbook, duty

\(^1\)For a more extensive review of the history of the Dudley-Charlton schools see "Organization of the Dudley-Charlton Regional School District," unpublished paper written by John F. Canavan, May 1972, University of Massachusetts comprehensive exam.
rosters, the master schedule, the grading and reporting system, the orientation program, the open house program, the school fair, the extra-curricular program, the athletic program, the student government organization, the student-faculty advisory councils, and the self-evaluation committees under the guidelines of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

In short, as the reader can observe, the candidate, the staff and the students of Shepherd Hill Regional High School were quite busy and quite burdened with the enormous task of creating a school environment for 1,500 people to live in. In addition to the obvious jobs which had to be accomplished it should be noted that for all people in the school it was quite a job to learn the names and/or faces of at least 60% of the population, including both students and faculty as quickly as possible.
Strategy or Method of the Study

The project really had its beginnings in the school year prior to September, 1973. It was during that time period that conversations began relative to the conception of an ongoing problem solving seminar which could be organized by the candidate, offer graduate level college credit, and thereby help to establish a supportive, facilitative and provocative relationship between the candidate and the teaching staff.

After many discussions with teachers, the candidate began to consider the forces for and against such a project. Many questions had to be answered: Would the project be seen as a threat to the organization by the central administration? How would the candidate limit enrollment without creating stress? Would the district provide a place for the course to meet? Would the Superintendent of Schools approve the course so that teachers could have their tuition reimbursed after successful completion of the course? Would the students in the course be able to "experiment" with their teaching methods? etc.

The method of attack in those early days is rather hard to describe. Let it suffice to say that the candidate was persistent and thorough in an unorganized and unsystematic way. Most of the task was left to whimsey. This must be mentioned so that the reader does not believe that the candidate used a handbook, or, if you will, a cookbook which gives a recipe for organizing such projects.
Possibly the most important process which required the greatest amount of diplomacy and delicacy was the recruitment of participants. It was important to find out if some of the more dynamic and influential members of the staff would be willing to participate in such a project without the author having to "twist arms." When it became apparent that there would be volunteer participants sufficient in number to support the project, the candidate petitioned the Office of Continuing Education for course approval. Consequently, two courses were approved by the Office of Continuing Education at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in March, 1973. Dr. David Flight served as the university liaison and the candidate served as the adjunct instructor for these courses.

In successfully negotiating with the Office of Continuing Education at the University of Massachusetts and thereby acquiring the authority to act as an adjunct instructor, the candidate had completed a major step towards the implementation of his project process. It was then possible for a large sampling of the staff to meet with the candidate in weekly seminars. As students in the courses, faculty members acquired new knowledge and skills and were able to incorporate these in their respective classrooms.

As a seminar leader the candidate was better able to enlist voluntary faculty cooperation in the project. Graduate semester credits available at little or no cost\(^1\) were significant compensa-

\(^1\)The course fees will be reimbursed to tenure teachers and will cost $10 per semester credit to non-tenure teachers. The candidate received no monetary compensation for his work as instructor of the courses.
tion in kind for the teachers. There will be opportunities to transfer credits into degree programs and to move towards additional salary increments under provisions of the collective bargaining agreement with the local school committee. A complete project participant profile can be found in the appendix to the second chapter.

The first seminar was held in the teacher's lounge at Shepherd Hill Regional High School on September 12. Subsequent meetings were conducted weekly at the same location. Meetings began at 7 p.m. and lasted, on the average, until 9:30 or 10:00 p.m. Weekly topics were outlined at the first class and participants were required to maintain a journal which included the following:

1) A summary of reactions to the previous class focusing on content and/or on process.

2) A reaction to the readings which had been assigned for that week.

A list of the first twelve class topics as originally discussed and outlined is displayed in the appendix to the second chapter.

One of the participants, who was somewhat of an expert on the taxonomies of objectives, offered to take over the lecture phase of the seminars on the weeks that behavioral objectives were scheduled to be topics for discussion. Those weeks ultimately became fairly rigorous workshops for the participants and all concerned, including the author, learned how to identify and write exemplary performance and behavioral objectives. In addition, the candidate was able to achieve a fuller perspective of the social
climate of the seminars by becoming one of the participants for a short time rather than the seminar leader.

The candidate evaluated his work based upon his performance with respect to the general problem and the research problem and specific objectives, and his ability to respond to the changing conditions of the organizational environment (as discussed fully with the members of his dissertation committee).

The dissertation committee received copies of the candidate's journals which described in part the candidate's actions relative to the analysis, rationale and hypotheses developed in the original project proposal and/or prior journals. The dissertation committee was able to evaluate the candidate's performance in the project on a month-to-month basis through its access to the aforementioned candidate's journals and the following:

1) Access to journals written by the project participants,
2) on-site visitations to observe the candidate in his seminar leadership role,
3) access to questionnaires created by the participant group to fully assess the value of the seminar to the participants, and,
4) access to the taped interviews conducted by the candidate with several participants and with the principal of Shepherd Hill Regional High School.
Outline of the Dissertation

In the chapters which follow, the author describes the progress of the project highlighting his impact on the group and its agenda. The writing is in the first person and represents a very personalized account of what took place in the project at the time it happened. The reader will find a narrative description of what happened interspersed with quotations from the journals of the teachers. From time-to-time the author recapitulates and interprets the data throughout that section.

In the final chapter, the author summarizes and draws conclusions and implications from this study.
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CHAPTER II
CANDIDATE'S JOURNAL
PART ONE

Integrating and Developing the Use of Diagnostic Skills and Problem Solving Techniques for Faculty at the Shepherd Hill Regional High School Dudley, Massachusetts

Perry Berkowitz
November 1973
Week One

It seemed reasonable to me to begin the seminar at ground zero. Ivan Illich's writings provided a good beginning point! As shown in the course outline (see appendix to this chapter) the first topic on the agenda was the question: Why educate? Seminar participants were asked to read "The Alternative to Schooling" by Illich (see footnote). As they read, they listed whatever statements they considered "truths" and contrasted these items to a list called "lies" (including distortions and exaggerations). Eleven participants attended the first session and I asked them to form two leaderless groups to try to arrive at a consensus with respect to their individual lists. I observed both groups and rated their progress on two scales: concern for task and concern for each other. I considered the first session to be an attempt at unfreezing as described by Kurt Lewin.²

The reactions expressed in the journals that week ranged from safe and noncommittal remarks to surprisingly perceptive and candid expressions of either support or rejection of the material presented and/or the method of presentation. I present a few selected examples along with a brief description of each writer.


Diane is teaching mathematics for her third year at the junior high level. She is always eager to be involved in new and innovative programs. She tried having her students work in leaderless groups to develop strategies for using the geoboard. It was interesting to me that she would try the process of the first seminar as a basis for experimentation with one of her classes. (Most of the participants were not able to apply the first seminar to their classes.) Diane reacted to the first seminar as follows:

It is not at all surprising that our groups were not successful (meaning that the tasks assigned based on the Illich readings were not completed). It will take us time to get used to airing our views on educational material and opinions like those included in the article. We must become adjusted to and comfortable in speaking to our fellow workers as if we were back in a classroom learning situation.

Paul teaches social studies courses in the high school. He is the yearbook adviser, attends school functions, and is president of the teachers' association as well as their chief spokesman at the bargaining table. Paul enjoys a good measure of influence on his fellow staff members and his students alike. His opinions are highly regarded by the administration. In my opinion, Paul's journal entries can be rated both honest and candid; in effect, a kind of barometric reading of the influence of the seminar on the thinking of the participants. His first journal entry included the following:

Interesting: this term will do as a method of description for session number one. The term may be applied to the title of the course and to the spread of personalities. A number of thoughts emerged from the first class. Primarily, that few people enjoyed the
reading. It is my belief that the reading was designed to show that process was more important than content. The time factor in regard to the task left something to be desired.

I must admit that I liked the structure used in class in relation to the listing of truths and lies when reading the ambiguous statements. I truly believe that Ivan Illich will never make the best-seller list and if he does reach such notable status, it will say something (negative) about the English speaking world. The most interesting thought, from my point of view, was that too much work and not enough time could easily be applied to many classroom structures. I believe that I must keep this in mind and do my best to remind the members of one particular department (social studies) who believe they are lecturing at William and Mary.

Dennis, a science teacher, reacted strongly to the emphasis placed on process in the classroom:

...by now you probably realize that I am in favor of content. I agree that process may suit the purpose in some areas of study, but certainly never in a discipline study. The concept of process runs into its greatest obstacle when one factor is brought up. Before anyone can become involved in a true sense, in a topic, they must have a certain basic knowledge and mastery of the subject. Then, and only then, can a person undergo the process factor. Without this, there will be much wasted time, dealing with topics unrelated to the tasks or objectives set in a course. In courses where covering a certain unit of material to meet future needs or college entrance tests, this is an unforgivable and totally unnecessary mistake.
Week Two

Just as Ivan Illich's article "The Alternative to Schooling" served to unfreeze participants' thoughts in the first week, "The Student as Nigger"³ by Jerry Farber made sure the ice was broken. I admit I used the article to guarantee that the discussion which ensued would be lively. I was surprised to find that Farber didn't evoke as much negative response as I would have predicted. Two teachers even decided to read it to their classes. Paul comments on this in his journal:

Reality..."Student as Nigger" was read to my American Cultural Heritage class this week. I was "nigger" enough to remove the objectionable language at your suggestion. It would appear that all of us are really "niggers."

I also made use of the truth and fabrication exercise. The problem that developed was that most of the students agreed with the bulk of the article.

Paul's journal further attempted to read the group pulse as shown from the following excerpt:

"Student as Nigger," Wow! The impact of the article still remains with me, even after a week of digestion (and some regurgitation)...Do you study reactions? I think you do. If you noticed, very few found the article to be even remotely obscene. While I was watching for reactions, it also crossed my mind that many people were not really reacting because they don't know how to react in an honest fashion. After all...teachers are niggers too! We all want to please the teacher, and we all know you are a bleeding heart liberal.

Diane highlights some important points in her second journal:

Discussion in our group this week was much freer

---
and easier than the first. As group leader, I did not strongly urge the group to stay on the discussion of truths and falsities. Our conclusion—that anyone in a working class society is a nigger—did not really lead us to solutions but did point us towards a "power syndrome" in which teachers and all workers find themselves.

Points that we felt were obvious in our classrooms relating both to the student and teacher:

1) That students need a specific set of directions for their activities,
2) that students need a degree of regimentation and order,
3) that teachers are slaves to order, forms, and procedures,
4) that society is a slave shop and we are training future slaves to exist in this reality.

Later in her journal Diane reported on her attempts to determine to what degree her students depend on "super explicit directions." She reports:

Students were absolutely dependent on getting directions and a form to follow. There were so many repetitious questions about the form that I wanted that it is doubtful that many would have done the work if they did not get directions from me....In the past week I've noticed, very vividly, how dependent students are on directions. I'm ready to (consider) some alternatives and solutions.

Art is an art teacher at the junior high level. He's had five years of experience. He's enthusiastic about his work and his enthusiasm affects others. As shown in the Project Participant Profile, he coaches the cross-country team. Art adds to the support for the Farber essay:

The overall reaction to this week's seminar was that
a vast improvement was evident in communication and execution of task. "Student as Nigger" was of value to me as a form of shock therapy. As the article violently points out the inequalities and suppressions in the classroom, it forces the reader to evaluate his own attitudes and past performance in the classroom. It is very important that a teacher not impose his opinions or attitudes on his students.... The seminar, as a whole, was much more productive than that of the previous week. Everyone in both groups appeared to become much more involved in both the material and the following discussion.

Joe teaches social studies at the junior high level. He has had three years experience and writes:

The reading, "Student as Nigger" is very applicable to the teaching as I find it. After having read the article and scoffed at it, I observed, the next day, that many of the ideas were very valid, although not all of his complaints apply. I believe that the author would like to see education become a cooperative process rather than a tyrannical one; both student vs. teacher, and teacher vs. administrator.

Mary is a science teacher in the junior high. She has taught for four years. Her second journal entry gives a fair picture of what happened in class the second week. Her major concern is:

Where will it all lead?

I found "The Student as Nigger" very interesting to read, easy to become involved with, and certainly interesting for group discussion. I found the process more successful this week for many reasons:

a) People were more comfortable with each other,

b) Material much easier to discuss,

c) Adequate time was allowed for reading the material, and

d) A group leader was assigned and people were more concerned with completing the task.

In reference to "The Student as Nigger" and others
we have read so far, I can't help but wonder where all this analysis is getting us. Once again the system is knocked (I'm not saying it should never be) and again no alternatives are given. Alternatives are always left up to the individual (what a cop-out). The idealism of these writers is incredible. In education today discipline is too often overruled in favor of the child's self-expression. I feel that we are doing our children a great injustice if we do not teach them self-control, respect for others, and respect for themselves, which almost always does not walk hand-in hand with self-expression. Life is full of disciplines and if we do not discipline our children, they will never discipline themselves.
The Journals: What Do They Show So Far?

First of all, the journals provided a vehicle for two-way communication. I was able to obtain a record of personal reactions to what has or has not been realized at a seminar session and I was able to respond to each participant on an individual basis. When I returned a photocopy of each journal submitted to me, I attempted to respond to those participant statements which, in my opinion, invited response. My comments ranged from supportive phrases to constructive criticism with appropriate explanation or just plain good-natured, stubborn disagreement. What seemed most important was that everything be done with a good sense of humor so that Paul, Diane, Mary, Art and company didn't reduce the high level of candor which characterized their writings, thereby maintaining the value of the journals as evidence of attitudinal and behavioral change.

The journals provided me with data indicating a measure of success in meeting one of my objectives for this intervention: the development of a renewal process for teachers in the project. Looking at the excerpts from the journals presented in this chapter, I could see Paul, Diane, Art and Joe beginning to check their present assumptions, diagnose their classroom environments, and thereby uncover classroom problems. Diane was already explicit about her own readiness to "consider some alternatives and solutions" with respect to student dependence on "regimentation and order." Paul read Student As Nigger to one of his classes and thereby
might be considered on his way towards modifying that environment. Art and Joe (and probably all others in the group) are quite clearly coming to grips with their current assumptions and measuring them against those being voiced in various ways by others in the seminar, by the authors of the readings, and by me.

At this point I began to feel excited and enthusiastic by what was happening in such a short time and by what seemingly would happen if this momentum could be maintained. I found the experience of working with this small group of teachers within a seminar structure enjoyable. The journals, individual conversations and group discussions that I've had to date indicate that my feelings are shared by the participants.
APPENDIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School Role</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
<th>Education Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Assistant Principal (Grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Elementary Schools Reading Coordinator</td>
<td>Develops reading workshops for elementary teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Guidance Counselor Work-Study Coordinator (gr. 11 and 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estelle</td>
<td>Reading teacher (grades 7 and 8), Testing Coordinator (grades 7-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laola</td>
<td>Guidance Counselor (grades 9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>English Teacher (grades 9-12)</td>
<td>Newspaper Advisor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>English Teacher (grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td>Grade 7 Advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher (gr. 9-12)</td>
<td>Yearbook Advisor, President of the Dudley-Charlton Teachers' Assoc.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Social Studies Teacher (grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td>Assists the J. V. soccer coach and the cross-country coach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Math Teacher (grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td>Girls Basketball Coach, Junior Student Council Advisor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Science Teacher (grades 9-12)</td>
<td>Student Council Advisor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Science Teacher (grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>School Role</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
<td>Education Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Business Education Teacher (grades 9-12)</td>
<td>Treasurer of the Dudley-Charlton Teachers' Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Art Teacher (grades 7 and 8)</td>
<td>Cross-country team coach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Week Three

During the first two weeks of the project the participants were alternately challenged and cajoled in an attempt to upset their equilibrium, to unfreeze them, and to set the stage for the work ahead. I felt it was considerably more difficult to challenge faculty members in a seminar of this type than it was, for example, to challenge student teachers in an elementary preservice teacher preparatory program. For one thing, teachers seem more threatened by the writings of education critics than student teachers do. Sometimes it seemed that student teachers felt they were embarking on a crusade to change education, while in-service teachers (even first-year teachers) felt threatened by the attacking forces. Personally, I would have enjoyed the intellectual challenge of seminars focused on the works of Kozol, Silberman, Illich, Holt and Toffler, but the objectives of the project would not be well served by too much time spent attacking the educational establishment.

Accordingly, the third seminar was set up as a goals workshop and, as such, gave the participants something systematic, utilitarian, and comfortable to work on. The class began with a lecture. As I outlined my thoughts on the blackboard, it seemed that the participants were relieved to see me do something so traditional. They all took notes. To me, the whole process seemed funny. I would have found it hard to take notes and be passive
one week after I had been asked to explore the notion that students are slaves. (Well, so much for my sense of what is comical.)

The topic of the lecture was Individualizing Goals. I borrowed from the writings of Ken Blanchard and Paul Hersey and discussed the relationship between the goals of the school and the goals of teachers in the school. More specifically, I tried to point out the need for mutually supportive sets of goals as a requisite for psychologically healthy schools. I used a flow chart format to show the relationship between motive strength, goal-directed activity, goal activity, and the goal itself. I introduced the needs hierarchy developed by Abraham Maslow and cited examples of the effect of this hierarchy on students and teachers in schools. I spent some time elaborating on the concepts of "esteem" and "self-actualization."

The second part of the week's seminar was spent in setting up the contingencies for a mini-workshop on developing goals. I used the strategies I had seen employed at the University of Massachusetts by Dr. Tom Hutchinson. The technique is rather simple and proved to be effective. The steps are outlined as follows:

1) The participants are asked to list the goals they have for themselves as teachers at Shepherd Hill school.

2) The participants are asked to list the activities they commonly engage in when working at the school.

3) Next to each activity the participant indicates which goal he attends to when he engages in that activity.
4) Each goal for which there is no activity listed is analyzed as follows:

a) If the goal is seen as important, then as a corollary to that goal an activity must be developed and, therefore, "developing an activity" which moves towards that goal becomes a new goal.

b) If the goal is seen as unimportant, the goals list can be refined by eliminating that goal.

5) Each activity which is listed for which no goal has been identified is analyzed as follows:

a) The activity is based on a goal which should be stated to make the goals list more complete, or...

b) The activity is non-productive and should therefore be terminated.

Developing strategies for writing goals seemingly made sense to all the participants. Dennis had been very critical the first two weeks. He rejected most of the attacks launched at the education establishment and made it very clear during the seminar discussions and in his journal. His response to the goals workshop seemed a reversal of some of his former positions:

Last week's discussion on goals brought out a few interesting points. I agree with you one hundred percent that oftentimes people start out on a project with many goals. However, when they sit down and think about the goals they strived for over a period of time, they find that they never really came close to achieving them. The reason for this being that many of their actions were non-directed. That is, they had nothing whatsoever to do with attaining the goals. It makes one wonder what the sense in doing something is, if you cannot put it to use towards some mean or objective. This could possibly be one of the greatest enemies to education and why it is failing. We say we are attempting to
educate the youth in America but at the same time it appears that many of our programs do not even come close to meeting this goal. If education is to succeed in the future, I think it must sit down, take a long hard look at itself, and institute programs that will better fit the needs and goals it tries to attain.

The goals written at the workshop revealed the effects of the previous two weeks on the attitudes of the participants. Every set of written goals contained at least one which was indicative of a concern for process. Here are some examples:

1) Display more patience with students.

2) Try to better understand that my subject is not the most important one the students have.

3) To have more informal talks about students' observations concerning class and subject matter.

4) To have an atmosphere of freedom of thought by giving the student a chance to talk about his feelings for school.

When these goals were revealed and shared, it became apparent that participants were looking at their classroom behaviors from a new perspective. They were publicly affirming an apparently new value. It is astounding when one considers how unusual it was for the participants to be asked by anyone to state, analyze, and evaluate their goals. Almost one hundred years of total teaching experience are represented collectively by the teachers and administrators in the seminar and not one of us (I include myself) had ever been asked by our respective superiors to consider enumerating our goals for an ensuing school year.
Week Four and Five

John took over as seminar leader for two weeks. He did an excellent job presenting as much information as he thought the participants could handle in that amount of time. His topic was writing performance objectives. John is the elementary school reading resource teacher for the district. He is a self-taught needs assessor, objectives writer, and grantsmanship specialist. He disclosed some of the problems he had to solve in order to meet the stringent requirements of the Massachusetts Department of Education when considering E. S. E. A. Title I grants. The department insisted that he state his primary and secondary objectives in behavioral terms.

John's employment and his desire to offer an innovative and exciting remedial reading program in the summer of '72 were just two of the motivators which thrust him headfirst into the grantsmanship game. His willingness to share these experiences and his expert guidance over some of the pitfalls he had faced in trying to assess needs and develop goals and objectives helped to make these two weeks of the project very interesting.

One of the main arguments advanced during the workshop was that students should always know in nonambiguous terms exactly what is expected of them. As it is, a student usually is expected to guess what is on a teacher's mind, and unless teachers provide crystal balls, they should be compelled to provide clear statements of the expected performance criteria.
John heeded this mandate and did in fact "practice what he preached." He presented the participants with a list of three instructional objectives for the two week workshop. They are:

1) The learner is to develop knowledge of the five important parts of a specific objective and will demonstrate this knowledge by being able to employ them in constructing a performance objective under the guidance of the instructor.

2) The learner is to develop an understanding of preparing specific objectives and will be able to pick out from a given list of ten objectives those objectives which meet the criteria of a good objective, with no more than three errors.

3) The learner is to develop skill in writing specific objectives and will be able to write three specific objectives in one-half hour without errors.

In addition to fulfilling the objectives as shown, John covered quite a bit of additional ground in the workshop. He presented all the components of an elaborate systems approach for the improvement of instruction through the use of objectives. The system was presented in three stages: planning, evaluation, and modification. Planning was presented as a set of processes including: goal formulation, needs assessment, prioritization, and the selection, classification, analysis, and specification of performance objectives. Benjamin Bloom and D. R. Krathwohl's respective taxonomies for classifying objectives in the cognitive and affective domains were offered as paradigms. Behavioral objectives were categorized by listing subsets: performance objectives, program objectives, and instructional objectives. As one participant put it:

We worked so hard and covered so much ground in the past three weeks that I feel as if I've successfully
completed an entire course in developing goals and objectives to improve classroom teaching.

As a finishing touch John decided to develop program objectives for himself for the year and to present these to the participants.

During the three-week goals-objectives workshop meetings, group discussion was used as the primary means of obtaining feedback from the participants relative to the tasks they were being asked to complete. Journals weren't required because of the substantial amount of homework. As a consequence of this decision, the following paragraph represents an attempt at assessment based on my observations as a temporary group participant.

The most significant change which apparently took place during the three-week goals-objectives seminar was a change in attitude on the part of the participants towards the entire process. There seemed to be a tremendous amount of resistance to the notion that teachers ought to restructure their lessons so that students could receive the benefit derived from having a precise knowledge of what is expected of them. At the outset there was an undercurrent of resistance to the process. One participant said, "What value is all this work going to be?" He elaborated further and made it clear that he couldn't see how a teacher could ever find the time to develop instructional objectives for all his lessons. Nevertheless, by the end of the three weeks, the participants seemed more willing to accept the notion that there was some value in learning the skills necessary to writing instructional objectives in behavioral terms and, although it would be time-consuming, this
process could be of use in preparing lessons and measuring student performance.
Week Six

The sixth week of the project marked the beginning of substantive commitment on the part of the participants to meeting the challenges of the first five weeks. Half of the participants began to initiate processes which were learned in the seminars, all on a voluntary basis. Several of the more enthusiastic teachers in the group began to share their ideas with other teachers in the school who were not members of the project group.

The topic of the sixth seminar was Clarifying Communication. I brought a poster to class which read: "I know that you believe you understand what you think I said, But, I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant." The poster served as a catalyst for the lecture, discussion, and simulation which followed:

The lecture covered three types of communication: one-way, one-way with feedback, and transactional. The point made was that the only way to transmit information which is fully satisfactory, laudatory, and efficient is the two-way or transactional mode. It is a participative structure which guarantees that each individual is involved, and that each individual can actively initiate a message. It is a process wherein active listening takes place. A summary of the skills which are necessary to implement transactional communication was outlined in the following manner:

A) Participants must be able to state thoughts and feelings clearly.

B) Each participant is capable of reading the others' nonverbal cues.
C) Participants employ the tools needed to guarantee that the message received is the one intended. For example:

1) paraphrasing - checking the others' meanings
2) perception checking - checking others' feelings
3) describing others' behaviors in nonattributive and nonevaluative terms
4) owning up to one's feelings

Luft's Johari Awareness Model was described showing the four quadrants among which behavior can be distributed:

A) Open - that about me known by me and by others
B) Blind - that about me not known by me and known by others (requires feedback to become known)
C) Hidden - that about me known by me and not by others (requires disclosures to become open)
D) Unknown - that about me known to no one (the exclusive domain of the psychoanalyst)

It was suggested that transactional communication can be facilitated by increasing the open quadrant.

The simulation used that week in the course (see the description which follows) was repeated in many of the participants' classes. There was no cue from me indicating that this should happen. The participants reported in their journals (each without the knowledge that any other participant was doing the same) that the simulation used in the course not only demonstrated a need to him, but also could be used to demonstrate the same need to their students.
The following is a description of the simulation used in the one-way and two-way communication exercises:

One member of the group is chosen to be the communication sender. The others are receivers. The sender is given two geometric patterns of rectangles. One pattern is presented to the receivers in a one-way fashion; the other is given by two-way interaction. During both communications the sender sits with his back to the receivers so that facial cues and hand movements do not influence the communication. The receivers are asked to draw the patterns as accurately as possible. During one-way communication, they can ask no questions and must remain silent. In two-way communication, on the other hand, the receivers are encouraged to break in any time to raise questions and to interact verbally with the sender.  

The results of the simulation were noteworthy. A small statistical analysis showed that two-way communication increases accuracy, takes more time, and increases frustration levels for the sender.

Three of the journal entries are included in the appendix to this report, in full. They serve as hallmarks of the kinds of things that the candidate intuited (in the original proposal) would happen if this project were to be considered a success. These participants are in fact modifying their course content in

---

a fashion consistent with the data which they are receiving. The journal entries of Mary, Karen and Art show willingness to attempt new strategies in their classrooms to solve problems that might not have been recognized as such without the seminars. Other participants have given testimony to the fact that they, too, are doing things differently as a result of the influence of this project.

Paul reports:

Many times I find myself involved in a directive type of class communication. It has been my objective this week to cease one-way feedback and begin the process of more two-way communication. The development of the process has been difficult at best since most of the students have been brainwashed into thinking that the directive approach is the only one in existence. What we must all do is encourage students to talk back and question the transmitted idea, not only in the classroom, but in their everyday lives.

Active listening, two-way communication, how difficult it is to attain when you love to hear yourself talk. My great downfall must be my inability to shut my mouth—in the classroom and everywhere else.

And then Dennis wrote:

The simulation game which was played with the rectangles drawn in different positions was quite interesting in that it proved the point it was setting out to prove. It's a lot easier to accomplish a task when people are allowed to converse. The results showed that success was much higher on the second trial.

In class we tried something similar to this. A lab was given to classes A and B. Class A received the written instructions and a period was taken to go through them and explain them. Class B was given the instructions with no additional explanation and no discussion. The results showed Class A finished the lab in one day and scored better, while Class B needed two days to complete the lab, and did not fare so well.
Week Seven

The topic for the seventh week of the project was Uncovering and Working with Conflicts. Conflict in schools, as in any complex organization, must be viewed as a natural phenomenon to be uncovered, managed, and resolved. The pragmatist realizes that conflict resolution is not an absolute state, but rather a relative state. The important consideration for school people is that conflicts which are not brought into the open and dealt with often lead to destructive tensions, poor morale, exaggeration of the roots of a problem—in short, mountains where once stood molehills.

Whether in speaking of an organization we mean a classroom or an entire school, we must realize that organizations consist of people acting and interacting with each other in ways based upon their perceptions of their role requirements. In the rapidly changing environment of today's schools, the continuously evolving role requirements demand adaptive and flexible behaviors from each individual. A skill in understanding the feelings, thoughts, and role requirements of the other person is required of each person in the classroom, student and teacher alike.

Role playing is a method of instruction that meets these needs. Individuals take on the roles of other people and act out the others' feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. It is a method whereby role conflicts can be surfaced, recognized, and thereby managed and resolved.
The simulation I used to involve participants in role playing experience was developed by Harvey Matte, Professor of Education at Long Island University. The game is marketed by Randa, Inc. under the name "Actionalysis." The format is simple:

1) One person plays the part of teacher and another plays student.

2) A situation card is drawn and described to the observers.

3) Attitude cards are drawn and not revealed to the observers.

4) The situation is acted out for three minutes, during which time all observers fill out the first part of an observation form which asks the following questions:
   a) Is the situation realistic?
   b) What do you feel the student's attitude to be? Why?
   c) What do you feel the teacher's attitude to be? Why?
   d) What was done to convince you of the authenticity of the roles played?

5) Observers discuss the role play. After three or more minutes, the game master calls for the teacher and student to reveal their attitude assignments.

6) Observers fill out the last part of the form which asks:
   a) Were the teacher and student convincing in their roles?
   b) What could they have done to be more realistic and convincing?
   c) Do you think the situation was well handled by the teacher?
   d) What do you feel would be a better approach to the situation?
The journal entries which follow indicate somewhat the range of response to the seminar. Karen wrote:

The next part of this journal is concerned with role playing. I don't know if it's because I'm a kid at heart or because I aspired to be another Bette Davis, but I really enjoyed watching and participating in role playing in class. I do find it very true that as a student progresses in years he tends to shy away from role playing if this is not a common occurrence in his learning experiences. During my period of student teaching with juniors and seniors I tried role playing a number of times, the first being a disaster. I started to meet with success once my students let down their defenses and shyness. It took awhile for me to develop an atmosphere conducive to learning from the role playing. They finally did realize that role playing is not just an end in itself, but it is a tool they use in everyday life.

Sally wrote:

Role playing to me is a two-edged deal. It sounds great until you have to do it. I find it extremely difficult to allow myself the freedom to really, honestly play the role as I cynically believe it to be. Yet, when contemplating the idea of turning the tables and asking students to do the same thing, the idea is attractive and, somehow, the kids don't seem to mind.

I may have found a solution to its usage in my class. In Creative Writing the students are writing short scenes--dialogues involving a two-person conflict. The first step was to choose a conflict that was realistic for them within their experience. The second was to create a character to fill a role. They must create a full character, i.e., ugly, nervous, quiet, problems at home, hang-ups, etc. The third step is to role play with each other to test a workable dialogue. They must then write only the words in the dialogue. On Thursday they are going to test run the dialogues for the class so that the group may give suggestions and criticisms.

To be brief, by next week they will have a full scene with setting, gestures, emotional explanations, facial
expressions, etc.

The main point is that they verbally "role played" without having to go through all the awkwardness of actual impromptu settings. Better yet, Bill's acting class will then act out these scenes so that the writing class can observe their work a bit more objectively when performed by "outsiders."

I also like the idea that it is completely student oriented, criticized, written, and performed--I don't have to be teacher--judge--they don't have to think about pleasing me.
The Journals: Another Look

The journals following the goals-objectives workshops continued to provide me with evidence of the changes I had anticipated in the project proposal. I saw continued concrete examples of the direct influence of my behavior as a seminar leader and of the seminar processes on teachers' classroom behaviors. I proceeded with the project on the assumption that this group of teachers had been influenced by new knowledge and increased awareness and will continue to initiate new processes in their classrooms as long as doing so doesn't violate administrative mandates.

Sally's role playing, Paul's attempts at transactional communication, and the more elaborate experiments described by Mary, Karen and Art in the appendix to this report are concrete examples of what is described in the participative change paradigm I've chosen as a theoretical basis for this intervention. That is to say that my influence on the participants has been the consequence of the teaching methods I've used and the new information and knowledge they have acquired at the seminars. The changes exhibited thus far by the teachers haven't been the result of the position power an administrator can exert, but rather of the personal power exerted by their seminar leader.
Karen: Clarifying Communication

Last week's class (October 17) was one of my first experiences with simulations and I must say I enjoyed every minute. I understood and was able to grasp the lectured material given on one-way communication, but after taking part in the rectangle simulation, the information was further impressed upon me.

As a teacher I am usually in the position of being the sender so I found my role as the sender during the simulation very meaningful. As I was giving the receivers instructions on how to draw the rectangles, I was thinking of the instructions I gave my classes that day for their homework. There was one major difference as this particular thought was crossing my mind--my receivers during the first simulation could not ask me any questions while the students did ask questions about the homework assignment. It is amazing how I concluded that my receivers in class understood my instructions because they were not asking me any questions. I had conveniently forgotten they were not allowed to ask anything. After being bombarded with my students' questions that day, it was a pleasant change for me to give instructions and not have to repeat myself four or five times. (Now that I think about this more though, I wonder if the students ask me questions as a result of not understanding or because they want to make sure they follow the directions accurately.)

In the two-way communication simulation, I found myself
wondering just how well I was sending this message. The specific questions did not bother me but if someone asked me a more obscure question--"Could you please repeat that?", for instance, I became more frustrated. I figured if it was necessary to repeat the whole instruction, no message had been transferred or received at all. I was extremely nervous more than frustrated because I thought my colleagues may subconsciously be judging me as a teacher by how well I explained the drawing instructions to them. (This is probably only first-year teaching nerves.)

I did try the two simulations with two of my classes the next day in school. For the one-way communication, I was the sender. In addition to the results listed below, I noted the physical results of the two classes. Before going through with the simulations I explained the whys and hows of what we were going to do. I also made it very clear they were not going to be graded on this in any way, shape or form. What I found in both classes was this: when a student was the sender the results were pretty much the same as when I was the sender but the frustration level that I could see and hear was very high in the two-way communication simulation. I found it necessary to constantly say: ask specific questions if you have any but keep other comments quiet. They preferred me as the sender even though they could ask their fellow students questions and not me. The other observation I made was the student sender was pretty sure of himself when he first started out, but as the class began to ask questions he became visibly frustrated and nervous.
One-Way Communication Simulation Results:

Class A - 7 minutes

Class A - Number Right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-0</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>2-1</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>4-8</th>
<th>5-4</th>
<th>6-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number expected right:

| 0-1 | 1-1 | 2-1 | 3-0 | 4-6 | 5-8 | 6-5 |

Class B - 8 minutes

Class B - Number right:

| 0-1 | 1-0 | 2-1 | 3-0 | 4-6 | 5-8 | 6-5 |

Number expected right:

| 0-1 | 1-1 | 2-1 | 3-0 | 4-3 | 5-4 | 6-8 |

Two-Way Communication Simulation Results:

Class A - 14 minutes (19 questions asked)

Number right:

| 0-0 | 1-0 | 2-3 | 3-5 | 4-9 | 5-4 | 6-3 |

Number expected right:

| 0-0 | 1-0 | 2-1 | 3-4 | 4-8 | 5-5 | 6-6 |

Class B - 12 minutes (12 questions)

Number right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>4-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-0</td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>6-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number expected right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-0</td>
<td>5-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>6-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary: Clarifying Communication

Following directions seems to be one of the most difficult tasks for a 7th grader (at least it seems this way to me). I constantly give directions only to have them disregarded. The following tasks gave students an opportunity to give directions to their own classmates and then to see how well their classmates carried out the directions. (See attached form for tasks.)

All observations and conclusions were made with some reservations. It is difficult to make general observations and conclusions when you deal with so many variables. These include 1) varying abilities of students for said task both as receiver or sender, 2) attitudes of students (some may have perceived this as a game not to be taken seriously), 3) the class time to complete this task was 3 days and because of this it becomes difficult to evaluate the students' performance and to determine where their frustration stems from. Because of these reservations I have based all observations and conclusions on the performance level of the majority of the students.

Task 1 - One-Way Communication

1. Class chose a sender--one they felt had the ability to accomplish the task.
2. Sender was given as much time as needed to determine how he would have students accomplish the task.
3. I followed as sender for the same design.
Observations - Class 1

1. With the student sender 23 students had 0 designs correct however the frustration level was 2 (a little frustrated).
2. With me as sender 13 people had between 1-3 correct but the frustration level increased with 12 students feeling between 3 and 4 (some real frustration and very frustrated).

Class 2

1. With student sender 27 people had 0 designs correct and the frustration level was low with 16 people feeling a little frustrated.
2. With me as sender 16 people had between 1-3 correct and the frustration level was still low.
3. I sensed an increase in the frustration level when I was the sender (indicated by an increase in remarks) however the students recorded no increase in the frustration level.

Class 3

1. With student sender 16 people had 0 designs correct and 16 students recorded little frustration.
2. With me as sender 13 people had between 1-3 correct and there was no increase in the frustration level. (I did not sense an increase in the frustration level either.)

Conclusions (One-way communication)

1. Student senders were greatly frustrated with their task.
2. The frustration level of students was generally low. The
reasons for this that were given by the students were no grade—nothing to be frustrated by and task was fun even if it was not correct.

3. It was generally agreed that directions are not always easy to give.

Task 2 - Two-Way Communication

1. Class chose senders—people they felt had the ability to accomplish the task.

2. Two people per class were chosen to be senders. This allowed students to be aware of the fact that people view the same designs differently and therefore their directions were different.

Observations - Class 1

1. Sender 1--12 people had between 1-3 designs correct and 10 people recorded little frustration.

2. Sender 2--13 people had between 1-3 correct and 13 people had recorded little frustration.

Class 2

1. Sender 1--19 people had between 1-3 correct and 8 people recorded feeling real frustration.

2. Sender 2--12 people had between 4-6 correct and 14 people recorded feeling real frustration.

Class 3

1. Sender 1--7 people had 2 designs correct and the frustration level was recorded as little.
2. Sender 2--22 people had 0 designs correct and the frustration level was recorded as low (little).

Conclusions - Two-Way Communication

1. It would seem that classes have their own frustration levels. Classes 1 and 3 displayed little frustration with two-way communication although Class 1 displayed real frustration with one-way communication. Class 3 displayed no increase in frustration with either type of communication. (I feel this is probably true. I find Class 3 difficult to motivate as well as frustrate.)

2. All of the senders were frustrated with 2-way communication.

3. It was generally agreed that receivers were unconcerned for the sender and his difficult task. (A brief discussion on consideration for others was held.)

4. It was interesting for me to observe individual frustration levels.

   I feel that the following points were accomplished by this task (at least for a time).

1. Students seem to be more aware of the need for good directions.

2. Students seem more aware that it is difficult to reach all of the students with the same directions because people view the same thing differently.

3. These tasks gave us the opportunity to discuss consideration for others.

4. I am more aware of individual frustration levels as well as group frustration levels.
Preliminary Evaluation of Experimental Contract System for Grade 7 Classes

Student Participation: Before implementing this program participation was adequate but basically due to pressure to relieve an average mark. There were isolated cases of students who were highly motivated (intrinsically) and students who were very difficult to motivate.

Since implementing the program the overall reaction has been one of a rebirth of interest. The opportunity of directing the students' own progress and order in which the projects can be done seems to motivate most of the students. This arrangement can create some indecision with a student who needs direction from an outside source.

Until and before changing the format a student had either a vague idea or no idea concerning his progress "grade wise." Only a student who would individually ask about his grade would know his class standing. This can lead to indifference in attitude of students or apathy in relation to progress.

The contract method has had great impact on this problem. Students have a constant awareness of their progress which takes a great deal of pressure off their shoulders and encourages more energy toward creativity and achievement.

Flexibility in a program such as this is essential! The contract system, in itself, encourages fast (and maybe reckless)
work unless provisions are made for projects which might require more time or greater attention to detail. Another point of consideration is creativity and imagination. I feel that an effective program has to make allowances for (and encourage, heartily) the natural creative process.

My program does make this allowance by encouraging students to implement their own project for credit. (This is already happening.)

As can be seen in this text, I am excited about this project and I feel that my students are also excited about it. This is a clear indication that progress is being made and that it is an enjoyable progress.

I am only able to find fault with one area. There has been an increase in latitudes in the room and control of supplies has been a more difficult situation. With some minor changes I feel that the situation is now under control.

Recently, I came upon an unfortunate situation in my classroom. Pilferage of art supplies. By doing some quick checking, I was able to determine which class was responsible for most of the thefts. Working on this, I then spoke to my department coordinator (who was of very little help) who then referred me to the principal, who made suggestions which I didn't agree on. (I wanted to isolate culprits and handle the problem my own way, rather than use a group punishment technique.)

On the next class (with this group) I spoke to the class about
how shortages in supplies would affect them and students taking art in the following semester. Also, I impressed the fact that I just wanted consultations with the students involved (not retaliation). The point was made that if consultation wasn't effective then a parental conference would be advised.

The result was four confessions of guilt and numerous promises to acquire and return stolen art supplies.

I had private discussions with each of the four guilty people in which they returned the materials taken. I told each person about why stealing can be dangerous to themselves as well as who they're stealing from. Also, I related experiences with shoplifters that I've had while working in retail stores. To culminate each session I had each student write me a letter to confess his participation in removing art supplies from the art room. Also on the letter was a written promise to work hard at improving themselves as people and students and to never remove art supplies from the room without my consent.

I let each student know that I was disappointed in them and that I expected great improvement in the coming weeks.

Reactions: This course has been a tremendous asset to S.H.R.H.S. and I'm totally in favor of a continued in-service program such as this. We've covered a great amount of material and most of it has had a positive value for me.

One disappointing note however, is the reaction of some faculty members toward the course and trends in modern educational methods.
I recently discussed the topic with a few teachers in the lounge area. The first comments related to how foolish it was to take the course. I stated that it was convenient for me and that I've definitely gained from it. The rest of the conversation was that modern ed is nothing but an updated Sesame Street, fun and games, etc. They also felt that anything but an authoritarian class is radicalism.

This conversation ruined my day because I felt very sorry for these people but more (much more!) sorry for the students they are influencing. In my opinion, a person who is solely interested in hearing himself talk (lecture!) or seeing how difficult a test can be made, or seeing how many of his students he can flunk, should be in a different profession, such as washing cars, driving a cab, etc.
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Introduction

In the paragraphs in the first section of this journal a set of representative statements and excerpts from participants' journals have been collected. In doing so I've attempted to continue to highlight the way in which the bridge between seminars and classrooms have been made.
Weeks Eight through Eleven

In the next few weeks of the project the participants and I addressed ourselves to the theories which could be used in the diagnosis and solution of classroom problems. The lectures, discussions, and simulation exercises of these weeks fell within the following categories:

1) Measuring classroom norms
2) Parental influences and other variables affecting the learning environment
3) Problem solving theory
4) Leadership theory
5) Management of change
6) Self-evaluation, student-evaluation, and evaluation of classroom teaching

Several participants have introduced, on a regular basis, two features in their weekly work in the classroom. First, the simulation used in the weekly seminar became a regularly featured activity in the participants' own classes, and secondly, students were allowed opportunities to assess their classes and to suggest improvements.

Estelle reported that, as a result of discussions in the course, she and another reading teacher began to allow students the option to decide which reading teacher they would want to meet with. In addition, both reading teachers have asked their students to answer the following seven questions:

1) List what you like best in reading class.
2) List what you like least in reading class.

3) What suggestions do you have for improving reading class?

4) Do you feel it has been helpful to choose your present teacher? Why?

5) Should students be allowed to choose their reading material? Why?

6) Do you know what reading material would help you improve your reading skills? If so, what?

7) What suggestions do you have about handling a student who does not behave in class?

Diane appointed a student observer who acted as a process consultant for each class. The observer tallied the frequency of each of the following events:

1) Raised hand to answer question
2) Called out an answer
3) Asked permission to sharpen pencil
4) Left seat without permission
5) Raised hand to ask question
6) Talked out while someone else was answering
7) Helped a classmate with a problem
8) Ridiculed someone

The student then answered the question, "Would you consider this a generally good or bad class?" As a result, one student wrote a letter to the class that reads thus:

Dear Class,

You were very noisy and some of you people did things just so I would write something about you. I really didn't think we were that noisy, but when I just listened and shut my mouth, it was noisy.
Now I know how the teacher feels when she has to listen to this BULL! When it is your turn to be observer and if you listen, you will think, "Did I make all that noise?" and then you wonder why you have homework. I know I'll try my best to do a good job. I think if you wanted to you could really be quiet. And when I looked across the room and saw people talking to their selves, I couldn't believe it. And a kid gets caught with gum and he is making a big joke about it and putting on a big show.

by Barry A.

Arthur used sentence completion methods to find out what his students thought about school in general and his class in particular. Some of the sentence stems he used were:

1) I learn best when...
2) If only teachers would...
3) Compared with most years, this one...
4) Someday, I...

Diane also used sentence completions and shared some of the more significant completions with the other participants:

1) Today I want to...
   throw a fit at you for making us do labs
   quit school
   tell Miss C. off
   go home and sleep

2) Many times I think I am...
   going to be killed by my father
   very hard to be liked by my classmates
   weird

3) If only teachers...
   were nicer
   would learn something from kids
   would listen
were not stuck up so you could talk to them like Miss L. and Miss M. and you, sometimes

4) I learn best when...
   there is no teacher
   I am not pressured
   there is music playing
   my father takes off his belt

5) My teacher thinks I...
   am stupid
   am a troublemaker
   am disgustingly smart
   am a big mouth

During the week that problem solving theory was discussed, I structured the lecture as a series of questions and answers as follows:

Q. What is a problem?

A. The discrepancy between what is actually happening (the real state) and what is desired (the ideal state).

Q. What sequence of events must take place if the problem solving cycle is to be successful?

A. Stage I. The problem solver states his goals and identifies the ground zero point (the target situation vs. the present situation).

Stage II. The problem solver uses a force field analysis approach to identify the forces which currently exist to facilitate success and the forces which mitigate against success. (In other words, he identifies the driving forces and the restraining forces).

Stage III. The problem solver generates multiple solutions without analysis or evaluation (brainstorming). The goal is to complete an exhaustive list of solutions without concern for practicality.
Stage IV. The solutions are analyzed. Probabilities of success and residual affects are considered. A concrete plan is produced.

Stage V. If time permits, the plan is simulated on a small scale using appropriate feedback information. The plan can be revised if necessary.

Stage VI. The plan is put into effect.

One of the exciting outgrowths of the project has been the transfer of simulations from the seminar to the school classroom. The following is an example of a simulation used in a seminar that was subsequently used by several participants in their classrooms as reported in their journals:

**Brainstorming Simulation**

1) There are 2,000 miles of telephone wire in Alaska which have been breaking due to the weight of accumulated ice and snow. The problem is to find a way to eliminate the ice and snow before these breaks can occur. The solution must be cost effective.

2) Everyone is encouraged to think of as many solutions as possible.

3) Wild ideas are desirable because they often lead to viable solutions and they are indications that the ideas are not being censored by the participants.

4) No evaluation of any kind is allowed. This eliminates the need to defend ideas and gives people the impetus to keep thinking of new ideas.

5) Quantity is encouraged. Quantity eventually breeds quality.

6) Everyone is encouraged to build upon or modify the idea of others.

The brainstorming session was a tremendous amount of fun. Some of the solutions were zany and crazy, but the value of soliciting crazy ideas became apparent to the participants. I have
been told that the example problem I used was solved by using helicopter downdraft to eliminate accumulated ice and snow and that this "crazy" solution was born in a brainstorming session. In our session one of the participants actually hit on the idea of using a small airplane to solve the problem. When I told the group of the helicopter solution, they were astounded to hear how close they had come to it and how what appeared nonsensical was actually rather inspired.

Karen's journal entry gives some idea of what the reaction to the brainstorming session was:

My big problem in class is not expressing a negative evaluation. Controlling verbal evaluations is one challenge that is not too hard to overcome. The evaluation I had the most difficulty with was the evaluation I started to make within my own mind every time someone presented a solution to the frozen wire situation. I kept thinking each time a solution was voiced, "That one is more ridiculous than the last one." The answer that I had in mind and then finally voiced was that of putting insulation on the wires. What I failed to do was accurately identify the problem. The stated problem was not that the ice was freezing the wires, but that the wires were getting too heavily laden with ice. Insulation would add more weight!

I have applied brainstorming successfully with the cluster of seventh grade teachers I work with. When the team met recently, we all discovered we were having a problem with one boy in particular. He seems to be more of a behavior problem in my class because he comes to English near the end of the day and right after lunch. We started to brainstorm the possible techniques we could use, or have used to work with this boy. Luckily for me, we hit on an idea that sounded great to me and which I have found successful. The solution involved individualizing his program and correlating
his classwork with a set of very specific library assignments. The point is that there were a lot of negative ways of handling this boy's problems. The solution came about as a result of brainstorming.

Several simulations were used which were designed to demonstrate the prevalence of the competitive assumption which must be overcome if cooperation in the classroom is to be fostered. One of the simulations was repeated by Diane in her math classes. She describes the experiment as follows:

From a coin box I keep in class containing a good deal of fake coins, I handed two students twenty cents each in pennies and nickels. I took six additional nickels out of the box and told the two students that it was their goal to obtain as many of the nickels as possible in exchange for as little of the twenty cents as possible. I represented "big business" and they were the consumers who were trying to get the most nickels for the smallest investment. With each class that I tried, and no matter how many pairs of students I chose, the results were the same—they bid up to twenty cents to get a nickel. They bid against each other rather than against me, and they sometimes seemed to be overbidding since it was play money that they were paying off in.

I did try this coin exchange a second time in one class. This second time I repeated the same directions and gave them the play money, but before they began bidding they got together and tried to outsmart me. The first bidder would bid a penny, the other would bid two, then the first person would pass. In each bid for a new nickel, it was sold for two cents. They knew that they would make more money if they froze at one cent, but couldn't seem to resist the opportunity to put in one bid against the other person.

The following journal entry written by Arthur cites a new response to student evaluation and grading which has already had an effect on the art department, industrial arts department, and
the physical education department. By the third term of the school year these departments will be adopting a grading and evaluation policy similar to the following:

This journal will deal directly with changes made in my curriculum and procedures which have been influenced in some way by material covered in the U. Mass. course.

To begin with, the entire procedure in my seventh grade classes has been altered to make allowances for individual preferences and the amount of effort to be expended during the marking period. Basically, the new program consists of 12 projects (watercolor, pen's ink, woodcut painting, acrylic painting, linoleum printing, etc.). The student may work the projects in whichever order he wishes. He can eliminate projects which do not interest him or which appear to be difficult. Minimums have been established for grade requirements. For example, a student must satisfactorily complete five or more projects for a "C."

For the student who shows outstanding interest in a particular area, I have arranged an alternative whereby a student can work on a single project for as many weeks as necessary. For example, three students in one of my classes are working together constructing marionettes. They are carving the parts from soft pine, connecting the body parts, making costumes, etc.

My reasons for implementing this program are as follows:

1) To have students know their class standing anytime during the marking period.

2) To set goals for the individual to shoot for.

3) To make exceptions or provisions for the student as an individual.

4) To provide and encourage individual interests and motivations.

The range of difficulty of these projects is wide enough so that the most and least competent students can be challenged and be successful.
By the measure of simple observation, I've already recognized a significant amount of success. Student participation, interest, and enthusiasm has appreciably increased. Often a student's success with a project serves to motivate other students to try that project.
At this point in the project I felt it would be an appropriate gesture if I shared with the participants some of my personal goals and hypotheses which I had adopted for myself as an interventionist. Pursuant to this decision I proceeded to discuss my role as a participative change strategist with the group.

The participative change cycle was contrasted with the coercive cycle as described in the project proposal. I drew the flow chart illustrating my interpretation of a self-renewing change process and highlighted the various steps I felt a teacher ought to take to avoid the school problems I described as isolation, insensitivity and lack of curriculum flexibility.

I talked about leadership behavior using the behavior dimensions "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" as developed at Ohio State University and described by Hersey and Blanchard. I asked the group to assess my leadership behavior using the Ohio State Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, an instrument designed to describe how a leader behaves within the framework of the two behavior dimensions.

In the seminar I referred to Initiating Structure as "task" behavior and Consideration as "relationship" behavior. The results of the questionnaires were tabulated and I received a moderately high score on task and a very high score on consideration. My

---

5Hersey and Blanchard, pp. 73-76.
6Ibid.
self-assessment was identical to the group's assessment of my behaviors. I pointed out the value of having a realistic self concept of the ways in which a leader's behaviors are seen by his followers.

At the conclusion of this seminar I described the "life cycle theory of leadership" as developed by Hersey and Blanchard. I explained that the theory is an attempt to describe a function which relates appropriate and effective leadership style to the maturity or immaturity of the group being led. At one extreme is the immature group of followers who would seem to need a leader who assigns the group tasks, various standards of group rules and regulations, and other somewhat authoritarian mandates. At this extreme little time is spent in considering group suggestions or allowing for group decisions. At the other extreme the mature group is left alone to make its own decisions and the leader might be considered much more a facilitator.

As a group we agreed that it is important to assess the maturity of a group of students and to adopt leader behavior in the classroom as a function of this assessment. It was further agreed that teachers ought to attempt to continuously allow for increased maturity of the students in a class by making the appropriate adjustments in teacher task and relationship behaviors.

7 Ibid. pp. 133-148.
At this point in the project participants were saying less about their reactions to the seminars in their journals and more to me directly. Paul, Diane, Art and others let me know that they felt that the disclosures I had made in these two weeks coupled with the change paradigm and leadership theories made a lot of sense to them. There were many comments made about their perceptions of the positive effect they felt this project was having on them. My own enthusiasm hadn't waned a bit!
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Participants' Evaluation of the Project

Project participants took an active part in the development of an instrument which would help to evaluate the project and which would help to tailor the remaining seminar experiences to the needs of the group. In a brainstorming session led by Albert, the members of the class listed all possible questions which would be included in a questionnaire to evaluate the course. At the end of the session the group was divided into three smaller groups, each having four or five people to develop a section of the course evaluation questionnaire. As a result of this work, an eleven page questionnaire was developed. Albert collected the questionnaires and reported the tabulated results to me.

In Part I of the questionnaire, each weekly seminar topic was evaluated on a five point scale with respect to the following:

1) Initial Expectation Level: What was the level of expectation for this topic before it was presented?

2) Satisfaction Level - After the topic was presented:

   a) Evaluate the type of information, useful ideas, and innovative concepts developed (product).

   b) To what degree did the technique of presentation and motivation prove stimulating (process).

Five points on a descriptive scale and the same levels as applied to each week of the course were similarly applied to the course itself. One could argue that this is a redundant step.
It might appear that the same result could be obtained by averaging the weekly responses. However, by referring to Table I at the end of this report, the reader will observe that the average of the weekly responses was noticeably higher than the mean or median as applied to the course as a total.

One page of the questionnaire was designed to be removed and handed to me separately. It was headed by the statement: "This section was designed as a separate component because responses contained herein may possibly lack anonymity."

Three questions were asked:

1) What were your major contributions to the course?
2) How would you rate your participation?
3) What topics would you like to see explored in the second semester?

Section II of the questionnaire dealt with the readings which had been distributed throughout the project. Eighteen titles were listed and each one was checked according to the appropriate category as follows:

1) Did read 4) Highly recommended
2) Did not read 5) Recommended
3) Skimmed 6) Not recommended

Part III of the questionnaire was listed as "Evaluation of Affective Results." It included some of the most relevant questions with respect to the project from my point of view.
For example:

1) Was the class relevant to actual teaching experiences?

2) Did your attitude toward education change?

3) Did you develop contacts with other faculty members?

4) How many presentations or techniques did you use in the classroom as a result of this course? How many would you try again?

For a glance at the complete questionnaire see the appendix to this journal. The results of Part I: Evaluation of weekly class topics are tabulated and displayed in Table I. As shown, results (measured as product and process) were consistently higher than expectations. As pointed out in the introduction to this project, it is very important that the participants accept new knowledge and develop a positive attitudinal commitment in the direction of the desired changes, both explicitly and implicitly sought after in this project.

After analysis of the questionnaire tabulations I suggest the following conclusions can be made:

1) The attitude towards the theories advanced in the project is that they are valid and useful to this sampling of professional public school staff. This attitude was not in evidence either at the beginning of the project or at times prior to the presentation of each theory throughout the project.

2) As a result of the project, the participants gained more awareness of the sociological...
climate of the school and attempted to initiate affirmative actions in their classes in response to newly perceived needs.

3) The attitude towards the candidate as a seminar leader and as a doctoral candidate using the seminar as a basis for his dissertation was favorable. The relationship between the candidate and the participants as cited above is often difficult or impossible to develop within the ordinary constraints of line administrator-staff working conditions.

4) The project did facilitate a process whereby teachers expect to receive advice from their peers and their supervisors without anticipating failure and/or a negative evaluation.

A set of nine questions relative to the readings was included in Part II. The responses were highly favorable. Tabulation of Part II showed 65 tallies for "highly recommend," 60 tallies for "recommend," and 12 tallies for "would not recommend." In view of the response to the readings and the content therein, it is important to consider them in the overall evaluation of this project and to note the following:

1) The readings were selected from current writings in various educational journals and other sources for their relevant and evocative content.

2) With one or two exceptions, participants referred to the readings in their journal writings.

3) With one exception, participants indicated that they discussed the readings with other members of the group and with faculty members not part of the project.
4) It is probably atypical for a significant portion of a school faculty to be reading current educational literature and reacting to it as a group, particularly when considering the scope and depth of the material used in the project.

Part III of the questionnaire checks out two very important concerns. First of all, is there any indication of behavioral change as a result of the project, and secondly, is there any indication that the project has an effect on the school outside the direct influence of the participant group? In tallying twelve responses the following results were obtained:

1) Ten found the project relevant to actual teaching experiences. It was helpful in:
   a) planning (according to three participants)
   b) organization (according to five)
   c) grading (according to three)
   d) evaluating
   e) developing interaction (according to six)
   f) classroom presentation (according to five)

2) Five said that their overall attitude to education changed somewhat as a result of the experience.

3) Eight participants developed contacts with a total of twenty teachers outside the project and shared ideas and information.

4) Eight participants reported trying a total of twenty-five different presentations or
techniques with their respective classes as a result of the course.

5) Of the twenty-five presentations cited in number four above, twenty-four will be repeated again in the future because they were found to be worthwhile.

6) Ten of the participants feel that there is a correlation between a favorable image of the school in the community and the kind of work suggested in the course.

These results, in conjunction with other evidence reported in previous journals, suggest strongly that the project has served as a catalyst for more than a token amount of behavioral change and for a significant amount of attitudinal change. The effect on faculty not in the project group is difficult to assess. However, it is reasonable to assume that by virtue of the twenty outside contacts developed by participants some degree of change has been initiated.

The self-evaluation process and results as just described verify the claims and suppositions advanced in my journals throughout the tenure of the project. The instrument created by these teachers could alone serve as verification of the fact that they can diagnose their own classroom environment, and, if motivated to do so, can develop a self-renewing change process as was illustrated in the original project proposal. The results shown indicate transition through three stages of the participative change cycle: from knowledge change (Stage 1), to attitudinal change (Stage 2), and to individual behavioral changes (Stage 3).
### TABLE I: EVALUATION OF WEEKLY CLASS TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Topic</th>
<th>Expectation Mean:Median</th>
<th>Product Mean:Median</th>
<th>Process Mean:Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Why Educate?</td>
<td>3.8 4</td>
<td>2.0 2</td>
<td>2.8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process vs. Content</td>
<td>3.9 4</td>
<td>4.3 5</td>
<td>4.3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individualizing Goals</td>
<td>3.3 3</td>
<td>3.9 4</td>
<td>3.7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Behavioral Objectives</td>
<td>3.0 3</td>
<td>3.6 4</td>
<td>3.6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clarifying Communication</td>
<td>3.8 4</td>
<td>4.4 5</td>
<td>4.4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conflicts in the Classroom</td>
<td>3.5 4</td>
<td>3.0 3</td>
<td>3.3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Measuring Class Norms</td>
<td>3.3 3</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
<td>4.0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Problem Solving Theory</td>
<td>3.0 3</td>
<td>4.5 5</td>
<td>4.6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Leadership Theory</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
<td>3.8 4</td>
<td>3.7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management of Change</td>
<td>3.1 3</td>
<td>4.0 3</td>
<td>3.6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. &quot;Fixit&quot; Simulation</td>
<td>3.7 3</td>
<td>4.1 5</td>
<td>4.7 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
<td>4.0 4</td>
<td>4.1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Course</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
<td>3.5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 3.5 3 3.8 4 3.9 4

**Evaluation Scale**
- 5 = excellent
- 4 = above average
- 3 = average
- 2 = below average
- 1 = poor

**Note:** Table shows tabulation results from twelve questionnaires. Participants absent on a given week not included in that week's tally. Average number of responses per week: 10.
APPENDIX
**PART I: Graphic Rating Scale for Evaluation of Weekly Class Topics**

Problems in Education: Diagnosing the Classroom Learning Environment.

**KEY:** Each weekly topic will be rated on two levels: Initial Expectation Level and Satisfaction Level. The Satisfaction Level is further divided into product and process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Expectation Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was your level of expectation for this topic before it was presented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level: [after the topic was presented]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Product</strong> - Evaluate the type of information, useful ideas and innovative concepts developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Process</strong> - To what degree did the technique of presentation and motivation prove stimulating?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Initial Expectation Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Satisfaction Level:

#### A. Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### B. Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Why Educate?
   Illich: Deschooling Society, "The Alternative to Schooling".
   Listing of truths and/or lies.
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5  (high)
   Initial Expectation
   - Product
   - Process

2. Process vs. Content in the Secondary Curriculum
   Farber: "The Student as Nigger"
   Listing of truths and/or lies.

3. Behavioral Objectives
   Five important parts of a performance objective.
   Cognitive and affective domain taxonomy.
4. Individualizing Goals in Secondary Education

Behavior is goal oriented: Maslow's hierarchy.

Workshop: Comparison of goals: list with activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(low)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Clarifying Communication

One-way, directive, and transactional communication.

Johari Awareness Model: Communication simulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Uncovering and Working with Conflicts

"Actionalysis" simulation: Role playing, role reversal, perceiving attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Measuring Classroom Norms, Parental Influences, and Other Variables Affecting the Learning Environment

"Diagnosing the Classroom Learning Environment",

Cooperative bidding for coins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Initial Expectation
- Product
- Process

8. Problem Solving Theory

Force field analysis, brainstorming.

Simulation: 3 man corporation holding up correct numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Leadership Theory

Position power vs. personal power,
task behavior vs. consideration behavior.

Ohio State Leadership Behavior Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Management of Change

Participative vs. Coercive Change,
Behavior Modification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(low)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Initial Expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Evaluation—of Self and Others

Summative vs. formative evaluation;
Brainstorming for the right questions; This questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Simulations—"Game of Fixit"

Role playing; Budgeting for games;
Politics and education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graphic Rating Scale for Evaluation

Problem in Education: Diagnosing the Classroom Learning Environment.

**KEY:**
- Course will be rated on two levels:
  - Initial Expectation Level and Satisfaction Level.
  - The Satisfaction Level is further divided into product and process.

**Initial Expectation Level:**
What was your level of expectation for this course before it was presented?

- **Low**
- **High**

**Satisfaction Level:** [after the course was presented]

A. **Product** - Evaluate the type of information, useful ideas and innovative concepts developed.

- **Low**
- **High**

B. **Process** - To what degree did the technique of presentation and motivation prove stimulating?

- **Low**
- **High**
This section was designed as a separate component because responses contained in this may possibly lack anonymity.

I. What were your major contributions to the course?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

II. How would you rate your participation?

LOW       AVERAGE       HIGH

III. What topics would you like to see explored in the second semester?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
## Evaluation of Weekly Topics

"Problems in Education: Diagnosing The Classroom Learning Environment"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Readings</th>
<th>Did Read</th>
<th>Did Not Read</th>
<th>Skimmed</th>
<th>Highly Recommend</th>
<th>Would Not Recommend</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached sheet
(1)  FIX-IT GAME
(2)  WHADGAGET
(3)  VALUES & MORALS
(4)  THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANCE
(5)  STUDY OF STUDENT ATTITUDES
(6)  THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ROLE PLAY
(7)  BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES IN THE AFFECTIVE DOMAIN
(8)  PROBING VALIDITY OF ARGUMENTS AGAINST BEHAVIORAL GOALS
(9)  COMMUNICATION 1 WAY VS. 2 WAY
(10) A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION THRU OBJECTIVES
(11) WHAT IS INDIVIDUALIZATION
(12) A BASIC REFERENCE SHELF ON SIMULATION & GAMES
(13) A CAREFUL GUIDE TO SCHOOL SQUABBLE
(14) THE PYGMALIAN EFFECT LIVES
(15) STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS
(16) "STUDENT AS NIGGERS"
(17) YESTERDAYS' CURRICULUM TODAY'S WORLD
(18) THE ALTERNATIVE TO SCHOOLING
1. Which readings affected your outlook on education? No(s) ______

2. Should background material have been provided for some
readings? Yes ___ No ___ If so, which ones? No(s) ______

3. Should follow-up material have been given Yes ___ No ___

4. Was enough attention paid to the readings in class? Yes ___ No ___

5. Did you respond to the readings in your journal? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, when? (check applicable) When you disagreed ____
   didn't understand ____, agreed ____

6. Did readings stimulate discussion with other members of the
   group? Yes ___ No ___

7. Was the book appropriate to the course? Yes ___ No ___

8. Was the book relevant to your area? Yes ___ No ___

9. Give reasons for recommending 3 of the readings you checked.
   Give reasons for not recommending 3 of the readings you checked.
PART III

Evaluation of Affective Results

"Problems in Education: Diagnosing The Classroom Learning Environment"

Was the class relevant to actual teaching experiences? Yes ___ No ___

If yes check when applicable

___ planning ___ organization ___ grading ___ evaluating

___ interaction ___ classroom presentation or technique

Did your attitude toward education change? Yes ___ No ___

A. Did you develop contacts with other faculty members? Yes ___ No ___

If yes number contacted ______

B. Did your contact cause change in these members? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___

Did the comments in the journal influence your attitude or classroom teaching? Yes ___ No ___

A. How many presentations or techniques did you use in the classroom as a result of this course? ______

B. Of these presentations and techniques how many would you rate

___ Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor

C. How many of these presentations and techniques would you try again? ______

Do you believe that there is a correlation between a favorable image of the school in the community and the kind of work suggested in the course? Yes ___ No ___
CHAPTER VI
CANDIDATE'S JOURNAL
PART FIVE

Additional Participant Journals and Interviews

Integrating and Developing the Use of Diagnostic Skills and Problem Solving Techniques for Faculty at the Shepherd Hill Regional High School Dudley, Massachusetts

Perry Berkowitz

April 1974
Introduction

In the first section of this report I've collected a substantial supplementary sampling of additional participant journal entries which provide the reader with additional qualitative data to support some of the project findings.

In the section which follows, exact transcripts of taped interviews provide qualitative and quantitative data to support project findings. The reader will note that I made every attempt to ask questions which would be open-ended and not attempt to lead those being interviewed. As a result the responses are relatively nonstructured if not stream of conscious.

In short, both sections of this report show me evidence of attitude and behavior changes which are a direct consequence of the intervention.
Paul: October 3, 1973

I must admit that I was disappointed that we did not spend a greater degree of time discussing "The Pygmalion Effect Lives." As usual, I have an ulterior motive. I gave the article to my psychology class to read. It sure would have been nice if I had some constructive ideas from the class...without the discussion I may have to think for myself! By the way, the Pygmalion Effect Lives at Shepherd Hill.

Since you love criticism (you did say that once?), last week's class lacked the old kick as far as I'm concerned. I really missed the group discussion, which, as far as I'm concerned, is one of the highlights of my week. After all, how often do I get a chance to listen to living anachronism!

Much of the information from last week's class I have already placed into practice. I had the students in psych class list their goals in relation to their basic human needs. As I anticipated, the students had a great deal of difficulty listing their goals for the coming year. The real difficulty, however, developed when it was necessary for the students to develop the activity that complemented the goal. I am quite sure that most of the students had never even thought in such terms. The discussion that followed the goal listing would have to be classified as informative.
The first part of this report will deal with role playing in the classroom. As an art, role playing is difficult but very informative. It is my belief that role playing tells a good deal more about an individual than many hours of conversation. As I see it, role playing lets the real person out. If one is observant enough, you can paint a picture of their classroom environment. The real stress in role playing should be animation. Personally, I felt slighted since you failed to ask for my presentation, but it is possible that my past actions in role playing sufficed.

Simulation games and role playing have their place as a learning activity, but a danger is also present. We must be able to justify the role playing and at the same time find role playing members that are able to deliver the central theme to the rest of the class. Last week I attempted role playing in my psychology classes. I discovered that some members who took part in role playing were well suited for the job while others simply failed to respond. I believe I learned that it is necessary to be selective with the group. It is my contention that all persons are not suited for active role playing. Those that responded in the desired manner were the students who were very animated to begin with.
Paul: November 28, 1973

The class held prior to Thanksgiving centered itself on leadership theory. I must admit that I enjoyed the rather frank discussion in regard to concern for people vs. concern for task. The only area that surprised me was the fact that you scored higher in the area of task than I anticipated. You mentioned that leadership theory consists of two parts, task and people. It would appear that a blend of the two in equal proportions is desirable, but I question this type of reasoning. I believe that it is necessary to determine the needs of the group in order to arrive at a conclusion. This type of logic applies both in the classroom and outside of the classroom area. To care only for task or only for people results in a negative. Group needs must be of foremost importance in all cases. As a teacher you must understand group needs, as a leader in the community you must understand group needs. Some groups may be 90% task while others may need 90% concern for people. The real art of leadership, and it is an art, is to have people believe in you as an individual. This can only be accomplished by careful manipulation of all persons involved in group action. If necessary, you must play the role but always mindful of your own needs and aware of what you wish to accomplish. Leadership is a way of life, but if you're short on balls you will never make it! That should be the major concern of every leader.
Arthur: September 26, 1973

Material Covered:

**Student Perceptions of Teacher Violations** really brought home a few important points.

A) "Students are persons under our constitution." "Students are persons," a very simple phrase! But how often is it forgotten, or never even thought about? If every teacher would spend more time treating students like persons rather than objects, there would be less problems around us.

B) Suppression of underground newspapers is wrong. Underground newspapers are usually more honest and creative, in my humble opinion, than straight newspapers.

C) Disagree. "Most all teachers favor the superior student." Again, this appears to be a case of outdated material. In my opinion, at least 50% of teachers today are more concerned with slow students rather than bright.

**The Pygmalion Effect Lives:**

Rosenthal goes to a great deal of trouble to prove a very valid point. Students react better when the instructor's attitude is favorable. The studies cited drive home a good point: Teacher attitude, either conscious or subconscious can alter student's ability. It's frightening to wonder how many adults would have led different lives if they had received opposite treatment.
The format of this week's seminar was very relaxing, pleasing and informative. The positive aspects of the use of role playing became very apparent in a very relaxed and comfortable manner.

Role playing can be an effective tool in the classroom when used correctly. For example: One student in my eighth grade art class is a potential discipline problem. After being elected to the post of editor for a literary magazine, which is being made by the class, his behavior has been excellent as well as his performance. My opinion for his change is that he is displaying the same behavior patterns as before the project, but he now has a function in the operation of the project, i.e.,

**Before:**

1) Liked having attention.
2) Enjoys mobility.
3) Likes to receive praise.

**Now:**

1) Classmates now apply attention due to project.
2) He must roam the room organizing the magazine.
3) Receives many rewards for his efforts.

During the past week I read an article in the October issue of "Psychology Today." The article, "A careful Guide to the School Squabble," by Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, was very informative and I feel it would be of great value in our course. The article raises some provocative questions such as:

a) Why must the class period be 45 minutes when the
topic can be covered in 20 minutes, or 1 hour and 20 minutes?

b) Why must school activities be confined to a school building?

c) Why must schools place students in competitive roles?

These questions could go on and on...

Suggestions for future seminars:

A) Spend a seminar compiling a list of the absurdities in present day education, and work on solutions.

B) Spend a seminar showing the group how the creative instinct of people is stifled in the first ten years of life.

In reference to suggestion "B" I'd be willing to conduct an experiment to prove this point.
Estelle: October 31, 1973

Thoughts on morality and teacher-to-teacher relationship inspired by the discussion in class on October 31: Halloween.

For the most part, I do not believe one teacher can criticize the work and attitude of another. An exchange of ideas and suggestions between friends is fine.

When I taught elementary school, there were two veteran teachers who had an excellent reputation. They spoke very softly, frequently hugged children and used endearments which primary students enjoy. However, there were rumors that a wayward student could be treated rather harshly behind closed doors. If Johnny complained to Mother and Mother came to school, she would be treated in the sweet manner and told what a lovely, beautiful, little son she had and how proud she should be, etc. This would close Johnny's mouth.

I saw enough to know that the sweetest boy in the world could become a "horse of a different color" when no one was supposedly around. I hope the story of children being put in a closet as punishment was untrue though the source of the information was reliable and in a position to know, having been in the next room a number of years. These teachers would not have appreciated being told that children in first and second grade should not be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment. Besides, there was no proof.
They were very nice ladies, still are, though retired--maybe just a little sadistic.

In another instance, a teacher continually said unkind things about parents, as: "Your parents tell lies," and cite examples. Or say the students have bad manners because their parents never taught them any since the parents knew no better, etc. As a parent, I considered this dirty pool. Most parents do the best they can, in many cases under adverse conditions. Telling this to this teacher would have resulted in a kick in the teeth--at best.

It is my opinion that a teacher who does unprofessional things would not welcome the criticism of another no matter how well meant. If a parent should comment and you know it's true, the most gracious thing to do is change the subject.
Estelle: November 7, 1973

Diagnosing the Learning Environment in Reading Class: A Study by Estelle Ziemski and Sheila Miller.

Mrs. Miller and I were told that we could divide the reading classes in any way we felt the students would benefit. We tried having Mrs. Miller take a different small group one day a week. The objective was so that each student could learn basic reading skills in a small group with more individual attention.

This did not seem successful. It made continuity in the class difficult. Also, the students reacted differently. Some were eager to go with Mrs. Miller, others were not. We decided that we would allow the students to choose which teacher they would prefer. The results were interesting. The class divided itself in half. These students now have the teacher they chose. These students were given a questionnaire:

**Question I:** List what you like best in reading class.

Reading plays was first choice. Many students listed "Read" magazine, the class library, sport stories.

**Question II:** List what you like least in reading class.

Almost universally the students did not like written tests. There is strong dislike for skill-building exercises. This they need very much.

**Question III:** Suggestions to improve reading class.

Answers varied. Several suggested one day that they could choose the reading activity they prefer.

**Question IV:** Do you find it helpful to choose your teacher?

Most students agreed they liked the idea. A few
said it didn't matter. One student said that it was a good idea because "then you wouldn't hate any teacher."

**Question V:** Should students choose reading material?

Almost all said they should.

**Question VI:** Would students know what to look for and know the skills they need.

Students were divided. Some were emphatic—No! No! Others emphatic—Yes! Yes!

**Question VII:** What to do with students who don't behave?

Some said to ignore him, "yell at him," give him a zero for the day.

Most students seemed more severe than a teacher would be. Most common answer was to give him three warnings and send him to the principal. One student said "send him to Mr. Tibitoe."
Mary: November 7, 1973

The purpose of this survey is to determine how students feel about a particular class. I had the students fill this out after completing a lab on the microscope.

Having observed their performance and attitudes during class, I determined the following before the survey:

1. Most of the students learned a great deal—all could focus an object under 2 objectives at the end of class.

2. The reason for the lab must have been fairly clear because most students began work immediately.

3. Extra help was needed only on occasion.

4. How they felt about my role was of interest to me.

Generally, my observations were correct. Results:

1. Forty of 49 people said they "learned a lot."

2. The reason for the lab was clear to 42 of 49 students.

3. Twenty-two people said they didn't need extra help. The remainder said they needed help once or twice; only one said he needed help several times.

4. Most students felt satisfied with my role.

I included one more question in the survey: "Do you like answering questions like these?" Results: 25-Yes; 13-No; 12-Sometimes.

I think that a survey like this can be helpful. Some students find this of great value and for them it is very helpful. It also gives the teacher an idea of how the students feel. I do not think a student should have to do anything of this type if he doesn't want to.
Dennis: November 25, 1973

It was stated last week that the Leadership Theory was concerned with two factors: a) the concern for task, and b) the concern for people. It was also stated that the movement has been instituted in industry for some time now, but has only recently been used in the schools. Since the most important part of the school environment to me is the classroom, I would like to state my point of views on the topic in relation to the classroom.

First of all, let me indicate that the leadership theory is a good theory since it has been scientifically proven to work. However, in the classroom one must play the middle of the road in relation to the theory. Certainly, the classroom teacher is a leader since he is the one conducting the class and is responsible for all work produced in the classroom. He must have concern for people, since I think that this is a prime purpose for even being a teacher. The teacher should extend himself beyond the realm of the classroom in showing concern for some of the students' outside interests and goals. The student should also feel that the teacher has some interest in his or her plans for the future. This general concern should show the normal student that the teacher is an "OK" guy and usually eliminates many of the common student-teacher problems encountered in other classes. In essence this phase of the
leadership theory makes the classroom very relaxed and easy to work in. Hopefully, this should aid in the production of classroom work. However, if carried to extremes, the concern for people concept can get out of hand. That is the buddy-buddy situation that may arise and make the accomplishment of work or progress impossible.

On the other hand, the teacher must be concerned for task. He has a responsibility to the community and especially to the students that he is not short changing due to a lack of work and progress. Also, you know very well what happens to teachers who do not produce. It is my belief that educators must play the middle of the road and try to reach the happy medium where good relations are maintained with the student, but also that the students realize that a certain amount of work must be accomplished during the course of a year.
Karen: January 23, 1974

I don't think I can really express in words how much I enjoyed last Wednesday's class. Bill Allard is a dynamic speaker and a knowledgable person. I couldn't believe how fast 9:30 rolled around.

I thoroughly agree with the concept of the Worcester Alternative School, even though I know I never would have been happy there under that system during my high school years. The student who attends an alternative school must be a person who has a goal and some idea of the way he wants to get to that goal.

There is one inequality that I see in the alternative system and I would be upset about it if I was anxious to be accepted and not chosen by the lottery system. A student in the alternative school could take all structured classes in all standard schools with one advantage—they don't have to accept or put up with the "klunky" teachers along with the fantastic teachers. They are, in a sense, elite in that they can do the choosing of all superb teachers. I don't think there is any student anywhere who would refuse the opportunity to pick all the "great" teachers. Yet some of those same students would not want to go to the alternative system because of the lack of structure in other areas that they may need the structure.

I can understand why some parents may be uneasy at the idea of an alternative school, but change and something different is
not always easy to accept, especially something that may change the entire thinking of a student. It is difficult enough for parents to let their children go on their own at the college age level, but in the case of the alternative school you have a thirteen or fourteen-year-old molding, planning, and carrying out his own plans. I guess it is a bit young for the bird to leave the nest.

After meeting Bill Allard, I would not hesitate to let a son or daughter of mine attend the alternative school. Any person who cares as much as he does has my faith in advising youngsters when they seek advice.

I know I talked to you about this, but I still am not sure of what to do for a presentation. Maybe a conference is needed but I still am very uneasy about carrying on a discussion on a topic in class. I am not nearly as experienced as everyone else in the group in education. I don't think anything I could say would have any interest. In a word--HELP!
Question: Did you benefit and do you think that other teachers could benefit in future seminars from the assortment of ideas, strategies, and techniques explored in the seminar?

Karen: I am convinced that other teachers could benefit by receiving knowledge in this way. I think because of the way it was presented by you and by other members of the group that they would be more apt to try these things because they aren’t alone. It’s not like it’s a school where the principal says "I see you're having trouble, why don't you try this?" It's a seminar where everyone is there for approximately the same reason and they are all in a position to learn new things or to re-learn things that they've come across before; to digest it, think about it, try it and then report the findings back to the group. It's not just one individual having to make a massive change all of a sudden. And it's understood, (it's clearly understood) before you start that you're not going to be thought of as a poor teacher because you have at least tried, whether you've failed or not. I think it's an excellent way to get people to change because you're bound to, even if you don't change drastically in your classroom procedure, your attitude towards students has to change somehow.

Question: How would you describe your own changes?

Karen: O.K. now, the changes that I went through were a great deal in my attitude towards students mainly because I was not involved with seventh graders at all previous to this year and there was a lot of understanding and change that I had to go through. I thought of them as babies. I downgraded their intelligence to a great extent. I went overboard! Well, one thing I did because of the course was in the area of communication. I did an experiment with them drawing rectangles, as we did in the course, showing the differences between one-way communication and two-way communication. But with one class I didn't leave it at just an experiment. Because the experiment succeeded so well, I decided that I would
remind them every time I gave them directions for homework, quizzes, tests and projects; I would remind them that if they receive one-way communication they're not going to understand what I want them to do. If we have two-way communication, and I used the term "two-way communication," (questions by me, questions by them) they're going to understand what needs to be done a lot better. My instructions will be clearer and it will be clearer to me whether or not they have grasped the instructions that I have given them. More recently, a drastic change that I've tried was team teaching. It also has to do a great deal with communication. Teachers tend to talk a lot and things that I've learned from trying this team teaching is it's not always going to succeed for every unit. It will succeed for some kinds of units and won't succeed for others. The times it does succeed for me as a teacher is when I realize that I don't have all the information to pass on to these students; that there is another person in the building who has some other ideas, who can jump in when we are team teaching and present those ideas. So the students are getting a double batch of information from two different personalities and two different memory banks. The students had a hard time getting used to this at first. At first, all of Ms. N's students stayed in her room and all of mine stayed in mine, even though I opened the dividing door. What happened afterwards, after we got into this a couple of days, the students in the opposite rooms started talking with each other and working together.

Question: What gave you the idea that you could affect this drastic a change in your teaching arrangements without prior administrative approval?

Karen: It was sort of an overflow from the course. I got the feeling that when I tried something in this school, it's a new school, it's a new experience for me entirely because it's my first year, but I got the feeling and the understanding that what I tried in my classroom would be accepted by the administration because it's my first year, but I got the feeling and the understanding that what I tried in my classroom would be accepted by
the administration because I knew from the course that change was an accepted thing because the administration knew we were doing it for the benefit of the students, whether it failed or not your major intent was for the benefit of the students. I think somehow without directly telling the students they realize that when you do things differently you want it to be better for them and I think that does come across.

Question: I know this is a hard question, but could you have acquired that information about the openness of the administration if you didn't have the experience of the seminar?

Karen: I think because of the large number on the faculty that it would be pretty impossible for me to get the feeling that I have, the strong feeling of communication that I have with the administration at this point. And I've judged this because Mr. Day was not in the seminar. I see him, I joke with him, we have a very open communication as far as I can see, yet I still don't have that same communication that I have with you and with Al. Because we've been in the seminar, we've said what we've had to say on our minds, the knowledge was passed on to me directly by talking, not in a memo, because it was two-way communication I could get a better feedback of what the administration not only expected of me as a teacher but as a person in my relations with the students. Another thing that I've just done today, and it's from the course, is having the students evaluate me and the classroom atmosphere. I did this sort of late in this year because I wanted to let the students get to know me a little bit better; I wanted to know them a little bit better. I'm thinking of it as a tool mostly for next year to find out how the students accepted me this year; have accepted the way I teach, what I teach, and how much I taught them. Yet, there is still one quarter left. I couldn't make too drastic a change now, yet there is still enough time left where I can take what they have to say into consideration in making out my plans. It's interesting that one student said to me, "Why did you do this now? Why didn't you hand us this evaluation before Christmas? It's too late for you to change now."
When I read this student’s evaluation, she put her initials on it. I had told them to put their names on if they wanted to. Her evaluation was beautiful. One of the questions said, "What changes should I make to become a very good teacher?" and she put, "you are a very good teacher and I can’t think of any way you should change." So it was strange that she of all people would ask why did I hand it out so late in the year. But I think that's an excellent tool for a teacher to find out, not only what the students think of her, what they've learned from her, too. I think every teacher thinks they're getting "X" amount of information across and "X" amount of their personality across. It's very interesting to find out that some of the students, even though you think you have a terrific rapport with them, think you don't understand their real problems, or you think more about their school work than you do about their real problems. I think it's an excellent tool, and even though I'm fresh out of college I had never heard of doing anything like that until I learned it in the course. In the book that we had there were examples to follow but the questions that I used on the evaluation were from a printout that we received in the first part of the course and I took quite a few of the questions from that. I made up a few of my own, but I took most of them from that.

Question: Are there students who saw you change or shift your attitude at a point in time, in October or November, and who could relate specifically to this apparent shift?

Karen: I think my students think of me as the kind of person that they really don't know what to expect from next. They wouldn't be too surprised by what I would do. As far as changes go, they just think it's just ingrained in me and they wouldn't think anything of it. Therefore, no matter even if I did something drastic would they think it's a big deal. They probably really wouldn't notice it so much as a change as more--I don't know how they would think of it. I really don't think they could pinpoint it as "Mrs. M. made a big change" because I've been trying
a lot of things since the beginning of the year.

Question: So it would be hard to interview a student and pin him or her down as to the old or the new Mrs. M.

Karen: Right. I'm sure parts of the things that I will do will be the same and I will expect the same and have it done the same way. Yet, there's another part of my teaching that will always be changing because seventh graders need that. If they don't get it, they get terribly bored. For example, as far as the grading goes, in the beginning of the year I was grading them on their papers 85, 83, 82, or I would put 35 out of 40 right, and I would leave it at that. Now, what I do is sometimes I put 30 out of 40 correct and they'll know that that's either good or bad just by comparing the two numbers, or I will just put A, B or C. So I put something different on their paper every time. Sometimes I don't give them a grade at all; I just put "good" or "fair" or "you could do better," or "I know you could do better, even though this is a good paper, you're capable of more."

Question: So you've tried different things, you feel free to try these things, you've picked up some knowledge, changed some attitudes, you've changed some behaviors, and the feedback you get from the kids helps you decide whether or not this was a good change or not. Do I have it correct?

Karen: Yes. I think the most important thing is, the two most important things I learned at the seminar are 1) I found that the administration wants us to do things whether or not they succeed and not only do they want to know our failures, but they want to know our successes, and 2) the students want to know our successes and our failures and they want to be able to talk to us about them. The administration is looking for change that benefits students and the students can show you where those benefits are.
Interview: April 1974 with Arthur

Question: What changes in your classroom behavior can you attribute directly to your experience in the course?

Arthur: The changes that came about in my teaching and in my attitudes during the time the course was being taken can be directly related to information which was picked up and acquired during the course. Probably the greatest influence on my attitude was in response to readings we had in relation to student rights as an individual, and the confidence in himself. A great part of the reason that I was ready for substantial change was the fact that I had been teaching sixth and seventh grades for the past four years and now was changing over to a system where I was working with seventh and eighth grade and older students. It was a change that was very necessary for me and I appreciated the opportunity to be able to receive the support of the administration and fellow teachers in the seminar.

Question: Focus, if you will, on the relationship between administrator and teacher that existed as a result of this opportunity to be together in a seminar.

Arthur: The relationship...it was a tremendous relationship having the course, the seminar, available to us, because it was an opportunity to relate to the administrators on a personal basis as well as a group basis thereby breaking down the fears and restrictions that you might have of experimenting in the classroom. The sheer knowledge of the fact that you wouldn't be chastised for it, and in more cases, more than likely you would be rewarded for making changes, or at least you would receive some sort of support for making changes in the classroom was what helped the most. There is no way for education to grow without changes being made; it has to be a dynamic process.

Question: What I gather after talking to you on numerous occasions
is that you feel that this is the kind of experience many more people should have. How do you think we could get other teachers to get involved in this kind of experience in the future?

Arthur: One way it could come about could be in a workshop form; a situation where teachers, either teaching the same block of students or the same grade area, though not necessarily the same subjects, could get together and pick specific problems or specific situations which exist around them and they could brainstorm on these problems and work together.

Question: The biggest problem there is that the way teachers' contracts tend to read it prevents an administrator from holding any meetings of longer duration than one hour. Consider that we met for three hours a week, every week, for 30 consecutive weeks.

Arthur: Then the only solution there would be an in-service course of some sort where there is some financial or other reward to the teacher as motivation for getting involved. Without this sort of incentive program the teachers who may need this experience most might never get involved.
Interview: April, 1974 with
Al (Participant) and the High School Principal, Bob

Question: What I'm looking for are changes that you've seen possibly as a result of this project, advantages that you can see for the present year and the future, and disadvantages that you can see.

Al: Specifically, as we were saying, I've seen a teacher, Dennis, who has always been a very professional, a very dedicated young person, very industrious, a great teacher, cooperative with administration, cooperative with his fellow teachers; but I think a little reluctant to accept change, very strong traditional leanings, who during the course of Part I and Part II of this project has grown an awful lot in that he's willing to accept some progressive ideas; he's talking and sharing with his peers more and more. I think there's an ample degree of evidence there of a person who's really grown as a direct result of the course. He's had an opportunity to register some of his feelings. I think he's been forced to examine some of his traditional leanings (really forced by members in the course, not by yourself as instructor). People have challenged some of his thinking. I've seen him get hot under the collar and react a little bit, and the end result has been that he's been forced to think things through. I find him a more progressive person. He's still got traditional leanings, but he's willing to look at what he's doing more than he ever was and I think that Dennis is willing to say, from time to time, "I was all wet--I wasn't headed in the right direction--maybe you've got something there--I ought to try it." I see some movement. I see some growth and development.

Bob: I'm going to go back in time, before the school even opened. Knowing full well that the objectives of the
new high school, especially a regional high school, in combining teaching staff from one community with the teaching staff of another community, who in the past had never had an opportunity to get together, plus adding at least 40 percent of brand-new people to a staff—that my objective for the new high school was to try to get these people together. Also, realizing that one of these staffs had had the insecurity of a number of different administrators over the past number of years and were a little hesitant in the new school, under new conditions, with new people, with new students, to feel free to do some things that they'd like to do or even discuss or even know the administration that they were going to be working with the first year of a new high school. I think because of this course, even though 14 to 15 percent of the faculty were involved in it, that it had to have some positive outcomes. Basically, maybe I can make that judgment on just the number of individual cases, such as, Sally speaking up at a full staff meeting. I guess you could call it challenging a decision in a positive manner in front of her peers, which a year ago, I don't think she would have done. Also, I think the follow-up was impressive to me. This particular teacher came in the next day and felt comfortable in coming into my office and talking to me further about her challenge of the decision that was made which involved all of the staff and was made as an administrative decision. She felt free to come in and talk about it, which has to be a positive. I think the young lady, Karen, who is a new teacher fresh out of teachers' college with the ivory tower kind of feeling about things about public school, came into a situation and for a number of months kind of felt she was alone. Also felt that she couldn't (because of her lack of background and experience) share ideas, or if she had an idea, she was afraid to share it because she felt it might get shot down because it might be contrary to what administration felt. I feel this young lady had come around to the point where now she has no fear in saying I'm wrong, or I've made a mistake, to any one of us. She's apt to say I realize that I've
made a mistake, and she's not worried about this being held against her as a professional.

Al: May I interrupt if I could? I think that's very true, and I think also she's at the point now where (I think that it's probably even more important) she's no longer afraid to challenge some of the others as she was the first few weeks. I think this is a spin-off from the course. She's learned to talk to other people, she's learned in a small group that she can express herself, even as a novice; that she's got some good ideas and she doesn't sit and nod and agree with what everybody else is saying. She's done it in a group of 14, 15 or 16 people and I think she's learned to apply this in a larger group situation, for example, the faculty room. She cited to me, specifically, that she used to go there and hear things that she didn't agree with but was afraid to say anything. She sat and smiled or nodded, tacitly agreed; then she got to the point where she avoided the faculty room rather than agree with something that she didn't believe in. And I think now she's at the point where she's willing to go in there and register an opinion. She's learned to express herself. She's not afraid to express her opinion and she's not worried about what other people think of her. She's got some ideas and she's willing to share them.

Bob: Yes, Al, I agree with what you just said about this young lady. I guess the point that concerns me the most now is that we've talked about 14 percent when I actually feel that perhaps 100 percent of our faculty should be involved in this kind of a seminar, this kind of a class. The problem I face, and I think we all face it, from the administrative viewpoint, is how do we approach involving other people on the staff in this type of a course in a nonthreatening approach to have them enroll in it on a basis of their wanting to take it because they can see the merit, or have felt the merit from the spin-off from the people who have been in the course. So I guess the point, to end it up, as I see it, is getting more teachers involved in a noncoercive manner.
Al: The last statement I'd like to make, Perry, is that (maybe I'll flatter myself a bit) I think some of the things that I feel have been achieved as a direct result of the course I might have been able to achieve with individual teachers without the course. The important thing is, though, there would never had been the exchange of ideas and the communication that occurred in the course. I could, with Karen or Dennis or Paul or Pete, right down the line, I think, easily communicate the ideas you were able to. But it could never have been as productive as it was being able to work together for three hours a week, collectively, for a good part of a year.
CHAPTER VII

Final Report

May 1974
Summary and Findings

This study was designed to provide means for final evaluation of the author's administrative performance in dealing with a significant educational problem. To this purpose a setting was necessary which would provide the candidate an opportunity to test leadership and change theory in action and to thereby further the development of knowledge in an action situation. Therefore, a seminar was developed and offered on a voluntary basis and was gotten underway with fourteen participants. The seminar agenda included, among others, the following topics:

1) Process vs. Content in the Secondary School
2) Goals and Objectives for Teacher and Student Performance
3) Clarifying Communication
4) Uncovering and Working with Conflicts
5) Measuring the Classroom Climate
6) Problem Solving Theory
7) Leadership and Change Theory
8) Evaluation - of Self and Others

Participants in the project kept journals, as did the writer. These materials constitute the basic data of the study and have been presented in the previous five chapters.

The fact that teachers began, of their volition, to use the
things which were occurring in the seminars in their respective classes, was a substantially significant event given the writer's stated purposes. It is noted that the classroom changes which occurred after each of the seminars seemed to happen in an immediate, natural, and sequential way, thereby having demonstrated the pertinence of those seminars to the participants.

There were many examples of the changes herein referred to throughout the previous five chapters. As one example, evidence was presented that the participants used simulations in their classes which were learned in the seminars. Karen, Sally, Paul, and others used role playing strategies to enhance their programs, and the one-way, two-way communication tests were used in several classes by various participants. In addition, brainstorming techniques and a demonstration of the competition motive strength were replayed in participants' classes. All of these activities served as evidence to the author of one effect of his influence on the behaviors of the participants.

Several participants, including Estelle, Karen, Art and Paul, wrote journals describing their uses of questionnaires, sentence stems, student journals, and other value clarifying procedures which were learned in the seminars. Not only did these practices begin to happen soon after they were first used in the seminars, but the evidence presented in Chapter V indicated a willingness of the participants to plan on the continuing use of these
diagnostic practices in future classroom teaching. As reported in that chapter, eight participants developed a total of twenty-five different presentations for use in their classes and, having made those presentations, planned on repeating twenty-four of them in future years.

Arthur wrote a report presented in the appendix to Chapter III describing a new approach, for him, to the grading of his students' art projects. This change was reported in his journal to demonstrate the influence of a discussion in one of the seminars on his thinking about the grading game in education. This change served as another bit of quantitative data to help support the opinion that the author's objectives were being met.

A final example of the kind of classroom changes we've seen which may be attributable to the influence of the seminars was Diane's use of a process observer as reported in the first section of Chapter IV. This was a significant event demonstrating Diane's sensitivity to her students' behavior problems and her reported willingness to deal with these problems in an unusual way. The use of a process observer's report to help the group and its leader develop a more complete self-perception was demonstrated by the author at several seminars. Al served at those times as the process consultant. There was never any suggestion that a student could be used in this capacity and the idea of doing so was extremely imaginative and (as reported) apparently quite
useful.

In summary, we've found a substantial amount of evidence of change in the participants' classroom behaviors which have been attributed (by the participants and the author alike) to the author's intervention. Additionally, the interviews transcribed in Chapter VI, which were held with selected participants and the school principal, provided evidence that there were some gains in opening communication between teachers and administrators outside the seminar.

Karen spoke of this feeling at the end of her interview, and Al and Bob, the principal, described an incident at a faculty meeting where they saw Sally "challenging a decision in a positive manner in front of her peers, which she wouldn't have done a year ago."* In examining this data, the author was able to see some changes dealing with isolation in the school setting, which, the reader may remember, was one of the problems described by the author in Chapter I.

*See Chapter VI, Interview with Al and Bob.
Conclusions

As shown in the previous section, the seminar processes were translated into classroom processes. It follows that the purposes of the dissertation were well served since an impact was made, i.e., the actual ongoing classroom experience of children in the school were affected by the seminar experiences of their teachers.

The participative change paradigm as described in Chapter I proved to be a reasonable basis upon which to set up a group. In each of the author's journal chapters there were preliminary conclusions which interpreted the findings up to that point. Consistently, there was evidence of the influence of the author's leadership and teaching with respect to the participants which has resulted in knowledge changes, attitudinal changes and individual behavioral changes. These represent three of the four sequential steps of the paradigm for participative change.

In Chapter II, Journal One, the author saw Art, Paul, Diane, and Joe and others beginning to check their current assumptions, diagnose their classroom environments, identify problems and develop alternative solutions. These attitudinal and behavioral changes weren't forced; they evolved naturally. The candidate concluded that these changes came about without the necessity for an administrative fiat. The candidate's behavior as an administrator was used simply to facilitate the process and not to mandate
it. As pointed out in the concluding paragraphs of Chapter II, the steps which were being followed by the participants (as early as the second week of the project) were indicators of success in meeting one of the main project objectives: that the seminar mode and behavior of the author lead to a self-renewing change process to be followed by the participants.

The data which was presented in the three months following the author's first journal continued to reaffirm these same conclusions and they have been included in the final sections of Chapters III and IV. In Chapter V the author presented the participants' evaluations of the project. In the time which passed after that journal was submitted, there were many opportunities to discuss the conclusions made at that time with the various participants. The candidate was then able to look back at the project and reassert the following conclusions:

1) The attitudes of the participants toward the theories advanced in the project were generally that they were valid for, and useful to, the participants in the project.

2) As a result of the project, the participants gained more awareness of the sociological climate of the school and attempted to initiate plans of action in their classes in response to newly perceived needs.

3) The project did facilitate a process whereby participants now can generally expect to receive advice from their peers and their supervisors without anticipating failure and/or a negative evaluation.
These conclusions are supported in the remarks transcribed in the Chapter VI interviews with Karen, Art, Al and the principal. Since the interviews were held in April after the project was completed, and since they were voluntary, open-ended, individual interviews, the candidate has confidence that this data which supports his conclusions was, and is, particularly reliable and valid.

The author experienced an unexpected problem resulting from a role conflict between his seminar leader position and his position as a vice-principal in the school in which the project took place. Since the author was called upon to initiate changes in the school by the use of administrative fiat beginning in the early winter months, the coercive change paradigm as described in Chapter I intruded itself in a way that could not have been anticipated in the earliest weeks of the project. Consequently, people in the seminar became somewhat conflicted with respect to the author’s apparent dual standards of behavior. Trying to be both participative and coercive caused problems, not only for the participants, but for the author as well. Several of the participants discussed this conflict in private sessions with the author and were unable to find a satisfactory resolution. Three participants who stopped attending the seminars in January and indicated that this problem had some bearing on their decision. What was very significant to the author in January of 1974 was
that eleven of the fourteen participants were able to accept the author's dual behaviors as appropriate to the two groups he was expected to lead: the seminar group and the total group of teachers in the school.

This conflict was discussed openly during weeks 12 and 13 within the context described in Chapter IV. At that time the author and the participant group agreed that it was important for a leader to assess the maturity of a group and to adopt a leadership style appropriate to that group. The author was able to resolve the aforementioned role conflict by adhering to the principles of the "life cycle theory of leadership" as described in the last section of Chapter IV.

Specifically, the author concluded that the seminar group was a more mature and self-motivated group of teachers than the total group of teachers in the school. It was therefore not difficult to anticipate that the participative change strategy would continue to be useful with the participant group, even though it proved unsuccessful and inappropriate in early attempts to change the behaviors of the total group of teachers in the school.

---

Implications for Research and Practice

In this section the author respectfully offers some suggestions to the prospective action researcher. With the project complete and appropriate conclusions based on the findings rendered, some allowances can be made for speculations, inferences and daydreams.

The problems referred to in the dissertation as isolation, insensitivity, and lack of curriculum flexibility are not easy to deal with. The author feels reasonably assured that in a limited way everything possible was done to deal with these problems in the project. However, the reader is encouraged to focus carefully on these problems and make appropriate allowances for them in any school intervention.

As James Cass, education editor for Saturday Review World points out,

"education...has been ranked as the third most authoritarian profession in society--outranked only by the armed services and police....Education clearly fosters an environment that does not encourage independent thinkers or creative individuals, nor can it be expected to welcome fundamental change in the schools." 9

Cass goes on to say that it is fortunate that many scholars have turned their attention to the process of change in schools and that their labor is pointing towards new directions for the future.

The curricula changes produced in the Fifties and Sixties which were developed outside the schools and imposed upon classroom teachers in "teacher-proof" packages produced, at best, spotty results. John I. Goodlad, dean of U. C. L. A.'s Graduate School of Education, and his colleagues have advised not to impose predetermined change on the schools, but rather to provide a structure with which each school is helped to bring about the changes it wants to effect. The principal is presumed to be the key agent for change in his school and in order to perform effectively must become the "cooperative leader of a team rather than the traditional authority figure."10

One of the most important considerations that cannot be emphasized enough is that participative change is a long-term process. Goodlad and his colleagues stress that "neither individuals nor institutions alter their behavior or their traditional perspectives overnight. Experience indicates that three to five years is a reasonable time within which to expect achievement of productive change in the schools. The evidence indicates, nevertheless, that a supportive environment for those engaged in education reform will pay off handsomely in bringing the realities of the classroom closer to the rhetoric of education."11

The model developed in the project was easy for the author

---

10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
to follow. In summary, the main steps taken were:

1) Formation and organization of a seminar group. Teachers and the administrator-leader interested in change and willing to engage in open communication.

2) Establishment of a weekly meeting time and place which allows for informal discussion in a relaxed environment for a substantial period of time (2-3 hours).

3) Structuring of the discussion topics and work tasks as much as possible to include the following agenda items:
   a) Clarifying Communication
   b) Establishing Organization Goals
   c) Uncovering Conflicts and Interdependence
   d) Improving Group Procedures
   e) Solving Problems
   f) Making Decisions
   g) Assessing Changes

4) Encouraging "owning up" for all participants including the leader.

5) Requirement of some amount of journalizing for all participants.

The steps taken in this project, the foci maintained and the objectives sought were particularly appropriate to the candidate's personality and leadership abilities. We cannot overemphasize the importance of our success in maintaining the trust and support of the participant group.

It is the candidate's contention that the original proposal
was a reasonable estimate of a significant educational problem and an appropriate determination of a course of action for the candidate to undertake. Respectfully, it is suggested that the proposal, journals, and interviews provide the reader with substantial data from which to conclude that the candidate has developed a process which begins to answer the problems cited and is substantially consistent with the current theories of organizational development as outlined and synthesized by Blanchard and Hersey and other educators and social scientists. The candidate recommends that any administrator interested in developing a participative change strategy leading to a self-renewing change process must become familiar with the aforementioned change theories.

One of the adverse factors which added a significant amount of stress to the project was the candidate's job role. The degree to which the candidate is expected to monitor a school and act the role of disciplinarian with staff and students was greater than anticipated. As a result there was a reluctance among nonparticipant staff to accept the project work of the candidate or the participants at face value. Consequently, it is strongly recommend ed that the administrative leadership style be as consistent as possible with the project leadership style if optimum success is
to be anticipated.

It was the candidate's understanding that some environmental stress was attributable to the very fact that the candidate was a doctoral student working on a project dissertation. To avoid this situation a false pretext for the candidate's project would have been necessary. However, the candidate preferred to be open and to deal with the consequences. It is obvious that this is a unique variable which is simply problematic and of no concern to the administrator who chooses to develop a similar change strategy.

In conclusion, the candidate submits that the experience of administering the project has been a truly worthwhile activity, and will be valuable in his future administrative endeavors.