Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

An Assessment of the Self-Actualizing Education Program

Kathleen Pope
Utah State University

UtahStateUniversity
MERRILL-CAZIER LIBRARY

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE

SELF-ACTUALIZING EDUCATION PROGRAM

by

Kathleen Pope

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of the

Self-Actualizing Education Program

by

Kathleen Pope, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1978

Major Professor: Elwin C. Nielsen
Department: Psychology

Elementary school teachers enrolled in the Self-Actualizing Education training course were tested prior to and following the ten-week in-service course to measure to what extent teachers improved interpersonal communication skills in discussions with students. Teachers' positive responses (e.g., listening, owning personal feelings, offering choices to students), teachers' negative responses (e.g., judging, lecturing, rescuing), teacher talk vs. student talk, and the frequency of student misbehaviors were considered. Audio tape recordings were made of teachers as they dealt with student problems in a group discussion and in an individual discussion. Also, student misbehaviors were recorded during a 15-minute observation time.

The data were evaluated using analysis of variance. The results showed that in discussions with individual students, teachers increased positive responses and decreased teacher talk. In addition, the number of student misbehaviors increased after the training course. No other changes were found to be statistically significant.

(79 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Background

The traditional concern of the public schools has been in the cognitive domain. Little emphasis has been placed upon students' affective experiences. "The personal and psychological needs of the child have typically been considered by classroom teachers to be subsidiary enterprises and, for some, even 'off-limits' within the educational setting" (Vitro and Yvon, 1972, p. 11). Recently, however, personnel from all educational levels have joined a corps of individuals concerned about teaching "the whole child." They are concerned about teaching the child to deal with emotions--with fear, anger, discouragement, and pleasure--as well as to learn skills in academic areas. Educators are realizing that in the impersonal, fast-paced world of today, schools can no longer ignore the emotional needs of students. What has long been known by some is now being recognized by many: "the cognitive and the affective domains are not separate entities but areas that interact" (Schusler, 1971, p. 283).

The mushrooming interest in T-groups, sensitivity training, weekend retreats, in-service activities, and classes, including affective as well as theoretical and cognitive content, attests to the increasing concern educators are expressing toward the emotional needs of students. One cannot give what one does not possess, and so teachers are attempting to

increase emotional understanding and strength within themselves in order that they might, in turn, impart it to students.

Several contemporary psychologists, including Gordon (1970), Glasser (1965), and Harris (1967), have conducted or currently conduct institutes and/or seminars designed for teachers and others specifically involved in education. These institutes and seminars increase personal awareness and provide specific practical application of communication skills. Teacher education classes at university levels are incorporating affective education programs into classes which heretofore dealt basically with content and method. Extension classes and workshops also provide the practicing teacher with new skills in interpersonal relations and communication processes.

Statement of the Problem

While a review of the literature indicates that the importance of affective education is becoming increasingly evident, few programs teach appropriate and practical interpersonal communication skills to educators. The Self-Actualizing Education program is designed to offer in-service training to teachers and other school personnel. Such a program promises potential rewards to those involved in giving and receiving its services. The problem lies in determining whether or not such a program can actually inculcate, in teachers, sufficient knowledge and skill to make a difference in their everyday relationships with students. A study investigating whether or not the Self-Actualizing Education program is a tool through which teachers can and do increase skills in interpersonal communication seems warranted.

The Self-Actualizing Education Program

The Self-Actualizing Education program was conceived and formulated at Utah State University by Bertoch and Nielsen, and the training manual was developed and field tested as a doctoral study by Barcus (1975).

Funded under a rural development grant from the Kellogg Foundation, the Self-Actualizing Education program was designed as an in-service course to train teachers and other school personnel in more effective teacher-student interpersonal communication skills. It was hoped that focusing on the development of these skills in teachers and other school personnel would help prevent some of the potential emotional disturbances of students. In addition, such a program may supplement, somewhat, the limited mental health services in rural areas by providing more effective means of solving some student problems within the classroom setting. It was felt that the schools have the greatest potential for reaching the greatest number of students, especially during crucial developmental and formative years.

Designed as a ten-week in-service training program, the Self-Actualizing Education program focuses on the following specific areas:

1. Understanding the need to belong

2. Understanding the communication process

3. Understanding ways that people interact

4. Power

5. Judgmental communication

6. Communication killers

7. Covert communications

8. Listening skills

9. Identifying who has the problem

10. Responsible language

11. Owning feelings (teacher)

12. Avoider versus owner words

13. Owning feelings (students)

14. Confrontation when stable limits are overridden

15. Disengagement

16. Choices and consequences

17. Behavior modification

18. Reinforcing behavior

19. Knowledge of negotiation

20. Practice in negotiation

Contained within each area are explanations of the concepts, demonstrations, participatory exercises, and evaluation exercises designed to involve participants not only in a theoretical orientation but in an active learning situation as well.

The purpose of the Self-Actualizing Education program is to reinforce educators' awareness of the necessity of such a program, as well as to give practical aid in developing effective intercommunication and interpersonal skills. Teachers' actual, day-to-day involvement with students in implementing and practicing the various skills as they are discussed should more readily facilitate the assimilation of the communication skills into a teachers' repertoire of automatic teaching behaviors. At the conclusion of the ten-week course, teachers should be able to communicate with students more openly, listen to them more effectively, reinforce their positive behavior more appropriately,

discipline them more fairly, and understand them more clearly than teachers did before the training course.

Objectives

Barcus (1975) used a criterion-referenced field test to evaluate the Self-Actualizing Education program. Barcus' test consisted of three parts: (1) problem-solving episodes, (2) an objective, knowledge-oriented test, and (3) teacher estimates of student responsibility. Barcus reported that, after the training course, teachers evidenced a significant (p.$<$001) increase in knowledge of communication skills in parts one and two of the test. However, no significant differences were found on part three of the test.

Communication of one's knowledge of interpersonal skills on a pencil-and-paper test does not insure that those skills have become integrated into actual behavior patterns. As Barcus notes, "If teachers are given time to consider the skills they could be using, the communication skills will be used. If challenged without time to organize, the new skills will be forsaken for familiar reaction" (p. 54). The effectiveness of a program designed to teach interpersonal and communication skills must be determined by the extent to which those skills are integrated into teachers' actual behavior. The primary objective of the present study, therefore, was to determine whether or not the teachers trained in the Self-Actualizing Education program did, indeed, integrate those skills into actual teaching behaviors.

The Self-Actualizing Education program has four basic goals:

1. To help participants recognize the need for more effective communication with students

2.   To teach participants how to listen to their students

3.   To help participants more effectively take responsibility for their own behavior

4.   To teach participants more effective ways of helping students take responsibility for their own behavior (Barcus, Nielsen, and Bertoch, 1974).

The present study focused upon the latter three of these goals and was designed to answer the following questions:

1.   When the Self-Actualizing Education program is employed, do teachers increase their positive responses in discussions with students? (Positive responses include listening, owning personal feelings and behaviors, seeking solutions to problems from students, offering choices to students, calling for responsibility from students, and reinforcing positive behavior in students.)

2.   When the Self-Actualizing Education program is employed, do teachers decrease their negative responses in discussions? (Negative responses, as defined by many Transactional Analysis and Gestalt psychologists, specifically Gordon (1970), include rescuing, judging, lecturing, persuading, supporting, playing psychoanalyst, and using diversionary tactics.)

3.   When the Self-Actualizing Education program is employed, do students misbehave less?

4.   When the Self-Actualizing Education program is employed, do teachers decrease the amount of teacher talk in discussions with students, thus offering students the opportunity to express opinions, to

generate solutions to problems, and to accept responsibility for their behavior?

Hypotheses

In the present study, the following hypotheses were tested:

1.   There is no difference in teachers' positive responses in problem-solving discussions with groups of students before and after the training program.

2.   There is no difference in teachers' positive responses in problem-solving discussions with individual students before and after the training program.

3.   There is no difference in teachers' negative responses in problem-solving discussions with groups of students before and after the training program.

4.   There is no difference in teachers' negative responses in problem-solving discussions with individual students before and after the training program.

5.   There is no difference in the amount of teacher talk in problem-solving discussions with groups of students before and after the training program.

6.   There is no difference in the amount of teacher talk in problem-solving discussions with individual students before and after the training program.

7.   There is no difference in the number of student misbehaviors before and after the training program.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are quoted or adapted from the Self-Actualizing Education training course manual, Self-Actualizing Education (Barcus, Nielsen, and Bertoch, 1974). Numbers refer to pages in the manual.

Listening. "Giving [a student one's] full attention, being non-judgmental, and confident that he is capable of handling his problem if he has an opportunity to talk about it" (p. 14). It involves skills of silence, non-committal acceptance, invitations to continue, parroting, paraphrasing, and reflecting feelings. Examples: "Oh?" "I'd like to hear about it." "You're really angry!" "I imagine you're lonely."

Owning. Admitting one's own feelings and one's own "part of the problem" (p. 20). Examples: "I get angry when kids are pushing." "I have a problem." "I'm worried about . . ."

Asking for Solutions. Using brainstorming sessions in which both teachers and students feel free to offer solutions to a problem without criticism or evaluation (p. 50). Examples: "What do you think could be done?" "What could you do?"

Giving Choices. Giving a student an opportunity to "choose his course" according to "how he behaves" (p. 39). It places responsibility for action upon the student himself. Examples: "Can you be here quietly, or do you need to go back to the room for a while?" "Do you want to watch the program there, or sitting here by me?"

Calling for Responsibility. Inviting students to be responsible for self (p. 26). Examples: "So next time you are going to . . . . Can you handle that?" "Is there anyone who cannot take care of himself in reading now?"

Positive Reinforcement. Recognizing in a pleasurable way a student and/or his contribution or achievement (p. 40 ff.). Examples: "Good work." "Thank you." "I appreciate that comment."

Rescuing. Taking "responsibility from another person rather than letting that person handle his own problem" (Appendix 9). Examples: "Now what I want you to do is . . . ." "What we'll do is . . . ." "How about if we . . . ."

Communication Killers. Using judgmental statements which prevent the continuation of open communication (p. 8). Examples are given more specific treatment in the definitions which follow.

Judging. Using "positive and negative criticism, blaming, dis- agreeing" (p. 9). Examples: "You started this." "Don't lie to me." "It's your fault." "You can't go. You'd just get into trouble."

Lecturing. "Telling [another] person what he must or should do" (p. 9). Examples: "You should study right after school." "All of us should sit quietly in our seats." "You have to bring your homework every day."

Persuading. Using "logic, preaching, promising, warning" (p. 9). Examples: "Stop it, or you'll go to the office." "Sixth graders are old enough to know that." "Act like a third grader." "If you do that, maybe I'll have a little surprise for you."

Supporting. Using "sympathy, or the reassurance that things aren't as bad as they seem, or that they will get better" (p. 9). Examples: "Everything will be all right." "You're okay. Stop crying."

Playing Psychoanalyst. "Interpreting, analyzing, interrogating" (p. 9), or looking for motivation. Examples: "Now, who started this?"

"How do you feel about that?" "Why do you think you did that?" "Why do you think he treats you that way?"

Diversionary Tactics. "Trying to kid the other person out of his problem, or in some way avoid or help him avoid the problem" (p. 9). Included are such things as kidding, teasing, sarcasm, and humor. Examples: "You're not expected to be an Einstein, you know." "All high school kids have boyfriend trouble. It's just part of life." "Who do you think you are? Superman?"

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although a dearth of solid research exists in the field of effective teacher-student interactions, this subject has not escaped the attention of those who recognize the critical importance it has in contemporary education. Most of the writing currently being done focuses on two major areas: (1) the lack of, and consequently the necessity of, effective interpersonal communication skills among educators and the effect of such skills upon students' academic progress; and (2) the trial and implementation of programs currently being developed to train or to assist in training teachers in these important areas.

In a study in which college-aged students were asked to describe the two most negative experiences of their lives, Branan (1972) found that nearly one-third of the responses involved interpersonal relations with teachers. Humiliation in front of a class, unfairness in evaluation, destruction of self-confidence, personality conflicts, and embarrassment were among the individual experiences listed. As a result of this study, Branan concluded that "the damage resulting from sarcastic, insensitive, and noncaring teachers . . . must be decreased" (p. 82).

Webb (1971) showed that both high- and low-ability students identified as insecure and as school problems gave fewer educationally negative responses when placed with highly sensitive teachers than when

placed with less sensitive teachers. Low-ability, insecure students were more affected in educationally negative ways by less sensitive teachers than were any other group. Webb concluded that a teachers' behavior is more important than his knowledge in a student-teacher learning exchange.

Samph (1974) attempted to examine the extent to which teacher verbal behavior influences the language skills development of below-average achievers. Each teacher was classified as either indirect (i.e., accepts feelings, praises, encourages, uses ideas of students, asks questions) or direct (i.e., lectures, gives directions, criticizes, or justifies authority) according to Flanders' Interaction Analysis System. The results indicated that enhanced language skill achievement and positive attitudes of students are significantly related to indirect teacher behavior. Similarly, an earlier study by Aspy and Roebuck (1972) has shown that a teacher's increased positive regard for students is translated into classroom behavior which elicits higher levels of cognitive functioning from students.

Although studies generally support the thesis that there is a relationship between a teacher's verbal behavior and the quality of student-teacher interpersonal relations, Mason (1970) was unable to establish such a relationship using eleventh- and twelfth-grade social studies classrooms. He suggests that differing academic climates between elementary and secondary schools, differences between time spent with the teacher, and the maturity level of the students are possible explanations for the disparate conclusions reached in elementary and secondary studies. However, Branan (1972) found that the greatest number of students' negative experiences involving teachers occurred at

the high school and college levels. This suggests that even high schools and colleges need sensitive and caring teachers, trained in human relations and effective communication skills.

The current interest in such popular psychologists as Dreikurs (1964), Glasser (1969), Gordon (1970), and Harris (1967) attests to the growing concern shared by parents and professionals for students' education in the affective domain as well as in cognitive and academic skills. Even a cursory glance through current education journals reveals a new emphasis on the need for teachers and administrators to develop sensitivity to students, adequate questioning techniques, and listening skills (Ginott, 1972; Ladas, 1972a, 1972b; Romey, 1972; Snyder, 1975; Sund, 1974). In other studies, Transactional Analysis seems to be a useful model in a classroom to help students experience and understand their emotions (Ramsey, 1975; "The OK Classroom," 1973). Harbage (1971) asks students to keep a two-week diary in order that she might better know them and in order that the students might become more sensitive to the world around them. She describes the impact of this program upon her own emotional development:

> I learned to talk less, that I might listen more; to observe carefully with both eyes and heart so that I could hope to understand; to be less hurried in response so as to give myself and another time to gather a bit of wisdom; to hold safely in the memory the good and happy times as insurance against the trying days (p. 230).

Lutsk (1972) maintains that although a teacher's role is defined as being basically task-oriented, he must at some point attempt to establish an affective relationship with his students if they are to accomplish the specified tasks. By so doing, however, the teacher then becomes less concerned with the particular tasks at hand and more

concerned with individual students, a situation which Lutsk and others would consider desirable.

The education of the "total" or the "whole" child is a subject of concern to many educators, including Levine (1973) and Vitro and Yvon (1972). Levine speaks of education as a "preparation for life," and the responsibility of educators "to keep [a student] in contact with, and master of, his full repertoire of human learning potential" (p. 147). In the process of educating the "total child," Vitro and Yvon insist that "we must deal with his affective experiences (feelings, emotions, interests, needs) as well as his cognitive and academic ones" (p. 11).

A review of current literature shows an expanding interest in and emphasis on human relations and communication skills training for teachers and teacher trainees. Branan (1972) believes that "human relations knowledge and skill should become a prerequisite to teacher credentials at any level" (p. 82; italics added). Bondi (1971) and Chaney and Passmore (1971) are among current educators calling for a redefinition of competent teacher behaviors and the inclusion of programs in teacher education to train teachers adequately in human relations skills.

That it is possible to teach these skills is demonstrated in several studies. The teachers in Hopkins (Minnesota) School District, for example, were able to achieve significant improvement in knowledge of communication skills as evaluated on objective pencil-and-paper tests after an eight-week in-service training course (Haversack and Perrin, 1973). Hartzell, Anthony, and Wain (1973) conducted a 20-hour training program in human relations skills with two groups of student teachers, one group concurrent with student teaching experience and the other

group prior to student teaching experience. A control group of student teachers received no training. Results indicated that the training was highly successful; students who received training increased in human relations skills. However, the group trained before the student teaching experience decreased somewhat in their human relations skills following the student teaching experience. The concurrently trained group, while exhibiting no deterioration, did not achieve as high an initial level of functioning as the group trained before the teaching began. The attitudes of both experimental groups toward the training experience were extremely favorable. Student teachers in the control group, after their student teaching experience, achieved nearly the same level as practicing teachers, a level lower than that achieved by the student teachers who had been trained in the human relations skills. Hartzell, Anthony, and Wain concluded that, for student teachers, the most effective training program in human relations would consist of a training program prior to student teaching with "booster" sessions during the experience to combat the negative aspects of student teaching. The authors also felt that training groups are necessary for the professional staff with whom the student teachers interact.

That training programs must contain practical application and experience was verified by Neidermeyer (1970). He found that, in spite of "quality-verified instructional materials," teachers were unable to transfer the material learned to the classroom setting. Observers found, for example, that 40 percent of the pupils were never called upon to make an individual response, that teachers confirmed correct responses only half the time, that teachers made praising statements only about once every six minutes, and that when pupils were incorrect

or did not respond, teachers told the child the correct answer and then had him repeat it only 56 percent of the time. As a result of this study, the author concluded that there was a need for more substantial teacher orientation and training.

Iannone and Carline (1971) and Buchanan (1971) are teacher educators currently engaged in programs designed to prevent "humanly illiterate teachers" (Iannone and Carline, p. 429) and to produce instead teachers with affective expertise.

The need for human relations and communication skills training for teachers was discussed also by Harvey and Denby (1970). They compiled a descriptive list of a variety of training programs, workshops, group interaction programs, books, and pamphlets designed to give teachers specific help in developing interpersonal skills. Barcus (1975) discusses several programs whose impact is beginning to be felt within educational circles. Her discussion includes Self-Enhancing Education (SEE), developed by Randolph, Howe, and Achterman; Confluent Education, created by Lederman; Gordon's Teacher Effectiveness Training; and workshops by Glasser, Wight, Doxsey, and Mathiesen.

To deny that there is a need for specific programs to teach and train educators in human relations and interpersonal skills is, at best, unrealistic and, at worst, archaic. The difficulty generally, however, seems to lie not in defining the need, but in finding an adequate training program, one which not only teaches the necessary skills but also provides opportunity for sufficient practical application and practice that the skills become an integral part of a teacher's repertoire of teaching behaviors.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Subjects for the present study were 34 elementary school teachers in four schools of three school districts in northern Utah. All subjects had voluntarily enrolled in a ten-week Self-Actualizing Education class conducted by Barcus (1975), January through March, 1975. Each subject was told at the time of enrollment that observation and audio-taping was being conducted for evaluaton of the training program. Each participant enrolled in the program received $100 and three hours of university credit.

From each school involved in the study a list was obtained of the teachers who were enrolled in the Self-Actualizing Education course. The lists were then arranged according to grade levels taught, beginning with kindergarten and proceeding through sixth grade. In order to provide a control for the possible interaction of the pretest and the training course, only half of the teachers were used in the pretest. Therefore, teachers were divided into either a pretest-posttest category or a posttest-only category using a stratified random sampling technique. Stratified random sampling was necessary to insure a representative sampling of all grade levels in each category.

Measures of Student-Teacher Interaction

Measures of student-teacher interaction consisted of (1) audio tapes of group problem-solving discussions, (2) audio tapes of individual problem-solving discussions, and (3) student observations. A discussion of each of these measures follows.

1. Group problem-solving discussions. An audio tape was made of each teacher conducting a group problem-solving discussion with the class. For the group discussion, each teacher was asked to discuss, to its conclusion, a problem involving a point of procedure (e.g., how to get into reading groups more quietly, how to act when visitors come into the room, how to go to lunch without confusion, how to do seat work, etc.).

2. Individual problem-solving discussions. An audio tape was made of each teacher dealing with a student problem in an individual problem-solving session. For the individual discussion, each teacher was asked to select a student who was either doing something considered inappropriate by the teacher (e.g., misbehaving, being tardy, etc.) or not doing something he should be doing (e.g., homework, paying attention in class, etc.).

Teachers were given an outline of possible discussion topics for both group and individual discussions (see Appendix C). When questions were raised with respect to the location of the discussion, its length, teacher behaviors, etc., teachers were told to handle the problem exactly as they would if the tape recorder were not there.

An effort was made by those recording the discussions to accommodate the teachers' regular classroom schedules whenever possible. Teachers were cooperative, and most were willing to juggle regular

classroom routines and students' schedules in order to complete the taping sessions.

3. <u>Student observations</u>. Students in each classroom were observed for 15 minutes. They were divided into rows or groups, and each row or group was observed by two independent observers for ten seconds, followed by a five-second recording time. Any occurrence of the listed behaviors during the ten-second observation time was tabulated. Misbehaviors in the following categories were recorded:

a.   gross motor behaviors--being out of assigned seat, walking around the room, throwing objects

b.   disruptive noise--tapping a pencil, tearing or crumpling paper, throwing books on the desk, slamming or kicking the desk, stamping feet

c.   body contact between students--shoving, tapping, hitting, kicking, pulling hair--any physical contact

d.   verbalization--speaking when it is not permitted, answering the teacher without raising the hand or being called on, making comments or remarks out of turn, calling the teacher's name to get attention, crying, screaming, singing, laughing loudly

e.   other inappropriate behavior--ignoring the teacher's questions or commands, doing something different from that which the student has been directed to do, being involved in any task which is not appropriate but not disruptive enough to be in a different category

Design

To assess the extent to which teachers who participated in the Self-Actualizing Education program changed in their ability to use effective interpersonal communication skills, a modified one-group, pretest-posttest design was utilized. The pretest was given to only half of the teachers in an attempt to control for the possible interaction of the pretest and the training course.

The pretest was given approximately one week prior to the beginning of the Self-Actualizing Education course and was conducted in the following manner: The group discussion was recorded first, followed by a problem-solving session with an individual student. The 15-minute student observation followed the recording. An attempt was made to adhere to this procedure as closely as possible. Changes were made, however, when conflicts in schedules made rigid adherence to this format impossible.

Following the pretest recording and observation, all subjects participated in the Self-Actualizing Education course taught by Barcus (1975). Subjects attended the class once a week for ten weeks. Since the Self-Actualizing Education course was designed as an in-service training program, participants were encouraged to use the new skills in their teaching activities. They were encouraged to practice these skills with their students and to discuss their experiences with other course participants.

Approximately two weeks after the course, all participants were given a posttest which followed as nearly as possible the instructions and format established for the pretest.

To determine to what extent teacher behaviors might be lost, maintained, or increased with the passage of time, a second posttest was given approximately four weeks following the posttest. Although it would undoubtedly have been more desirable to have waited longer, it was impossible to do so because of the approaching summer vacations. In addition, no student observations were made during the second posttest. One factor contributing to this decision was the limitation of time.

Evaluation Procedure

Group and individual discussions. Each audio recording prepared for the present study was assigned a number. All discussions were then placed in random order using a table of random numbers. The discussions were then re-recorded on continuous tapes according to the random order. This was done to facilitate the review and evaluation of the tapes by the independent reviewers. A master copy was made identifying each discussion as either a group or an individual discussion and as either a pretest, a posttest, or a second posttest.

Two undergraduate students in psychology were trained to rate the audio tapes. Both raters read and studied the training manual for the Self-Actualizing Education course, and the researcher spent approximately six hours with the raters discussing the concepts and defining the categories to be rated. The following texts were used as sources of examples and illustrations in explaining and defining the categories: Teacher Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1974), Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom: Illustrated Teaching Techniques (Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper, 1971), and Self-Actualizing Education (Barcus, Neilsen, and Bertoch, 1974).

Tapes of actual classroom situations were used as a means of testing the raters' understanding of the concepts and of determining inter-rater reliability. The tapes were stopped at 20-second intervals, and the raters were asked to note, evaluate, and categorize the last teacher statement, according to the categories on the evaluation check-list (see Appendix A). The tape was then continued for another 20-seconds, again stopped, and the last statement by the teacher was noted, evaluated, and categorized. This procedure continued until 18 teacher statements had been noted, evaluated, and categorized. At that point, the taped discussion was stopped, an inter-rater reliability on those 18 teacher statements was computed, and any points of disagreement or uncertainty were discussed until the raters reached better agreement on the rating categories. This training procedure continued until the raters were able to achieve an inter-rater reliability above .85 on a series of three discussions. This they did, after approximately two hours of training, with inter-rater reliabilities of .72, .94, and .94, an average of .87. When this was achieved, the rating of the audio tapes prepared for the present study was begun.

The 20-second interval in rating the teacher statements was found to be quite satisfactory. It was long enough to give the rater insight into the trend of the discussion and to allow interchange between teacher and student; yet it was short enough to provide adequate sampling of the teacher's statements. The 20-second interval was timed using a stop-watch and was followed strictly, with one exception: if the teacher was in the middle of a statement at the end of the 20-second interval, the tape was allowed to continue until the statement was

completed. Generally, this took only two or three seconds longer. It was thought that this was necessary in order to maintain continuity in, and understanding of, the discussion.

As the rating of the audio tapes in the present study was begun, inter-rater reliability was computed often. This was done because the tapes available for training were geared more to the presentation of subject matter than to a discussion involving feelings and opinions. Frequent checks were made initially to insure that the raters were able to apply the concepts and rating methods to the tapes prepared for the study. Where disagreements occurred, discussion ensued until concepts were clarified sufficiently for the raters to reach agreement on the point in question. It must be emphasized that discussions for the purpose of clarification and understanding were conducted only after a taped discussion had been completed and tabulated. At no time were tabulations on a rating sheet changed or altered as a result of the discussion--even if reliability were embarrassingly low. As rating continued, inter-rater reliability was computed less often, but it was checked periodically.

It was found that inter-rater reliability at the beginning of the evaluations decreased considerably from the inter-rater reliability of .87 achieved during the training period. After evaulating two discussions, the raters' inter-rater reliability was only .59. After the tenth discussion, their inter-rater reliability had risen to .81; after the fiftieth discussion, the raters achieved an inter-rater reliability of .86. At the conclusion of the evaluations, the inter-rater reliability for the total number of discussions was .89.

Teachers involved in the present study were not given a time limit on the discussions. As a result, some discussions lasted only a few minutes while others extended to fifteen or twenty minutes. In addition, in some discussions there was a great deal of student talk but relatively few teacher responses, while in others there was much teacher talk and relatively little student response. The number of teacher responses, therefore, varied widely from one discussion to another. It is conceivable that a rather poor teacher conducting a lengthy discussion could adversely affect the results of the study. Conversely, a good teacher conducting a lengthy discussion would produce results which would give a false picture of the value of the training course. Therefore, a percentage of total responses in each category was computed rather than using the number of responses.

Computing the percentage of positive responses was done this way: (1) The total number of positive/non-positive agreements was counted. In other words, the raters agreed that the response was either positive or non-positive (i.e., negative or general). (2) The total number of positive agreements was counted. (3) A percentage of positive agreements was computed. This percentage of positive response agreements was used as that individual teacher's "score" in determining whether or not that teacher had changed in the use of positive responses.

Computing the percentage of negative responses was done in the same manner and for the same reason: the variability in the lengths of discussions. As with the percentage of positive responses, the percentage of negative responses was used as that individual teacher's "score" in each discussion.

Teacher talk vs. student talk. In addition to evaluating and tabulating teacher statements, the raters recorded the amount of teacher talk vs. the amount of student talk. At the end of each 20-second interval, a simple hatch mark was made under the heading of "teacher" or "student," according to who was speaking at the time. Keeping this account required some subjectivity on the part of the recorder to determine if the teacher or the students had actually done the greater share of talking during the preceding 20 seconds. For example, if the teacher had occupied the greater share of the interval, and the tape ended with a student response of "Yes," "No," "I don't know," etc., the teacher was credited with that particular interval. If a student had been talking during the interval, and the tape ended with a teacher response such as, "Well . . .," then the student would be credited with that interval. Most often, however, the response was credited to whoever was speaking at the time the tape was stopped.

A teacher's "score" was computed in a manner similar to that of computing a "score" on positive and negative responses. (1) The total number of responses was tabulated. (A response was recorded each time the tape was stopped at a 20-second interval.) (2) The number of teacher-talk responses was tabulated. (3) The percentage of teacher-talk responses was computed. (4) This percentage of teacher talk was used as the teacher's "score" for that particular discussion.

Student observations. Student observations consisted of a 15-minute observation period in each classroom. Students in each room were divided into naturally-occurring rows or groups (e.g., all the students in one row of desks or all the students at a particular table

formed a group). Each row or group was studied by two observers for ten seconds, followed by a five-second recording time. Any occurrence of gross motor behaviors, disruptive noises, body contacts between students, verbalizations, or other inappropriate behaviors that took place during the ten-second observation time was tabulated.

Observers were trained to use the observation instrument (see Appendix B) at the Edith Bowen Laboratory School at Utah State University. The Edith Bowen School was not used in the study itself. Because this school utilizes an open-classroom format, identification of intact rows or groups for observation was difficult. And as students generally are allowed freedom of movement and of verbal expression, identification of specific misbehaviors was also difficult. As a consequence, the observers were unable to attain an inter-rater reliability above .80. It was thought that there would be a more structured, traditional atmosphere in the schools included in the project and that this would lend itself more readily to the use of the observation instrument. However, since the program was scheduled to begin on a specific date, time did not permit other arrangements to be made for observers to receive additional training in a more traditional school.

This aspect of the present study did not prove to be particularly fruitful. The observers found that it was difficult to observe adequately and to record accurately the behaviors of an entire row or group within the 15-second limit. The number of misbehaviors recorded during a ten-second observation time ranged from zero to twenty.

In addition, even though the schools involved in the project were more traditionally oriented than the Edith Bowen Laboratory School,

there still seemed to be a great deal of latitude in students' freedom of expression and movement. Students sometimes changed from group to group, moving from a desk to join a group at a table, for instance. In one situation, students even moved from one classroom to another, apparently with the acceptance of the teachers involved. During work periods, students frequently conversed with each other--and sometimes with themselves--regarding the work they were doing. This verbalizing seemed to have the acceptance, if not the approval, of the teachers. The observers were uncertain whether or not to record such actions as misbehaviors if, in fact, these actions had the acceptance and approval of the teacher--as they seemed to do.

It became apparent, then, during the pretest period that the use of student observations as a testing measure would be severely limited. It was decided, however, to continue the observations through the posttest and to use the data obtained therefrom as a general, if inadequate, indication of the effect of the Self-Actualizing Education program upon student misbehaviors. In so doing, it was recognized that the information would be incomplete and would require further testing. It was felt, however, that the general information obtained from this aspect of the present study might prove useful in outlining plans for further study.

A teacher's "score" in this part of the study, both pre and post, is simply an average of the number of misbehaviors recorded by both observers.

Analysis of Data

For statistical analysis purposes, each testing session was considered separately, yielding the following five groups: (1) pretest

only, (2) posttest of those who took the pretest, (3) posttest of those who did not take the pretest, (4) posttest II of those who took the pretest, (5) posttest II of those who did not take the pretest. Table 1 illustrates the manner in which the groups were divided.

Table 1

An Illustration of the Division of Subjects into Groups

	Pretest	Posttest	Posttest II
Those subjects who received the pretest	Group 1	Group 2	Group 4
Those subjects who did not receive the pretest		Group 3	Group 5

It might have been advisable to have treated the individuals in the study as repeated measures and to have analyzed the data using a t-test for correlated means. However, the pretest was given to only half of the teachers. In addition, because of teacher absences in two cases, needed discussions were not obtained. Because of these factors, the study sample would have been considerably reduced in size. Subdividing the subjects into the five groups mentioned above and treating each group as though it were a separate group seemed to be a more effective method of analysis.

The data obtained in this study were evaluated using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Where a significant F-statistic was found, a Scheffé test was used to determine which groups differed from one another. The

Scheffé test was chosen because it is general and may be applied regardless of the number of groups and regardless of the number of cases in each group (Turney and Robb, 1973). In the present study, the Scheffé test was the most practical as the groups differed in size because of teacher absences on testing days or, in some cases, because of unacceptable tape recordings.

Hypothesis 7 was analyzed using a t-test for dependent measures. Because no student observations were obtained during the second posttest period, only two of the groups, Group 1 and Group 2, were used in the statistical analysis of this hypothesis. The results are intended to indicate, in a general way only, the effects of the Self-Actualizing Education program on student misbehaviors.

RESULTS

Data were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA), treating each sub-group as a separate group. A Scheffé test was applied if a significant F-statistic was found.

Hypothesis 1 states that there is no difference in teachers' positive responses in problem-solving discussions with groups of students before and after the training program. A computed F-value of 2.20 indicates that there were not significant differences among the groups (Tables 2 and 3). However, although the null hypothesis is retained, the F-value of 2.20 is very close to being statistically significant. It would appear, then, that teachers were able to increase their positive responses somewhat in their discussions with groups of students.

Hypothesis 2 states that there is no difference in teachers' positive responses in problem-solving discussions with individual students. A computed F-ratio of 2.87 indicates a difference ($p = < .05$) among the groups (Tables 4 and 5). The null hypothesis was rejected, and a Scheffé test was applied to determine which groups differed from one another. The Scheffé test failed to show any significant differences between the groups. Turney and Robb (1973) point out, however, that "the Scheffé test is very conservative, thus leading to relatively few significant results" (p. 133).

The data from the Scheffé test do indicate, however, that Group 1 (the pretest group) differs to a greater degree from Groups 2, 3, 4, and

5 (the posttest groups) than do other groups in similar pairings, with the greatest difference being between Groups 1 and 2 (significant at the .10 level). The Scheffé test, then, although unable to show significant differences between any two groups, does indicate the greatest likelihood of a difference between the pretest (Group 1) and the posttest (Group 2). The data suggest, then, that teachers were able to increase positive responses as the teachers dealt with students on an individual, one-to-one basis.

Hypothesis 3 states that there is no difference in teachers' negative responses in problem-solving discussions with groups of students. A computed F-value of 1.50 indicates no significant differences among the groups (Tables 6 and 7). Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating that teachers made little, if any, change in their use of negative responses as they participated in discussions with the entire class.

Hypothesis 4 states that there is no difference in teachers' negative responses in problem-solving discussions with individual students. A computed F-value of .75 indicates that there is very little difference among the groups (Tables 8 and 9). Again, the null hypothesis is retained, and again, the teachers' use of negative responses to students remained relatively unchanged as the teachers dealt with students on a one-to-one basis.

Hypothesis 5 states that there is no difference in the amount of teacher talk in problem-solving discussions with groups of students. An F-value of .95 indicates little difference among the groups (Tables 10 and 11). Therefore, the null hypothesis is retained. The amount of

teacher talk in group discussions did not change significantly after the training course.

Hypothesis 6 states that there is no difference in the amount of teacher talk in problem-solving discussions with individual students. An F-statistic of 2.78 indicates a difference (p= $<$ .05) among the groups (Tables 12 and 13). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

However, a Scheffé test failed to show significant differences between the groups. The data from the Scheffé test do show that the greatest differences between groups are between Group 1 and Group 2 and between Group 1 and Group 5. Although the Scheffé test was unable to establish that significant differences exist between these groups, it is apparent that, after the training course, teacher talk decreased when a teacher approached a student on an individual basis in a problem-solving discussion.

Hypothesis 7 states that there is no difference in the number of student misbehaviors before and after the training program. The data for Hypothesis 7 were analyzed using a t-test for dependent measures. The computed t-value is -2.17 (Table 14). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and a significant difference is noted in the number of student misbehaviors before and after the training program (p= $<$ .05). However, it would appear that the difference is opposite from that anticipated. There were more student misbehaviors after the training program than before. Fifteen teachers were involved in the pretest and posttest observations. Of the fifteen, only four teachers decreased student misbehaviors. In the other eleven classrooms, student misbehaviors increased after the training program.

Table 2

Positive Teacher Responses During the Group Discussion

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	707.19	2.20*	NS
Error	73	321.15		

*F of 2.53 required for significance at .05 level

Table 3

Positive Teacher Responses During the Group Discussion

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	40.0	48.4	49.4	50.8	35.5
S	18.4	16.5	13.7	21.1	15.5
N	14	17	14	17	16

Table 4

Positive Teacher Responses During the Individual Discussion

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	1070.24	2.87*	.05
Error	73	373.19		

*F of 2.53 required for significance at .05 level

Table 5

Positive Teacher Responses During the Individual Discussion

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	23.5	44.2	44.3	39.7	34.5
S	17.5	19.2	21.4	19.8	14.9
N	14	16	13	16	16

Table 6

Negative Teacher Responses During the Group Discussions

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	108.03	1.56*	NS
Error	73	69.29		

*F of 2.54 required for significance at .05 level

Table 7

Negative Teacher Responses During the Group Discussions

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	10.4	4.7	3.2	7.5	6.5
S	12.1	5.9	4.6	9.0	6.8
N	14	17	14	17	16

Table 8

Negative Teacher Responses During the Individual Discussions

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	351.70	.75*	NS
Error	70	470.67		

*F of 2.53 required for significance at .05 level

Table 9

Negative Teacher Responses During the Individual Discussions

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	37.9	26.3	25.2	30.7	30.5
S	20.1	19.3	25.7	20.9	18.8
N	14	16	13	16	16

Table 10

Teacher Talk During the Group Discussion

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	272.75	.96*	NS
Error	73	283.96		

*F of 2.53 required for significance at .05 level

Table 11

Teacher Talk During the Group Discussion

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	78.0	79.2	76.1	83.9	72.9
S	20.2	15.6	20.4	9.6	15.3
N	14	17	14	17	16

Table 12

Teacher Talk During the Individual Discussions

Analysis of Variance

Source	df	MS	F	Significance
Between Groups	4	801.25	2.78*	.05
Error	70	288.71		

*F of 2.53 required for significance at .05 level

Table 13

Teacher Talk During the Individual Discussions

Means and Standard Deviations

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Mean	92.9	76.6	81.8	82.5	73.7
S	11.2	15.8	20.2	14.5	18.8
N	14	16	13	16	16

Table 14

Averaged Number of Misbehaviors

Before and After the Training Course

N	Pre	Post	d	t	Significance
15	892.0	1228.5	-336.5	-2.17*	.05

*t of 2.145 required for significance at the .05 level

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

Borg and Gall (1963) have noted that the complexity of human behavior increases the difficulty of educational research. They identify three sets of factors which bear upon the educational research problem:

> First, the stimulus to which individuals are exposed is likely to be complex. Second, there are wide individual differences in the manner in which each person within a group will process a given stimulus. Third, the reactions of an individual to a stimulus are typically complex (p. 4).

This observation of Borg and Gall seems especially applicable to the present study; and in assessing the results of the present study, one must consider several factors.

First, although the present study dealt with the teachers' words alone, one cannot ignore the possibility that other aspects of the teachers' behavior may have had greater impact upon students than did their words. Tone of voice, gestures, facial expression, and other modes of non-verbal communication must surely have affected the messages sent from teacher to student.

Second, the student himself cannot be ignored. An individual student's sensitivity to and interpretation of non-verbal cues, his repertoire of experiences, his own needs, and his behavior to satisfy these needs influence his response, which in turn triggers the teacher's next response. It seems obvious, then, that some powerful inter-communication processes occur which words alone cannot convey.

A third factor to be considered in assessing the results of the present study is the influence of the Hawthorne effect. The Hawthorne effect refers to "any situation in which the . . . mere fact that the subject is participating in an experiment or is receiving special attention will tend to improve his performance" (Borg and Gall, p. 106). In the present study, both teachers and students were aware of the experimental nature of the project. Teachers volunteered to take the class with the understanding that they were willing to have group and individual discussions tape recorded for experimental purposes. The students were aware that observers and tape recording equipment were in the classroom. Some teachers reported a kind of Hawthorne effect in reverse. As students were aware of being tape recorded, they responded less readily or less vocally than usual; and in one instance, a teacher felt she had been "sabotaged" by students responding negatively and suggesting deliberately outlandish and unacceptable solutions to the subject under discussion.

A fourth consideration is the volunteer nature of the sample group itself. As Borg and Gall note, "the very fact that [subjects] volunteer makes them different from persons in the population who did not volunteer" (p. 127). The teachers who participated in the present study were voluntarily enrolled in the Self-Actualizing Education class for which they received three hours of university credit and $100. No attempt was made, within the scope of this project, to determine whether or not the teachers who volunteered differed from teachers who chose not to participate.

Another area of consideration relates to the relatively small sample size. This small sample size (34 subjects) precludes the possibility of assessing other variables which may have affected an individual teacher's increase--or decrease--in intercommunication expertise. No attempt was made, for example, to ascertain the influence, if any, of such factors as sex, educational level, years of experience, or age. In addition, the small sample meant that the study was unduly affected by absences on testing days of any teachers involved in the study.

The time of the Self-Actualizing Education course, and therefore of the testing days, must also be considered. From the first day of school, intercommunication patterns are set between students and teacher. By mid-year those patterns are firmly established, and attempts to change those established routines often become frustrating experiences for teachers, confusing ones for students. This is not to say that changes cannot or should not be made. Changes should be made, but they may be difficult and frustrating. Another consideration in the timing of the program is that the second posttest may have been given too close to the end of the school year. Students were involved in programs, field days, and other activities. They were eagerly anticipating the approaching summer vacation, less than two weeks away. One need only recall one's own excitement and hyperactivity at the approach of summer vacation to appreciate the increasing difficulty of teachers in coping with students' problems and misbehaviors.

Effective intercommunication is a teaching skill, not an inherent characteristic. It must be learned, but is seldom taught in teacher education programs. Perhaps teachers should not be expected to achieve significant change in the development of these skills in only ten weeks.

One would not expect a champion tennis player to emerge from a beginning tennis class, or a concert pianist from only a few weeks of piano training. Moreover, the process of learning effective communication skills becomes complicated by the fact that ineffective skills must be "unlearned" or changed before effective skills can be mastered. Perhaps it is expecting too much to assume that teachers should be able to accomplish such a feat in a ten-week in-service course. The teachers involved in the present study did not achieve at a level desired by the researchers, but perhaps it is significant that teachers made any change at all.

A comparison of teacher-student discussions taken before and after the Self-Actualizing Education course indicates that, after completion of the course, some teachers were beginning to understand the concepts of the Self-Actualizing Education program and were attempting to use them with students. This improved understanding is evidenced in the following two examples. Discussion #1 is a pretest problem-solving discussion between a teacher and a student. In this tape, made before the Self-Actualizing Education course, the teacher does a great deal of lecturing, judging, and blaming.

Discussion #1.

Teacher: . . . there is no way you can ever hope to get the work done, to learn something, if the book is never here. It's just a big joke. . . . So starting tomorrow I want you to turn over a new leaf. No more of this business of forgetting any more. Okay . . . . Tomorrow that book is here. Do you hear me? [pause] I don't care what you do tonight to help yourself remember. Tie a string around your finger; write the word 'book' on the palm of your hand; say 'book' to yourself 50 times on the bus--something so that you can remember to bring that book tomorrow. I want it here, and if there is any work that needs to be done, I want that done. If you don't have time to get it done tonight, I want you to come in, sit down in your seat until it's done. [pause] Understand? Is that too hard?

Discussion #2 records the same teacher after the completion of the Self-Actualizing Education course. In this discussion, however, the teacher's approach to the student has changed considerably. There is little that is negative. Instead, the teacher indicates her willingness to listen to the student, to understand his problem, and to give him responsibility for finding solutions to his problem. Complete transcripts of these discussions are contained in Appendix D.

Discussion #2.

Teacher . . . I feel really bad about you [sic.] not getting your work done. What? [pause] Is there any? [pause] What's happening that you're unable to do this?

Student: I don't know. Just that I get home and play too much.

Teacher: You go home and play too much. Well, if [pause] I know when school is out, it's time for play. . . . What could we do to help get these lessons done? What could we do?

Student: I don't know.

Teacher: Maybe if you thought about it for a minute. Could you think of something? . . .

Teacher: Does Paul bother you a lot?

Student: Yah.

Teacher: Uh-huh. What does he do when be bothers you?

Student: Um-m-m, tickles me.

Teacher: He tickles you. Yah, when someone is tickling you, it's very hard to do good work, isn't it? . . .

Teacher: . . . I was thinking that after you get home, I think there probably could be some time after you got home that you could set aside for studying? What about that?

Student: Well, when I get home my mom, my mom's usually got the table doing on something else there [sic.]. I usually have to do it on the carpet or else on the floor.

Teacher: Uh-huh. That's a little uncomfortable. Is there a place in your room where you could study?

Student: Yah, the table, but that's always filled up with puzzles, like from my brother.

Teacher: He has his puzzles there.

Student: Yeah.

Teacher: Uh-huh. I wonder if you could just kind of set up a little place for you to do your work?

Student: Well, I have a little thing about this big . . .

Teacher: Uh-huh.

Student: I might be able do one [sic.] on that.

Teacher: Okay. That sounds really good. Why don't you try that?

Student: But I'd probably have to put my book on my bed and my paper on the little desk.

Teacher: On your little desk? That sounds good. Do you think you could live with that?

Student: [giggling] Some of the time, yah.

Teacher: Okay. Now when would be a good time for you to do this, to set this up and get your lessons done? When would be a good time?

Student: Right after I get through playing.

Teacher: When you get through playing.

Student: Yeah.

Transcripts of other discussions indicate, however, that in many cases the teachers fell just short of an adequate response, or their continued use of communication killers or negative responses tended to counteract the positive aspects of the discussion. To illustrate this point, some brief examples follow. More complete transcripts of these discussions are contained in Appendix D.

Discussion #3.

Teacher: Now I know you're new in our school, and I know you're having a problem [pause] getting along with a lot of the other kids. Right now I want to talk about the problem that you give me.

(The teacher is judging and blaming the student.)

> Teacher: Okay, my problem. Let me write it down here. My problem: "I can't teach when people are out of their seats and talking." That's my problem. Now [pause] let me see if I can figure out some things I could do about it. What's one thing I could do about it? . . .

(This appears to be a teacher attempt to "own" the problem. However, if the problem "belongs" to the teacher, it is not the responsibility of the student to find solutions.)

> Teacher: You don't do anything when he slugs you? Do you do anything before he slugs you?

(This is a blaming statement by the teacher.)

Discussion #4.

> Teacher: I have [pause] I feel like that you have a problem in getting work finished. [pause] Do you think you do? [pause] And so I want you to tell me and I'll tell you some of the things that I can see about your problem.

(The teacher is judging and blaming the student.)

Discussion #5.

> Teacher: You know lately, [it] seems like I am making myself very, very angry with some of the things you're doing. . . .

(The teacher started with an "owning" statement, but negated it with a blaming statement.)

> Teacher: Do you think you follow these rules all the way?
>
> Student: No, not for the past month I haven't been.
>
> Teacher: Why? Can you tell me why?
>
> Student: No.
>
> Teacher: Is it something that you don't like about your teacher. .
>
> Student: No.
>
> Teacher: And you do these things to hurt your teacher?

(The teacher is blaming the student and playing psychoanalyst.)

    <u>Teacher</u>: And this is for your own protection. . . .

(The teacher is lecturing the student.)

    <u>Discussion #6.</u>

    <u>Student</u>: Seems like they all gang up on me. [pause] I don't like it. [The student begins to sob heavily.]

    <u>Teacher</u>: It upsets you because they gang up on you.

    <u>Student</u>: Yeah.

    <u>Teacher</u>: Is there any way that either one of us can change that?

    <u>Student</u>: No. No one can change ignorant people. [still crying]

    <u>Teacher</u>: I wonder if that's really true, [pause] if there isn't a way to change ignorant people. [long pause] What are we going to do?

    <u>Student</u>: I don't know.

    <u>Teacher</u>: H-m-m-m?

    <u>Student</u>: I don't know. [long, long pause]

    <u>Teacher</u>: Did you take that note to your mom?

(In this discussion the teacher had been exhibiting some good listening skills. The last question, however, is totally irrelevant to the student's present emotions and to the problem at hand. Obviously, an instrusion of this type can only mar the good communication established up to this point.)

<u>Recommendations</u>

    The Self-Actualizing Education program has much to recommend it as an in-service training program for teaching communication skills to educators. In only ten weeks, participants were able to demonstrate significant increase in their knowledge of communication principles

(Barcus, 1975). In addition, although to a much lesser degree, teachers were able to put their new understanding to use in their relationships with students, especially as the teachers dealt with students on a one-to-one basis.

To facilitate further study of the Self-Actualizing Education program, the following recommendations are made.

1. Extend the program to include a full-year study to begin in the spring and to conclude the following spring. The pretest would then be given in the spring (for example, the last week in April).

2. Provide a summer workshop designed to teach the concepts and principles of Self-Actualizing Education. This would utilize the findings of Hartzell, Anthony, and Wain (1973) that student teachers trained in human relation skills achieved a higher initial level of functioning if they were trained prior to their teaching experience than if they were trained concurrent with their teaching experience. This workshop would provide teachers with knowledge of the concepts contained in the Self-Actualizing Education program to help establish a pattern of intercommunication from the first day of classroom teaching. As a result, teachers should then feel less compelled to attempt dramatic changes after patterns have already been established.

3. Provide in-service booster sessions throughout the school year, perhaps once a month or, better still, every two weeks. The booster sessions would reinforce concepts learned during the initial workshop and provide a forum for discussion of experiences and/or problems in implementing the concepts.

4. Make frequent tape recordings of both group and individual teacher-student discussions to be used in the booster sessions. These

recordings would give teachers many opportunities to listen to and evaluate themselves, to correct mistakes, and to reinforce positive approaches to students. Frequent taping would also help students and teachers become accustomed to taping equipment in the room and would lessen the threat that such equipment may generate. Frequent taping would also tend to lessen the Hawthorne effect (or "reverse Hawthorne effect") as neither students nor teachers would know which tapes were being used for testing purposes. This would decrease the pressures on teachers and the incidence of students "clamming up" or "sabotaging" discussions.

5. Make the final test tape of the study at the same time of the year as the pretest tape was made (for example, the last week in April).

6. Enlarge the sample and expand the study so that other variables (e.g., age, sex, education, or experience) might be included and their effect on teacher performance evaluated.

CONCLUSIONS

Effective teacher-student communication skills are essential in promoting optimum learning among students. Few teachers, however, have the opportunity to learn such skills and to feel confidence in their ability to communicate effectively with students. The Self-Actualization Education training course is designed to acquaint teachers with such skills and to provide opportunities for teachers to incorporate these skills into their everyday teaching.

The present study indicates that teachers had greater success applying the skills and techniques of the Self-Actualizing Education program in discussions with individuals than they did in discussions with groups of students. In discussions with individual students, teachers increased their positive responses and decreased teacher talk. However, they did not make these same changes in discussions with groups of students; nor did they decrease negative responses with either individuals or groups.

REFERENCES

Aspy, D. N., & Roebuck, F. N. An investigation of the relationship between student levels of cognitive functioning and the teacher's classroom behavior. The Journal of Educational Research, 1972, 65(8), 365-368.

Barcus, C. G. The development and validation of Self-Actualizing Education: A primer for affective education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1975.

Barcus, C. G., Nielsen, E. C., & Bertoch, M. R. Self-Actualizing Education, 1974.

Bondi, J. Verbal patterns of teachers in the classroom. National Elementary Principal, 1971, 50, 60-61.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

Branan, J. M. Negative human interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 81-82.

Buchanan, M. M. Preparing teachers to be persons. Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 52, 614-617.

Chaney, R., & Passmore, J. L. Affective education: Implications for group process. Contemporary Education, 1971, 42(5), 213-216.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom: Illustrated Teaching Techniques. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Dreikurs, R., & Soltz, V. Children: The Challenge. New York: Hawthown Books, Inc., 1964.

Ginott, H. I am angry! I am appalled! I am furious! Today's Education, 1972, 61, 23-24.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Glasser, W. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Gordon, T. P.E.T.: Parent Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden, Inc., 1974.

Gordon, T. T.E.T.: Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden, Inc., 1974.

Harbage, M. Human sensitivity--and schooling. Educational Leadership, 1971, 29, 229-231.

Harris, T. A. I'm OK--You're OK. New York: Avon Books, 1967.

Hartzell, R. E., Anthony, W. A., & Wain, H. J. Comparative effectiveness of human relations training for elementary student teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 66, 457-461.

Harvey, R. C., & Denby, R. V. On humanizing teacher-pupil relations. Elementary English, 1970, 47, 1121-1134.

Haversack, D. L., & Perrin, G. Communication systems in the classroom: An in-service program to foster teacher growth. Additional Studies in Elementary School Guidance: Psychological Education Activities Evaluated. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), 1973.

Iannone, R. V., & Carline, J. L. A humanistic approach to teacher education. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 429-433.

Ladas, H. S. Here's how to take the put-downs out of praise. Teacher, 1972, 90, 46-47. (a)

Ladas, H. S. The gentle art of criticism. Teacher, 1972, 90, 11-12. (b)

Levine, E. Affective education: Lessons in ego development. Psychology in the Schools, 1973, 10 (2) , 147-150.

Lutsk, B. M. Teacher behavior: A different perspective. The Clearing House, 1972, 46, 364-369.

Mason, J. L. A study of the relationships between the behavioral styles of classroom teachers and the quality of teacher-student interpersonal relations. Educational Leadership, 1970, 28, 49-56.

Niedermeyer, F. C. Developing exportable teacher training for criterion-referenced instructional programs. Southwest Regional Educational Lab, Inglewood, California. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (DHEW), Bureau of Research, 1970.

The OK Classroom. Instructor, 1973, 82, 33-40.

Ramsey, M. The OK school--A guide of humanizing. NASSP Bulletin, 1975, 59, 66-71.

Romey, W. D. Nine ways to tune in on the child. Teacher, 1972, 90, 16-22.

Samph, T. Teacher behavior and the reading performance of below-average achievers. The Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 268-270.

Schusler, R. A. Nonverbal communication in the elementary classroom. Theory into Practice, 1971, 10 (4), 282-297.

Snyder, G. Swimming in the rushing stream of the affective domain. School and Community, 1975, 61, 23.

Sund, R. B. Growing through sensitive listening and questioning. Childhood Education, 1974, 51, 68-71.

Turney, B. L., & Robb, G. P. Statistical Methods for Behavioral Science. New York: Intest Educational Publishers, 1973.

Vitro, F. T., & Yvon, B. Ten easy ways to become an incompetent teacher. Academic Therapy, 1972, 8, 11-14.

Webb, D. Teacher sensitivity: Affective impact on students. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 455-459.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

STUDENT OBSERVATIONS RECORDING SHEET

		1	2	3	4
1	Gross Motor				
2	Disruptive Noise				
3	Contact				
4	Verbalization				
5	Inappropriate Behavior				

	5	6	7	8	9	10
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

	11	12	13	14	15	
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						

DATA SUMMARY SHEET

Rated by _____

Discussion # _____

	STATEMENT		TOTAL
POSITIVE	Listening		
	Owning Statements		
	Asking for Solutions		
	Giving Choices		
	Calling for Responsibility		
	Reinforcing		
NEGATIVE	Rescuing		
	Judging Statements		
	Lecturing		
	Persuading		
	Supporting		
	Playing Psychoanalyst		
	Diversionary Tactics		
GEN.	Neutral or Undecided		

APPENDIX C

SUGGESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE AREAS TO USE IN CLASS DISCUSSIONS

1. Academic procedures

   a. reading groups
   b. math groups
   c. working alone
   d. small group work
   e. class discussions
   f. seat work
   g. special projects

2. Routine social behaviors

   a. getting to recess
   b. going to lunch
   c. assemblies
   d. in the library
   e. having visitors
   f. on the playground

REMEMBER: Do not focus on student's bad behavior. Procedure is
          important.

SUGGESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE AREAS TO USE IN INDIVIDUAL DISCUSSIONS

1. Student is doing something that the teacher thinks is inappropriate

   a. misbehaving
   b. being tardy
   c. being a poor sport

2. Student is not doing something that the teacher thinks he should be
   doing

   a. homework
   b. cooperating
   c. paying attention in class

TRANSCRIPTIONS AND PARTIAL TRANSCRIPTIONS

OF SELECTED DISCUSSIONS

BETWEEN TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

Discussion #1

T.   I heard Mrs. W. talking to you this morning about your skill book
      and your reader. That is not like you. [pause]   Uh, you've been
      pretty good to do your things. At least you've had it [sic.] here.
      Your assignment wasn't done all the time, but you've at least had
      your book here.   S., there is no way you can ever hope to get the
      work done, to learn something, if the book is never here. It's
      just a big joke. Now, I don't know whether you're taking advantage
      of Mrs. W. or not. She's nice. She doesn't get mad and throw
      temper tantrums, like I do. She's very [pause] been very nice
      about it with you. So starting tomorrow I want you to turn over a
      new leaf. No more of this business of forgetting any more. Okay.
      Everybody forgets once in a while. When we forget all the time,
      then that's something else. Tomorrow that book is here. Do you
      hear me? [pause] I don't care what you do tonight to help your-
      self remember. Tie a string around your finger; write the word
      "book" on the palm of your hand; say "book" to yourself 50 times on
      the bus--something so that you can remember to bring that book
      tomorrow. I want it here, and if there is any work that needs to
      be done, I want that done. If you don't have time to get it done

tonight, I want you to come in, sit down in your seat until it's done. [pause] Understand? Is that too hard?

S. Huh-uh.

T. I'm not making it too hard? All right, what about your reader? Is it home, too?

S. Huh-uh.

T. Just your skill book? Okay. No more; no more. If we're going to be in the third grade, we've got to act like third graders; we've got to be a little bit responsible. Right? Okay.

Discussion #2

T. I feel real [sic.] bad . . . that you haven't been able to get your work done lately. Do you know why I feel so bad?

S. Yah, I guess.

T. Do you really?

S. No.

T. Let me tell you why I feel so bad. Because this homework and this work is to help you, and I feel like [sic.] there's [sic.] lots of places that you--you know--that you need some help. Everyone needs help every once in a while.

S. Yeah.

T. And I feel really bad about you [sic.] not getting your work done. What? [pause] Is there any? [pause] What's happening that you're unable to do this?

S. I don't know. Just that I get home and play too much.

T. You go home and play too much. Well, if [pause] I know when school is out, it's time for play.

S.   Yeah.

T.   You need to get out and get your body exercised, but there's also
     got to be a time for these lessons, too. I want you to keep that
     in mind. What could we do to help get these lessons done? What
     could we do?

S.   I don't know.

T.   [pause] Maybe if you thought about it for a minute. Could you
     think of something?

S.   Maybe if I stay after school?

T.   Okay. Okay, that's one thing you could do. Okay. I'm going to
     write that down: stay after school. What else could you do?

S.   Tell P. to quit bugging me.

T.   Okay. Tell P. to quit bugging you. Okay. Can you think of any-
     thing else? [pause] Can't think of anything else?

S.   Huh-uh.

T.   Okay. These are real [sic.] good things. Now, let me tell you.
     Staying after school bothers me just a little bit because I think
     you have Primary on some nights after school.

S.   Wednesdays.

T.   Uh-huh, on Wednesdays.   I think you have Scouts.

S.   That's at six.

T.   That's at six. Okay. Uh [pause] and some nights I know that your
     mother wants you to be home or to go someplace with her.

S.   Yah.

T.   And so that would work some of the time but not too often, not too
     often. Okay, now. Now telling P. to quit bugging you. Does P.
     bother you a lot?

S.   Yah.

T.   Uh-huh.   What does he do when he bothers you?

S.   Um-m-m, tickles me.

T.   He tickles you.   Yah, when someone is tickling you, it's very hard to do good work, isn't it?   I think we could probably have a little chat with P. and see if we could help him out, too.   Now, now is P. the only thing that bothers you?

S.   No.

T.   Okay, what else?

S.   I don't know.

T.   Okay.   Let me tell you what I was thinking of when we were talking. I was thinking that after you get home, I think there probably could be some time after you got home that you could set aside for studying?   What about that?

S.   Well, when I get home my mom, my mom's usually got the table doing on something else there [sic.].   I usually have to do it on the carpet or else on the floor.

T.   Uh-huh.   That's a little uncomfortable.   Is there a place in your room where you could study?

S.   Yah, the table, but that's always filled up with puzzles, like from my brother.

T.   He has his puzzles there.

S.   Yeah.

T.   Uh-huh.   I wonder if you could just kind of set up a little place for you to do your work?

S.   Well, I have a little thing about this big . . .

T.   Uh-huh.

S. I might be able do one [sic.] on that.

T. Okay. That sounds really good. Why don't you try that?

S. But I'd probably have to put my book on my bed and my paper on the little desk.

T. On your little desk? That sounds good. Do you think you could live with that?

S. [giggling] Some of the time, yah.

T. Okay. Now when would be a good time for you to do this, to set this up and get your lessons done? When would be a good time?

S. Right after I get through playing.

T. When you get through playing.

S. Yah.

T. Okay. The only problem with that is that you've got to remember to quit playing . . .

S. [giggling]

T. Before bedtime, haven't you?

S. Yah.

T. When is your bedtime?

S. Well, anytime really. Around nine.

T. Okay, 9:00. All right, let's say that every night at about 8:00 or 8:15 you stopped and went and did some lessons for a few minutes. How would you feel about that?

S. [hesitating] Um-m-m. Okay. Be okay.

T. Okay. What's wrong with it?

S. Nothing.

T. Do you think you could do that? Do you think you could remember?

S. Um-m-m. Yah, I think that, unless I forget about the time and then keep playing.

T. Okay. Do you have a clock at your house?

S. Yah, I've got a little alarm clock.

T. Okay. Uh [pause] you could use your alarm clock, couldn't you, to remind you?

S. Yeah.

T. What could you do with that alarm clock to remind you that it's 8:15?

S. Set it at that time.

T. Set it at that time. Yeah. That's a good idea. Set it at that time, and when it goes off, you'll know that it's lesson time.

S. Yeah. I think I'm usually downstairs.

T. Okay. That sounds good. Now, so that you don't have so much to take home at night, what could we do here at school besides tell P. to quit bugging you? What could you do to make sure that there's not quite so much to take home?

S. Walking around the room.

T. Quit walking around the room. Is that what you said?

S. Yeah.

T. Okay. Yes, I noticed that takes place quite a bit. Okay. Now, besides P., if we get P. to quit tickling you, is there anyone else around you that bothers you?

S. Not especially.

T. Okay. You think you could concentrate if P. wasn't bugging you?

S. Yeah.

T. Okay. Walking around the room takes up quite a bit of time, doesn't it?

S. [giggling] Yeah.

T. We can waste quite a bit of time walking around the room. Okay. Well, that sounds really good. It sounds really good, and I would like you to try this for maybe the next four days and then I'd like to talk to you again and see how it's working out and see how you feel about it. And anything you don't like about it, you feel free to tell me. Okay?

S. Okay.

T. If it's working out, we'll find out, and if not, then we'll go from there. Think you'd like to try it?

S. Yeah.

T. Okay. Ah [pause] would you do it?

S. Yeah.

T. You would try it and you would do it?

S. Yeah.

T. Okay. I heard a big yes.

S. Yes!

T. All right. We'll talk to you later then.

S. Okay.

Discussion #3

T. Now I know you're new in our school, and I know you're having a problem [pause] getting along with a lot of the other kids. [pause] Right now I want to talk about the problem that you give me, like when I'm trying to teach the class, when I'm trying to start

discussions [pause] or explain math [pause] or take up lunch money, what are you doing? You're sitting quietly? [pause] What are you doing? [pause] Can you tell me? [pause] Do I need to tell you [pause] what's happening? Okay. Well, my problem is that when other people are talking when I'm trying to talk, then I can't teach and when people are laying [sic.] on the floor and I'm trying to talk, I can't teach. [pause] Do you see what I'm talking about? Okay. Now [pause] do you think you can help me with my problem? You don't know? [pause] Could you try 'cause this is a really terrible problem [pause] like [sic.] I haven't been able to teach very well lately because I've had to talk to people and ask them to get in their seats. [pause] I've had to ask them not to talk and things like that when I should be teaching. Can you please help me with my problem? [pause] What do you think I could do? Okay. My problem. Let me write it down here. My problem: "I can't teach when people are out of their seats and talking." That's my problem. Now [pause] let me see if I can figure out some things I could do about it. What's one thing I could do about it? [pause] Anything I can do as a teacher? [pause] Surely there is something I can do?

S.   Kids won't leave me alone.

T.   Kids won't leave you alone?

S.   Brian won't leave me alone.

T.   Brian won't leave you alone?

S.   He keeps slugging me.

T.   He slugs you? [long pause] He slugs you? [pause] What are you doing?

S. Don't know.

T. You don't do anything when he slugs you? Do you do anything <u>before</u>
    he slugs you?

S. He writes notes to me all the time and when I get them, [pause]
    that was what one of them [pause] he always writes that same.

T. Are you telling me that he doesn't like you?

S. Uh-huh. [pause]

T. Do you think there could be a reason he doesn't like you?

S. I don't know.

T. I hear you telling me that <u>other</u> kids don't like you.

S. Nobody likes me. They <u>hate</u> my <u>guts</u>.

T. They don't like to <u>play</u> with you?

S. Nope, they don't like to play with me.

T. They don't like to help you with your work?

S. No.

T. They're mean to you?

S. Yeah. [pause] That's why I <u>hate</u> this school.

T. You don't like this school.

S. I been at [pause] once before and they still hate me.

T. You liked your old school better?

S. Uh-huh.

    (The tape ran out, so the rest of the discussion was not recorded.)

Discussion #4

T. I have [pause] I feel like [sic.] that you have a problem in
    getting work finished. [pause] Do you think you do? And so I want
    <u>you</u> to tell me and I'll tell you some of the things that <u>I</u> can see

about your problem. And I want you to tell me some of the things that you see about the problem that you have not getting your work finished. Do you think you can think of some of the reasons of why [sic.] you're not getting your work finished? Okay. Let's write your things down, and let's write my things down over here, and let's decide how you can get your work done before lunch. Okay, let's list number one. Can you give a reason?

S.   'Cause I'm playing around.

T.   Okay, 'cause you're playing around.

(The discussion continues in a similar manner.)

Discussion #5

T.   You know lately, [it] seems like I am making myself very, very angry with some of the things you're doing. [pause] And I'd like to have a little talk with you about it. What do you think is causing you to behave like you are lately in our class?

S.   They won't leave me alone.

T.   Children won't leave you alone? What do mean by that?

S.   They keep on bugging me.

T.   How do they bug you? Can you tell me some of the things they do? . . .

T.   Uh, [pause] what is it that bothers you out there? Is it just other people around you?

S.   Uh-huh. They won't keep their mouth quiet so I can concentrate on my work.

T.   Uh, [pause] what do you think you do maybe sometimes that bothers them a little bit, too? What are some of the things that you think

that maybe you might do that would give you a little better feeling and relationship with other people in the class [pause] so they're not always getting their friends to pick on you and things?

S.   I don't know.

T.   What about following the rules? Do you follow the class rules really well?

S.   Yeah.

T.   Do you?

S.   Yeah.

T.   Tell me some of the class rules.

S.   Not talking out when you're talking, and not to go back and get a drink when you're talking, and not to talk to your friends.

T.   Do you think you follow these rules all the way?

S.   No, not for the past month I haven't been.

T.   Why? Can you tell me why?

S.   No.

T.   Is it something that you don't like about your teacher . . .

S.   No.

T.   And you do these things to hurt your teacher?

S.   No.

T.   Or [pause] what [pause] just what is the reason? Why have you been breaking rules lately? You know fighting's one of our rules, isn't it?

S.   Uh-huh.

T.   And this is for your own protection and I know you've nearly been hurt a time or two when you've been in fight with someone.

S.   Only about four times.

T.   But what do <u>you</u> think you could do? Let's just set down a few things that maybe . . . [pause] Are you willing to make some commitments to me, to see whether we can have just a real nice relationship between now and the end of the year, so I don't have to get cross with you at any time? Are you willing to do this, to just tell me a few things that you think you'll try to do?

S.   Behave.

T.   I'd like to write some things down on a paper. I'll tell you what I'd like to do today. I'd like to list some of the things that you think you could do to make a better class, [pause] that <u>you</u> could do to help <u>other</u> children in the class and to help your teacher.

S.   Behave.

T.   You know I think you could be a real [sic.] good helper if you would promise me that you will try real [sic.] hard to follow these rules we've set up here. [pause] You could be a great help to me. Do you know that? [pause] Okay, would you like to sign this paper for me? Sign it. Sort of a contract that these are the things you're going to do between now and the end of school; [pause] [it's] just been the last month, hasn't it, that you've been having problems, and it's just been this last month that I find myself getting angry, and I feel badly [sic.]. I hate to make myself angry, and I do this. Do you know it? And I try not to, but I just find myself becoming angry [pause] sometimes [pause] and this doesn't help the situation, does it? Sure doesn't. Are you willing to sign these things and see if you'll try to do this between now and the end of the year?

S. At the top or at the bottom?

.. You can sign it right on the bottom, [pause] and we'll check together. Let's see. When do you think would be a good day to get together now and talk this over again and see how well you're following through on these commitments? When do you think would be a good day? Let's see [pause] we have [pause] today's Friday. How about next Wednesday? Would you like to come in next Wednesday during lunch hour and just talk to me for a few minutes after you eat your lunch?

S. Yeah.

T. And we'll go over these again [pause] and maybe [pause] we can talk a little more about them and see how we're following through. Maybe it won't be necessary to talk about them, but if we do need to talk about them, we'll talk a little more, and then we'll try again. Okay? All right. Thank you.

Discussion #6

T. What was the problem in there today during handwriting?

S. I don't know.

T. Seems to me you were having some kind of problem.

S. Who? [pause] I don't know.

T. Well, I looked over there a couple times. [pause] I noticed that there was [pause] that you were angry or something. I felt that you were angry. [pause] What was the problem?

S. Guess about today at lunch.

T. What happened?

S.   N., she called [pause] name, so I got mad at her and I threw a book at her, so [pause] 'cause she already called me a name, and I couldn't think of any name to call her, so I threw a book at her and hit D. instead. [pause] To me N. said [pause] I don't know. [pause] I didn't like what she said. [pause] That's all. [pause] I don't know what to do.

T.   You didn't like the things that she said to you.

S.   No.

T.   Were they things that upset you? Were they about you?

S.   About my nationality.

T.   About your nationality. What did she have to say about that?

S.   I don't know. I don't know what to say [pause] try and forget.

T.   Well, how do you think [pause] ah [pause] you know, I don't know if there's a solution to the problem. [pause] Maybe, perhaps we could change things a little bit, though. Think there's any way that we could change things?

S.   I don't know. [pause] I don't know how we could change things.

T.   To make things better for you, you know. [long pause]

S.   I don't know. [pause] Seems like they all . . . [pause]

T.   They all what?

S.   Seems like they all gang up on me. [long pause] I don't like it. [Student begins to sob heavily.]

T.   It upsets you because they gang up on you.

S.   Yeah.

T.   Is there any way that either one of us can change that?

S.   No. No one can change ignorant people. [still crying]

T. I wonder if that's really true, [pause] if there isn't a way to change ignorant people. [long pause] What are we going to do?

S. I don't know.

T. H-m-m-m?

S. I don't know. [long pause]

T. Did you take that note to your mom?

S. Yeah. [still crying] She said [pause] she [pause] last night she had a bad [pause] her kidneys were bothering her so she couldn't call you last night. She said if she felt a little better tonight she might.

T. Do you know why I wanted to talk to her?

S. No. [long pause]

T. Well, what do you think we should do?

S. I don't know. [pause]

T. Would it help if you were moved away from N.? Would it help things [pause] or not?

S. I don't know. [pause] Then, too, D. started . . .

T. Well, I don't think there's a lot we can do about D. You know, [pause] he has some big problems of his very own. [pause] So [pause] that's something that [pause] right now that isn't my problem, is it?

S. No.

T. My problem is that I'm [pause] I get upset when I see you angry because you know I don't like to see you angry. And what's your problem?

S. Huh?

T.   What's your problem?   [pause]   People being ignorant to you?
     [pause] You can't think of any way to solve that, huh? Do you
     think there's a way to make it better?

S.   I don't know.   [pause]

     (End of discussion)

VITA

Kathleen Pope

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: An Assessment of the Self-Actualizing Education Program

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born in Salt Lake City, Utah, April 29, 1943

Education: Graduated from Marsh Valley High School, Arimo, Idaho, in 1961; received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Utah State University in 1965 with a major in English; did graduate work in English literature at Brigham Young University, 1965-1966; will complete the requirements for a Master of Science degree in psychology in 1978.

Professional Experience: 1976-present, counselor at Dixie College, St. George, Utah; 1976, teacher of English, Jackson Hole High School, Jackson, Wyoming; 1971-1973, instructor, Executive Language School, Tokyo, Japan; 1967-1970, teacher of English, West Lake Junior High, Salt Lake City, Utah; 1966-1967, teacher of English, Rancho Alamitos High School, Garden Grove, California.