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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program for developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers. Demonstration of ability (1) to communicate with pupils on an affective level, and (2) to define mutual problems democratically, was expected to increase for experimental group student teachers, as a result of Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET), the independent variable.

The subjects in this study were 53 student teachers who volunteered to participate in a 30-hour human relations training program given concurrently with their student teaching. Thirty subjects received the ten weeks of training at the beginning of the semester and 23 subjects served as a wait list control group who were offered the course later in the semester. Experimental and control group equivalence was established by (1) a personality test (POI), (2) a test of childrearing attitudes, and (3) pretest measures of affective communication and problem-solving skills. No significant differences were found on any of these measures, and it was assumed that both experimental and control groups represented samples of the same volunteer student-teacher population.
Before training and following the ten week skill training, skill behavior samples were obtained by confronting the student teachers with affective pupil messages and stress-producing situations, and obtaining their written open-ended responses. Pre and post, experimental and control group responses were typed and randomly mixed. Trained raters categorized or rated the responses on instruments measuring: (1) listening skills: (a) understanding, (b) empathy, and (c) respect; (2) sending skills: (a) initiating affective messages, (b) congruence, and (c) self-disclosure, and (3) problem-solving skills. In addition, a measure of student teacher classroom emphasis was obtained by asking cooperating teachers to rank order phrases describing student teacher positive classroom behaviors which focused on either subject matter presentation or relationships with pupils.

Student teachers who received the training were able to demonstrate skill functioning in all areas at a significantly ($p < .01$) higher level than those in the nontrained control group. They were able to (1) respond to affective messages of pupils with understanding, empathy, and respect, (2) express self-feelings in low-threat, congruent, and self-disclosing messages, (3) produce a significantly higher ratio of facilitative than non-facilitative responses to affective pupil messages and to teacher problem situations, and (4) use significantly more democratic than either authoritarian or laissez-faire
classroom problem-solving methods. Control group subjects were found to remain at pretest levels or to deteriorate slightly in levels of affective communication skills, and to use slightly fewer democratic problem-solving methods after the ten week period.

It was predicted that the experimental group student teachers would emphasize personal relating more than subject-matter while the emphasis for control group subjects would be reversed. The results indicated that all student teachers who were evaluated emphasized relationships with pupils more than subject matter.

The results of training indicate that the systematically planned interpersonal skill training program (TET) was effective in developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers. They increased their listening and sending skills from an average starting level where they essentially ignored their own and others' feelings to an average post-training level where they achieved a high degree of skill in responding appropriately to affective stimuli. They also demonstrated significantly increased skill in using democratic problem-solving procedures after training. Special training can enable student teachers to relate to pupils on an affective level, and use democratic procedures in the classroom.
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A meaningful relationship between teacher and pupil
and teacher and class is of primary importance if a
teacher is to influence pupils in their positive develop­
ment and learning. The reinforcement value of the teacher
is based upon the significance of the interpersonal rela­
tionship. Gage (1963) defined teaching as "any inter­
personal influence aimed at changing the ways in which
other persons can or will behave" (p. 96).

Rapport must be established for a relationship to be
meaningful, or so that one person can be effective in
causing change or positive growth in another. The Compre­
hensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic
Terms (English & English, 1958) defines "rapport" as "a
comfortable and unconstrained relationship of mutual con­
fidence between two or more persons, especially between
tester and testee, counselor and client, or teacher and
class" (p. 437). Initial rapport (a) can occur naturally,
when a helpee seeks out a therapist or a disciple seeks a
guru, or (b) can be induced or created by special
facilitative skills of at least one person in the relation­
ship. In a helping relationship rapport must be created
by the helper if it does not exist already because of the
context of the relationship or because of the expectations
of the helpee. When education is compulsory, rapport is
not likely to exist naturally between the teacher and all
pupils. Therefore, it must be created by the teacher before effective learning can occur. Meaningful relationships depend on mutual understanding and action in a non-threatening, non-evaluative, accepting atmosphere. Mutual understanding depends on adequate communication of facts, feelings, and personal meanings (Rogers, 1969). Mutual action assumes mutual problem solving (Gordon, 1972).

Rogers (1969) proposed that traditional educational goals and assumptions were outdated and inadequate, and were in need of revision. He advocated a shift from a content-oriented education to a process-oriented education, from factual knowledge accumulation to "learning how to learn." He took the position that there should be a change from content to process because a content-oriented system produces passive citizens whose knowledge is settled and closed, whose ways of thinking are rigid, who have no feeling for the process of discovering knowledge and new answers. Rogers (1969) felt the need for a new approach to education, based on a new set of assumptions. He advocated experiential learning with personal involvement. He felt the relationship between the learner and the facilitator of learning to be crucial. This shift in education from content to process would require a shift in the kinds of relating that take place between teacher and pupil. Change in the teaching role would move from a more directive and autocratic role to a more facilitative and democratic role in order to prepare pupils to take a
meaningful part in a democratic and fast-changing society.

The kind of process-oriented education which Rogers advocated, in fact, is being implemented to some extent. In the last two decades the conceptualization of teaching has undergone change. This change in the definition of teaching reflected in part humanistic influences which are aimed at making the schools more humane and more democratic, requiring the teacher to help pupils develop active, inquiring, independent learning styles.

In the concept of teaching which implements the humanistic orientation, attitudes toward school, learning, subject matter, the teacher, and other people constitute important outcomes of education (Khan & Weiss, 1973). These outcomes are reflected in the performance-based criteria of effectiveness of teaching, focusing attention on the results of the teacher's efforts by assessing pupil progress in personal, social, and intellectual functioning (Messick, 1970; Stake, 1970). To achieve these ends, a teacher must be able to create a facilitative classroom climate, must be able to use democratic procedures, must help pupils learn to handle problems both independently and cooperatively, must enhance pupil strengths and self-esteem, and must motivate pupils to gain competence in social, personal, and intellectual areas. There is a need for teacher training to focus on these objectives (Khan & Weiss, 1973). This role for the teacher requires the
teacher to be proficient in interpersonal relationship skills (Gordon, 1972).

The need for teachers to be able to develop good working relationships with pupils has been recognized in stated objectives of school systems and teacher training institutions. Evaluations of teachers and student teachers usually include a teacher-pupil relationship dimension (Withall & Lewis, 1963).

Ryans (1960), in his massive study of teacher characteristics, identified two main areas of effectiveness: (1) a warm personal relationship dimension, and (2) a professional competency dimension. Cosgrove (1959), in his study of teacher effectiveness, found two major factors: (1) a student-teacher relationship dimension composed of subfactors of adequacy of relations with students and enthusiasm in working with students, and (2) a competence factor which was subdivided into a) subject matter knowledge and organization, and b) adequacy of plans and procedures. Other studies of teacher effectiveness have shown empathy (friendly, democratic behavior) and competency (systematic, organized behavior) (Bendig, 1953, 1954, 1955; Coffman, 1954; Gibb, 1955; Lovell & Haner, 1955; Medley & Klein, 1956) to be important factors. Group leadership studies have shown the importance of these dimensions for effective interpersonal relationships. Halpin (1956) found that meeting individual needs of group members was a prerequisite for group productiveness.
A number of studies of serious problems which teachers face revealed that failure to achieve good working relations with pupils was the reason for most teacher failure (Becker, 1952; James, 1930; Morrison, 1927). Other interpersonal problems involved teacher-supervisory relationships. There is a need for training in facilitative interpersonal relationship skills to prevent the loss of potentially creative and competent personnel.

Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) have presented evidence that few people in our society have facilitative interpersonal relationship skills, in the sense of helping another to use personal resources to handle problems encountered in daily living. On Carkhuff's five-level scales devised to measure interpersonal skills, with level three considered the minimally facilitative level and level five the most facilitative level, individuals from the general public were found to function midway between levels one and two (Martin & Carkhuff, 1968). Senior psychology and education majors were found to function at level two (Carkhuff, Piaget, & Pierce, 1968; Holder, Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Piaget, Berenson & Carkhuff, 1967), and teachers in a classroom setting were functioning at level two (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967). Level two functioning was described as responding only superficially to feelings of other persons, communicating little respect, responding according to prescribed "roles" rather than by expressing what they mean or feel. The
helper functioning at level two responds to the introduction of personally relevant material in a mechanical manner and evidences little emotional feeling or genuineness.

Sorenson and Halpert (1968) report that sixty percent of student teachers studied reported considerable stress at the beginning of student teaching, and twenty percent still experienced strong distress at the end of the semester. Research studies on student teaching seem to indicate that by the end of the student teaching there are some almost universally reported decrements in teaching behavior and in attitude. Gewinner (1968), using the MTAI, found that student teachers tended to change strongly in the direction of more authoritarian attitudes. Muuss (1969) attributed the decline in MTAI scores to frustration in the internship. Osmon (1959) attributed the decline to problems in motivating pupils and disciplinary problems and discouragement in getting pupil cooperation.

Hoy (1967) found student teachers changed from a "humanistic" to a "custodial" approach which stressed bureaucratic control and order. Iannaconne (1963) analyzed daily logs of student teachers. He found 24 out of 25 student teachers initially showed strong disapproval of their cooperating teacher's methods which contrasted with their training emphases. However, when they began teaching, they began to use these same unacceptable methods and tended to justify them on the basis of "it works."

Discipline problems were labelled "slow learners," indivi-
dual help decreased, and concern changed to "getting the class through the lesson." Matthews (1967), using interaction analysis to measure student teachers over a three year period, found student teachers became more restrictive of pupil behavior and showed less acceptance of pupil ideas and that pupil responses to their questions decreased. Peck and Tucker (1973) sum up research of student teaching by saying,

While there is undoubtedly some degree of realism in this change of attitude, it sounds even more like a cry of despair when faced with many simultaneous demands without adequately precise, constructive guidance in techniques which would both maintain orderly operation and facilitate growth in pupil thinking and skill (p. 969).

There is a need to help teachers increase their potential for interpersonal relationship skills so they can function at least at the minimally facilitative level on the Carkhuff scales and so that they can handle classroom problem situations democratically. Student teachers particularly need these skills in order to establish a classroom climate conducive to teaching.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Although the need for teachers to be able to establish rapport and maintain good working relationships with pupils has been recognized, investigation has disclosed that for the most part teachers do not possess the necessary interpersonal skills to establish and maintain such relationships. There are few training programs
especially designed to develop the necessary interpersonal relationship skills in teachers and even fewer programs for developing interpersonal skills of student teachers. It is particularly important for student teachers to know how to handle interpersonal relationships, not only as part of the repertoire for effective teaching, but also to alleviate their own anxieties about teaching and so that they can create a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning. It is important for teachers and student teachers to be able to establish rapport with pupils to optimize the chances for making a positive influence on pupil development and learning.

There is a need for a systematic approach to develop student teachers' interpersonal relationship skills, including communication and democratic problem-solving techniques. This study was designed to meet this need by testing the effects of a systematically planned interpersonal relationship skill training program for developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers.

THEORETICAL POSITION

This study is conceived in the humanistic framework of psychology and implements theoretical formulations set forth by Rogers (1969) and Gordon (1971). This frame of reference focuses on the study of people who are functioning adequately, competently, and creatively.
Humanistic psychology is concerned with the essential ingredients necessary for psychological health, and seeks to make it possible for the person to be more fully human, to function at the highest possible levels. Humanistic psychology offers a framework for (1) finding preventative measures so that people will not become psychologically incapacitated, and (2) encouraging full human functioning.

Maslow (1954), in formulating the humanistic position, set forth the basic tenet that need gratification or growth motivation means that there is a positive striving to grow. To be able to develop and use one's strengths, talents, and resources effectively, one's basic needs must be met. Newer and higher needs emerge as lower needs in a hierarchy of needs are fulfilled by being sufficiently gratified, beginning with basic physiological needs, then both physical and psychological safety needs, and then social or belongingness needs, then self-acceptance or self-esteem needs. These needs Maslow calls deficit needs. They must be "filled from without by human beings other than the subject" (p. 23). Positive growth needs or "being" needs are effectively met only after the deficit needs have been adequately met. Being needs include the need to know, to understand, to become adequate or competent (to achieve), to appreciate, and to create (aesthetic needs).

In applying this philosophical position to the field of education, there are implications for both the teacher
and the pupil. If teachers are to be effective, their basic needs must be met. They must feel secure enough to function effectively, to achieve, and to be creative. Their support can come from the community, from the school atmosphere, from school administration, from their own feelings of competence in their subject area and their skills at organization and presentation of subject matter, and in their ability to relate facilitatively to pupils and to meet basic pupil needs.

If pupils are to function effectively, to achieve and to be creative, their basic security needs must also be met. In a classroom it is the teacher who structures the environment and creates the climate for learning and for relating. The teacher must know how to help each child feel secure enough to achieve, create, and function at his or her best.

It is assumed that teachers can become meaningful adults to children when they help children to function at their best and when they communicate caring and understanding to pupils. It is assumed that communication of concern and understanding from a meaningful adult will help to meet the basic security needs of pupils since these needs must be met by persons in meaningful relationship with the child. It is assumed that teachers can assist pupils to develop and use their strengths, talents, and resources in order to function effectively and competently, both individually and as contributing group members.
Based on his experience as a therapist Rogers (1969) emphasized the importance of establishing a close personal relationship between helper and helpee. Creating a facilitative climate involves hearing and understanding others when they express what they are feeling or perceiving, and also involves being heard and understood. A safe atmosphere is necessary for personally meaningful disclosures. Rogers (1969) found that responses to disclosures of feelings or personal meaning which tend to evaluate, reassure, deny, distort expressed meaning, or take the responsibility away from the person in distress are deflating and cause feelings of loneliness and of being misunderstood.

In responding to others in a facilitative way it is essential to accept both the content and the expressed emotionalized attitudes, endeavoring to give each aspect the approximate degree of emphasis which it has for the individual. The person who wishes to be helpful must remain alert to expressions of feelings and endeavor to understand them from the person's point of view and to communicate this understanding. Such a facilitative response communicates confidence that people can use their resources to assess where they are and enables them to make realistic plans as to what they can do about their situation.

The interpersonal process also requires that a person take the initiative in sharing his or her feelings,
thoughts, reactions, perceptions, satisfactions or disappointments with others in ways which do not demand or impose. If a person can drop defenses and make no effort to be different from what he or she is experiencing, he or she can feel relaxed and open to others, permitting close-ness (Johnson, 1972; Rogers, 1969).

Such qualities in a facilitator create the core conditions which are both "necessary and sufficient" for a meaningful relationship. Rogers (1957) identified three core conditions for successful helping: empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness. Rogers proposed that the facilitative effect of an interpersonal relationship is directly and significantly related to the extent that these core conditions are provided by the helper, whether therapist, parent, teacher, friend, or other.

Gordon (1970) agreed with Rogers that these core conditions are crucial in a helping relationship, but he proposed that in a long-term interactional relationship, such as in a family or in a classroom, conflicts are bound to occur. In order to maintain good working relationships, mutually agreeable problem-solving methods must also be used. He advocated democratic problem-solving techniques incorporating the core conditions.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THIS STUDY**

Accurate Empathy: A sensitivity to current feelings and
meanings of another person, and a communication of this understanding in a language attuned to the person's current feelings. Understanding considers, not the cause and effect relations, but the inner significance of a psychic process. A person is valued, prized, respected, and liked as he is listened to and the nature of his inner world is discovered.

Warmth, Unconditional Positive Regard, or Respect:
Valuing a person non-judgmentally. Acceptance, sincerity, and a positive reaction to a person's individuality and uniqueness. To accept a person without imposing conditions. Warmth is communicated by concern and interest in the relationship. Warmth makes the relationship more personal. The expression of warmth and respect encourage trust in the relationship. Valuing and not evaluating--evaluation makes relationships threatening.

Congruence or Genuineness: Genuineness implies a direct, spontaneous, personal encounter, without defensiveness or retreat into facade or role, an openness and honesty. Spontaneous responsive reactions. To be transparently real, non-artificial, rather than rigidly consistent.

Self-Disclosure: A sharing of perceptions, feelings, experiences. Sharing present reactions and giving any information about the past that is relevant to understanding. The ability to disclose depends on
self-awareness and self-acceptance. The ability to communicate reactions requires being aware of self-reactions. Sharing requires acceptance, usually. Appropriate self-disclosure is an indication of equality and respect.

Communication Skills: Communication skills refer to communication of personal meanings in a psychological context, rather than the broader English meaning of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. It is within this frame of reference developed from the basic assumptions of humanistic psychology and the ideas of Rogers (1961, 1969) and Gordon (1970, 1971) that this study of a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program for developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers was undertaken.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Generalization of results from this study are constrained by a number of limitations in the research design. Personality and attitude measures are used in this study to establish equivalence of groups; there is no measure of either personality or attitude change. The measurements used are restricted to evidence of skill development in communicating, both in understanding and initiating affective messages, and in problem-solving. The only
measurement of classroom conditions is a performance measure based on cooperating teachers' evaluations of student-teaching emphasis. No attempt to evaluate actual classroom interactions between student teachers and pupils is attempted because all student teachers are not free to pursue their own teaching styles in student teaching situations. No measure of pupil opinion about classroom interactions is attempted because of the broad range from kindergarten through high school represented by the student teacher assignments.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The need for teachers to be able to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships with their pupils has been established. The problem becomes one of determining effective methods for meeting this need. A review of the literature on teaching reveals that the bulk of the research has been directed at identifying and measuring variables related to either the behavior or characteristics of teachers. The focus has been on antecedents of these variables or on their consequences. The antecedent approach has tried to explain why teachers behave as they do in their role as teachers. In this approach teachers' behavior is defined by role or methods or by studying individual differences of teachers. The teacher's behavior is seen as a function of teacher characteristics or teaching situation. The consequence approach has tried to explain how it is that the behavior of one person, a teacher, can influence the behavior or learning of another person, a pupil, or can influence group functioning. This kind of approach involves interpersonal influences resulting in learning. Teachers are often left to infer how to behave in the classroom, even though they may have been adequately trained in their subject matter area and in methods of presenting their subject. Teacher preparation should make desirable teaching behaviors explicit (Gage, 1963).
The research which has been concerned with establishing effective approaches for developing interpersonal relationship skills in teachers has been primarily in two areas: (1) research on interpersonal influences and group processes; and (2) research on training programs to develop interpersonal skills.

**Research on Interpersonal Influences and Group Processes**

Interpersonal influences have been studied in depth in the field of psychotherapy, and social psychology research has spurred investigation of group processes in education. The findings from psychotherapy research indicate that significant and meaningful learning for clients results when empathy, respect and genuineness are present in the relationship (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Rogers, 1969).

Studies on interpersonal influences and group processes view the classroom group as a social milieu in which instruction and learning occur (Withall & Lewis, 1963). Results indicate the group climate influences individual learning and development, as well as being an informal vehicle for testing social concepts and conduct needed for adapting to the social culture. In this research the individual learner's frame of reference within the group context is emphasized, especially his needs and the pressures on him from the group. The emphasis on the student is often referred to as "student-centered teaching," and requires that the teacher be able to understand the
internal frame of reference of each learner and to use the
group forces and his or her impact to facilitate learning
in pupils (Anderson & Brewer, 1945; Bovard, 1951; Glidewell,
1951; Jenkins, 1951; Jennings, 1947; Jenson, 1955; Lewin,
Lippitt & White, 1939; Perkins, 1949; Rehage, 1948;
Singletary, 1951; Thelen, 1951; Wispé, 1951; Withall, 1949).
These studies indicate the development of cognitive, social,
and personal skills are influenced by group interaction,
which, in turn, is dependent on the teacher as leader.

Bills (1956), in studying four variables found to be
associated with personality change in psychotherapy,
concluded that student-centered teaching and client-centered
therapy accomplish the same effect in that measures of both
indicate that there is an increase in the acceptance of
self, a decrease in the difference between the concept of
self and the concept of ideal self, and no change in the
concept of ideal self. Student-centered teaching research
has focused on attitudes and preferences, as well as on
learning outcomes.

Perkins (1949), in a study of the influence of teacher
role on student activities, found that group climate is a
relatively stable affair which is determined by the feelings
and relationships set up by the initial relations of teacher
and pupil. These initial relationships are crucial to the
establishment of group climate. Tensions, either within
individuals or in the group functioning, affect group
climate and limit learning in the group. Learning takes place in a group when it is emotionally free of relationship problems and can devote attention to objective problems.

Flanders and Simon (1969) reviewed a large body of research on interactions in school settings. These studies demonstrated that most classrooms are dominated by teacher talk, with most of the remaining time devoted to brief answers to teacher questions. Flanders' "two-thirds rule" stated that during two-thirds of all classroom time, someone is talking; the teacher uses about two-thirds of the talking time; and about two-thirds of all teacher talk is directive. Flanders advocated more indirect influence, encouraging more pupil talk and involvement. The teacher is encouraged to develop skills to adjust the direct and indirect aspects appropriate to plan or situation.

The research on interpersonal influences and group processes suggests effective interpersonal functioning depends on (1) being aware of the consequences of behavior, knowing which behaviors are likely to produce desired effects and should be used, and which behaviors are likely to produce undesired consequences and should be avoided, and (2) acting or reacting in such ways that behaviors have the intended impact on others. There is considerable research evidence, extensively reviewed by Truax & Carkhuff (1967), that interpersonal skills are learned, either overtly or covertly, in daily living, and that focused
training can capitalize on incidental learning by specifying helpful and unhelpful behaviors.

From the research on interpersonal relationships in psychotherapy there is evidence that to be helpful to another person requires a moment-to-moment sensitivity in order to grasp the meaning and significance and the content of the other person's experiences. To do this, the other person must be respected the way he is. Both of these conditions must be genuine. Unless the teacher is genuine in relating to a child, the caring and understanding can be threatening.

The research on interpersonal relationships and group processes points out what constitutes effective interpersonal relationships and suggests that interpersonal skills are learned. This research does not provide evidence as to what kinds of planned programs of training are most effective.

Research on Training Programs to Develop Interpersonal Skills

A search of the literature reveals that there is no dearth of descriptions of training programs to develop interpersonal skills. However, the relative effectiveness of the various approaches described in the professional literature does not seem to be clearly established. It appears that many interpersonal training programs for teachers have evolved from trial and error approaches to find satisfactory ways to teach facilitative skills for
personal influence. For example, Calliotte (1971), in discussing the training efforts at the University of Maryland, reports experimentation with a number of different approaches to help education students focus on interpersonal learning. The basic encounter group model was tried first, but was rejected after a year because few significant differences were found between trained and untrained students, and because students were not successful in translating group insights into teaching behaviors. A cognitive approach was rejected the next year for the same reason. An interpersonal relationship self-directed program, using a programmed text and a Carkhuff scale for feedback on communication skills seemed promising on the basis of a volunteer participation pilot study, but when the program was mandatory, the reaction of students was much more negative. Using the POI personality test as pre- and posttest measures, increased ability to develop relationships and increased self-feeling sensitivity were found to be significantly higher for the experimental group after training, but about half of the students evaluated the program negatively, mostly on the basis of the impersonal nature of the training. The final approach reported was a broader, more integrated approach to training, using films, video-taping, discussion, demonstration, and role-playing. POI personality measures were more positive and so was student acceptance. No report was given of level of interpersonal relationship skill development.
Studies of Communication Skill Training

A number of studies have been reported on the effects of planned programs to develop communication skills. One type of training in communication skills is reported by Burke & Benner (1973). A three-session (9 hour) training program was given at Bradley University for 24 volunteer counselor trainees. The training focused on (1) discrimination training to differentiate thinking and feeling, (2) "I-message" training, sending effective messages (Gordon model), and (3) Empathy training (Truax and Carkhuff model), which included showing respect. Evaluation consisted of (1) pre- and posttest POI personality tests. They report a significant gain on two POI variables, Self-actualizing Values and Synergy (p < .05), (2) pre and post evaluations of differentiating skills and of empathy skills judged from videotaped five-minute counselling sessions before and after skill presentations (same day). Evaluations were made by self-assessments and by trained independent raters. The independent rater pretest evaluations were much lower (about half) than self-assessment ratings. In addition independent raters' evaluations did not show a significantly higher rating on differentiating skills, although self-assessments did show a significantly higher rating. Independent raters gave significantly higher empathy scores on posttests, although self-ratings were not significantly higher, perhaps due to inflated pre-
score self-assessments. The evaluation for empathy did not use Carkhuff-type scales, but asked for evaluation on undefined one to five level scales for six behaviors: paraphrased content, accuracy of paraphrasing, reflection of feelings, accuracy of affective response, extent of indication of understanding, and extent of care apparent. No evaluation of sending behaviors was presented. Since the counselling samples were videotaped, independent raters could identify persons. No information was presented as to whether pre- or posttest identification was given. No control groups were used in this study. Although this training program judged posttest empathy skills higher than pretest skills, there is no standard to identify the level attained by trainees from the three-hour empathy training.

A microcounseling training model for communication skill acquisition for counselors, proposed by Ivey (1973), has been studied. In this model a base line of helping behavior is established by casting a person in the helping role and videotaping a five-minute interaction. The training then consists of providing trainees with a written manual describing a single skill, next a videotape model of an "expert" communication illustrating the skill is presented, the trainees then compare their videotaped interaction with the expert interaction and with the written manual criteria. Next a trainer provides didactic instruction and emotional support. A second videotaped interaction is made and there is a recycling of the procedure, depending on skill levels
acquired. Microcounseling is based on an operant conditioning model. The skills covered are: (1) attending behavior, which is behaviorally defined. After attending behavior is mastered, (2) the focus on feelings is taught as selective attending on emotional aspects (rather than to try to teach "undefinable empathy and respect"). Since some trainees have difficulty in recognizing emotions, the next skills focused on are (3) sharing behavior and expression of feelings and ideas, then (4) interpretative skills. The most important skill training is direct authentic mutual communication focusing on here and now behavior and aims at mutual exploration of helpee experience.

In an extension of microcounseling called media therapy, communication and interpersonal interaction skills are developed for helpees. The helpee views the videotaped interaction and decides which of his behaviors he wants to change. Later he is trained in specific skills as the therapist has been trained. Based on his research on these models, Ivey (1973) reports that microcounseling has proven effective with counselors, clinical psychologists, medical students, para-professional counselors, parents, and teachers. The skills of the counselor have also been taught to both junior high school students and elementary children, and extensions have been made into systematic work with psychiatric patients.
Studies of Interaction Skill Training

There have been some studies of interaction skill training programs for teachers, and teacher-aides. Brown and MacDougall (1973) reported on an in-service training program, involving both teachers and pupils, attempting to alter the social climate in elementary classrooms by improving teacher-pupil relationships, improving peer relations, and increasing student self-concept. Phase I of the training focused on teacher training designed to give teachers feedback on the results of their teaching behaviors as they affected their students. Volunteer teachers allowed classroom interactions to be videotaped with one camera focused on the teacher and one camera focused on the class. Split screen presentations were used for evaluation feedback. Private critiquing with each teacher by a trainer was provided, but only positive behaviors were noted. Teachers then shared their tapes with other teachers-in-training in the school so that they could learn from each other.

To assess the impact of the six-week training on the pupil population, a pre and post administration of a self-perception index was given to pupils in grades three through six. The researchers concluded that when teachers receive feedback and positive evaluation concerning their classroom behaviors, they can build positive self-concepts in children in their classrooms.
Phase II of the training focused on training children in pupil-pupil interaction skills focusing on affective perceptions. Training consisted of systematic social skill training using discussion groups led by school counselors, group guidance, and individual counseling (content and process unspecified). To assess this training, the same self-perception index and a peer acceptance index were administered to pupils. For the peer acceptance measure, each pupil was rated on a five-point scale by each of his classmates and his individual score was a composite of his classmates' ratings. The degree of socialization or like-ability was a class average of these scores. Teachers also made ratings of individual pupils. There was a mean gain for the peer-acceptance index, and a mean loss on the self-esteem measure. The classroom climate was found to become more positive as a result of the training. A multivariate analysis disclosed that the major contributions to the child's reported self-perception were the teacher's acceptance and peer acceptance. This study is limited in generalizability, since no control groups were used in the investigation.

A performance-based module instruction program for increasing positive interpersonal relationships was designed for the Florida State Department of Education (1971) for training teacher aides. This approach uses operant conditioning for (1) shaping rapport producing behaviors, focusing on positive interpersonal relationship
skills as identified by Jack Gibb, and (2) teaching reinforcement principles, as identified by Madeline Hunter. The research is limited by the use of opinion questionnaires for pre- and posttest assessment. No evaluation was made in which training objectives were related to criteria of effectiveness.

Studies of Interaction Analysis Skill Training

One of the most widely studied approaches for developing interpersonal skills is the interaction analysis program developed by Amidon (1970) using the Flanders Interaction System. This is an approach designed to teach skills for increasing teacher-pupil mutual involvement in the learning situation. The system involves recording teacher behaviors and organizing the behaviors and their consequences into patterns so that teachers can get feedback information to shape their classroom behaviors into more indirect methods of interacting with pupils. Teachers are also encouraged to use more positive verbal reinforcements for pupil responses and to avoid critical or negative comments. Most studies of interactional analysis have found that when teachers do try to elicit more independent thinking in their pupils, the pupils respond with more self-initiated thoughtful behavior. The studies tend to show that a teacher must act in ways to allow and encourage pupil initiative, or it does not occur to any great extent. Many of these studies were limited in size and scope, but essentially the same research design has been replicated in diverse groups and
conditions with very similar findings (Peck & Tucker, 1973).

Amidon (1970) studied the effects of interaction analysis training for both student teachers and cooperating teachers. He found that student teachers who were taught interaction analysis were significantly more indirect at the end of their student teaching on nearly all of the 20 indices used than were untrained student teachers. Moskowitz (1967) found that when both student teachers and their cooperating teachers were trained in interaction analysis, they both showed more variability in their teaching patterns than did untrained control subjects. Another finding of this study was that trained student teachers had more positive attitudes toward trained cooperating teachers and more negative attitudes toward untrained cooperating teachers. The training was not found to affect the attitudes of the cooperating teachers toward the student teachers.

Bondi (1970) studied the effects of interaction analysis training prior to student teaching and found highly significant differences in favor of trained student teachers. Finske (1967) found interaction analysis trained student teachers were more flexible throughout their student teaching, using more direct methods for exerting direct influence on students when that was their intention, but using more indirect methods for discussion lessons and eliciting more pupil talk.
Kirk (1967) found that training elementary student teachers in interaction analysis led to a more relaxed conversational teaching style, and they were more aware of what they did in the classroom. Simon (1967) found that interaction analysis trained student teachers used more praise and less criticism, as well as more indirect influence than an untrained control group.

There has been some research on the use of interaction analysis in combination with other training procedures. Hough and Amidon (1964) studied a group of 40 student teachers. Half of these formed the experimental group who were given a combination of interaction analysis training and human relations laboratory training. The experimental group was rated by their supervisors as more effective in their student teaching. Other studies (Hough & Amidon, 1967; Hough & Ober, 1966; Lohman, Ober & Hough, 1967) found trained student teachers to be more empathic with pupils, more experimental in methodology, more objective, used more praise and encouragement than untrained student teachers. They maintained their differences when follow-up studies were conducted from four to 12 months later. These studies which combined treatments were not designed to isolate specific interaction effects, however.

Studies of Carkhuff-Truax Interpersonal Skill Training

An extensive amount of research has been carried out to test the effectiveness of an interpersonal skill training program, implementing a model developed by Truax and Carkhuff,
using research scales to evaluate and shape responses of counseling trainees (Truax, Carkhuff, Douds, 1964; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). Truax considered the core conditions to be interpersonal skills which could be learned and perfected with practice; they were teachable responses. Building on research evidence, in 1961 Truax constructed a nine-level scale, the Accurate Empathy Scale, which was designed to pick up moment-to-moment understanding in therapeutic interactions. In 1962 he developed the Unconditional Positive Regard and Genuineness Scales (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). All three scales were designed to be used by trained raters for rating live, taped, or written excerpts from therapeutic interactions. The therapeutic conditions were operationally defined by the scales and both inter- and intra-rater correlations established their reliability in a number of studies. The scales have face validity and have been found to be significantly related to a variety of therapeutic outcomes in numerous studies of psychotherapy (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). The scales were also used for training therapists and lay helpers in the field of mental health.

Carkhuff and his associates modified and condensed the Truax scales in an attempt to make them useful for determining the effectiveness of other helping relationships. His revisions emphasized the additive and subtractive qualities of the scales. Carkhuff also explored other conditions which seemed likely to affect the facilitative process in
helping relationships. His research also tried to determine differences in initial contacts and in ongoing meaningful relationships. In the initial phase of therapy the therapist's communication of high levels of the facilitative conditions of empathy and respect were found to be most helpful, while in the ongoing relationship, the genuineness and openness of the therapist seemed to be most important (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967). More scales were devised to tap other dimensions in relationships, such as facilitative self-disclosure, concreteness, and immediacy.

Interrelationships between the three therapeutic conditions have been found to be moderately high, which might indicate that there may be but one underlying dimension of good relationships. In reviewing the relationships from a variety of studies, some studies found negative correlations or no correlations between one of the three conditions while other studies produced high correlations between the three variables. The three variables have been found to be functionally independent for different helpers and for different target populations (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

Carkhuff (1969) suggested casting a prospective helper in a helping role to assess his helping skills. Behavior samples of interactions are used both for formal and informal evaluation. Research reports investigating the interchangeability of live, taped, or written behavior samples have indicated that more cues are available in either live or videotaped interactions, so that a helper can
respond more accurately in these conditions and the response can be more accurately judged, but audio tapes which convey voice emphasis and quality can provide almost as much information and are adequate for most evaluations. For written responses, researchers have found the evaluations are either the same as for live and taped behavior samples (Therrian, 1974), or evaluations have been found to be slightly depressed for written responses, presumably because some cues are lacking and it is more difficult to agree on assessments (Carkhuff, 1969). However, written responses can be used for large group studies and for research covering large geographical areas since responses can be mailed. Written behaviors are relatively quick and easy to obtain and special equipment is not required. If trainees can each respond to the same standard expressions or situations, evaluation is enhanced since comparisons can be made of improvement in functioning of one person, or different people can be compared (Carkhuff, 1969).

Feedback techniques usually rely on judgmental evaluations of specific behaviors. These evaluations can be made by (1) trained and knowledgeable people, such as trainers, (2) raters who are provided with specified behavioral descriptions of criteria conditions for assignment to level of skill attainment, or to category of behavior, and (3) self-assessment. Feedback and evaluations are usually based on behavior samples from live interaction behavior, from viewing videotapes, from hearing audiotapes of sample
behavior, or from written samples of behavior. Ishler (1967) tested the effects of feedback and no feedback conditions with a student-teacher population. He found that the teachers who received feedback became significantly more learner-centered than the no-feedback groups. Joyce (1967) also found that feedback could be effective, but qualified his findings to specific constructive feedback. He found that supervisors need training in giving helpful feedback, because otherwise they tend to discuss hypothetical examples rather than specific current behavior.

The research evidence on feedback is consistent in confirming that giving teachers objective feedback about specific teaching behaviors helps them make constructive changes in their teaching style, especially if another person participated in the feedback session. Self-appraisal does not lead to much new insight or else it does not provide enough motivation for most people to make real changes in style (Peck & Tucker, 1973).

The Truax and Carkhuff scales have both been used for training purposes as a means of providing feedback as to level of functioning and to operationally specify the standards by which levels of conditions are judged. The three central elements of effective training in the Truax and Carkhuff model include: (1) communication of high levels of accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness to the trainees during training, the trainer serving as model for the skills, (2) specific didactic
training and skill practice, using the scales for shaping trainee responses toward high levels of the three conditions, and (3) a focused group-therapy experience for self-exploration and to foster integration of the didactic training with personal values and life styles. The basic aspect of effective training is on structured feedback for quality control (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

Using the five-level Carkhuff scales for evaluating trainee responses during training, prospective undergraduate dormitory counselors (Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966) and experienced guidance counselors (Martin & Carkhuff, 1967) were brought to function at almost the minimally facilitative level in less than 25 hours of training. Longer term programs are recommended for developing higher levels of the skills, most training running nearly 100 hours. Such a training program, extending over a four-month period, was used for training a group of post-graduate clinical psychology trainees and another group of lay hospital psychiatric aides. They were brought to levels not significantly different from a group of experienced therapists, which included Carl Rogers, Albert Ellis, Rollo May, Julius Seeman and Carl Whitaker, on measures of accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness. On the Truax nine-level Empathy Scale, the lay trainees averaged 4.6, the graduate trainees 5.1, and the experienced therapists 5.2, all nearly at the minimal facilitative level on the scale. The levels of non-
possessive warmth (five-levels) were: lay trainees averaged 2.8, graduate trainees, 3.0, and experienced therapists 3.1, all at about the minimally facilitative level. On the levels of genuineness, the experienced therapists were statistically higher than the lay trainers, but for practical purposes they were all around level 5 on the nine-point scale (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967).

Other studies aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of this approach to training were conducted to assess lay trainees in working with hospitalized mental patients (Carkhuff & Truax, 1965; Truax, Silber, & Carkhuff, 1966). Training for undergraduate dormitory counselors (Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966) and graduate students in clinical and counseling psychology (Truax & Silber, 1966) produced significantly superior results over control groups (p < .05).

A brief empathic communication training program using Carkhuff scales and training model for Head Start personnel was reported by Bierman, Carkhuff and Santilli (1972). The subjects in the experimental group were given a two-hour empathy training workshop for five consecutive afternoons during a summer program. The four experienced trainers had been rated at level three or above on the empathy scale. A detailed account of the didactic-experiential training is presented. Pre- and posttests consisted of evaluations of written responses to five tape-recorded helpee stimulus expressions. Posttest levels of the communication of empathy reached almost the minimum facilitative level, or
the trainer level, and were not significantly different from the average level which the professional staff of a children's guidance clinic reached in responding to the same stimulus expressions. The professional trainees in the Head Start program scored slightly higher than the non-professional trainees. Both changed significantly from pretest levels. No experimental control group was used in this study.

Donnan and Meadows (1971) developed a leadership and communication training program to intervene in the desegregation process in Alabama by enhancing communication and human relations climate between teachers and students at the junior high level. The Carkhuff training model stressing experiential learning was used to shape facilitative communication skills applied to group interaction rather than for one-to-one communication. Various T-group activities were also used to demonstrate the efficacy of cooperation in planning and in reaching goals. The only evaluation was a questionnaire which indicated a positive response from both students and teachers.

In a well-designed experimental study investigating the impact of a Carkhuff training program for communication skill training of student teachers, Hartzell, Anthony & Wain (1973) report that a 20 hour program significantly improved level of communication skills of empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and confrontation when such training was given just prior to student teaching and also when it
was given concurrently with student teaching. They found that the prior training produced somewhat superior results, but that some loss occurred during the student teaching experience itself. There was no such deterioration found in the concurrent group, but their highest level was at approximately the same level as the prior group's post student teaching level. Both trained groups functioned at about the minimally facilitative levels (level three) after such training. Cooperating teachers were also tested in the communication skills on the same scales. They were found to be functioning at essentially the same level that Carkhuff's previous research had indicated for teachers (median = 1.7). The researchers concluded that the low-level functioning of the cooperating teachers and/or the student teaching experience had adverse effect on the newly learned skills of the student teachers. There was a slight upward movement (from 1.5 to 1.69) of the untrained control group to nearly the level of their cooperating teachers. This finding is consistent with the counselor research that shows counselors-in-training tend to move toward the level of functioning of their supervisors (Carkhuff, 1969).

Aspy (1972) adapted some of the Carkhuff scales for in-service teacher training, focusing on teacher behaviors to promote student success. Research reports of their use in training is not yet available.

**Studies of Gordon Interpersonal Skill Training**

A number of interpersonal skill training programs have
been described in the literature. Four of the programs which have received attention were developed by Gordon (1971) to implement a training model for teaching interpersonal skills. In 1962, Thomas Gordon, a clinical psychologist and former student and colleague of Carl Rogers, developed a course for parents to help them meet their children's and their own emotional needs through more effective and meaningful communication and problem-solving. He felt that most parents whose children are referred for treatment need education in human relationships rather than therapy. Gordon developed a training program, Parent Effectiveness Training, for improving communication in families by teaching parents skills in three areas: (1) listening skills, (2) sending skills, and (3) democratic problem-solving skills.

1. Listening skills

The Rogerian technique of "active listening" is taught to facilitate understanding of children's messages. Active listening means giving feedback to the sender that the receiver has understood the attitudes or feelings as well as the content of the message. It also implies an acceptance of the sender; he or she is taken seriously. The purpose of active listening, according to Rogers and Gordon, is to communicate both understanding and acceptance so that the person can use his own resources to meet his own needs. Trainees are also taught to avoid specific nonfacilitative responses, called "roadblocks to communication."
2. Sending skills

Gordon operationalized Rogers' concept of congruence by specifying how to initiate messages to facilitate meeting self-needs. For initiation of affective messages Gordon specified the components of a clear, low-threat message, which he labelled an "I-message." The I-message is often followed by active listening to ensure acceptance and adequate communication. Therefore, listening skills are stressed throughout the training course.

3. Problem-solving skills

Gordon went beyond Rogers in dealing with problems of conflict which he felt were inevitable in sustained relationships, due to the changing dynamics of the interpersonal relationship. Healthy families, he felt, are not those without conflicts, but are those which have worked out mutually satisfying ways to resolve conflicts. When situations or behaviors are unacceptable to any family member, clear and honest communication is needed to define the problem in terms of the needs of the individuals involved. Power techniques are avoided because of their negative emotional side-effects, and instead, all concerned search together for a mutually acceptable solution to the problem. If a solution does not meet needs it must be reassessed and modified, rather than resorting to punishment for infractions; families learn from mistakes. Both listening and initiating skills are needed in "no-lose" democratic problem resolution. This method is designed to avoid both
authoritarian and laissez-faire conflict resolution in which unilateral decisions are apt to be made in favor of the person with the most power in the situation. In this training program, problem solving is taught to encourage maximum cooperation for democratic constructive conflict resolution.

The Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) course is conducted by a trained teacher, and consists of 24 hours of classroom training, including lectures, demonstrations, tape-recordings, classroom participation experiences, role-playing, buzz sessions, and general group discussions. Classes generally meet one night a week for eight three-hour sessions, for 24 hours of training.

A Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET) course was designed by Gordon to teach basic individual and group human relations skills to teachers; to teach the special skills of facilitating self-directed learning and serving as educational consultant; and to foster a climate of intellectual freedom and creativity in student-centered classrooms. TET is a 30 hour didactic and experiential course to improve interpersonal relationships between teachers and pupils (Gordon, 1972).

TET aims to accomplish these ends by teaching teachers (1) skills in differentiating between those situations in which the child is making it difficult for himself to meet his own needs and those situations in which the child is
making it difficult for the teacher to meet the teacher's needs.

(2) skills in active listening, empathic communications, and methods of keeping the locus of responsibility for problem-solving with the child who actually owns the problem.

(3) skills in facilitative confrontation with a low probability of producing guilt and resistance and a high probability of maintaining the other's self-esteem; skills in sending congruent messages, being transparently real, confronting pupils with "I-feel" messages, keeping the locus of responsibility for the problem with the teacher.

(4) skills in preventing conflicts by modifying the environment, by preparing for change ahead of time, conducting decision-making meetings for setting rules and policies to govern behavior in future situations.

(5) skills in using a non-power method of resolving conflicts, whereby both parties mutually search for a solution that will be acceptable to both, thus reducing the necessity for the teacher to use power to force submission on the part of the student.

This interpersonal training program is a preventive approach which helps teachers use skills to keep situations from deteriorating, and it is an educational program because it teaches both knowledge and skills. It is methods-oriented. The implications of the training theory are that teachers need to provide a safe atmosphere for students to talk about their feelings, experiences, understandings, and
needs. This safe atmosphere depends upon the teacher's responses to pupil attempts to express such needs or feelings. The way a teacher responds to pupil expression of feelings determines not only the future communication with that child, but also communication with other children who observe the transaction. If a teacher can accept a child as a worthwhile human being with legitimate unmet needs, the child will feel safe in further exploring his position. If the child is made to feel inadequate or put down by the teacher's response, he will not continue honest communication; the teacher's response will have been a "roadblock." Another implication is that a teacher should be able to state his or her own legitimate needs, feelings, attitudes and ideas in ways that are likely to produce beneficial results. This requires that the teacher be in touch with self-feelings and be able to express them tactfully and honestly. If both pupil and teacher needs are respected and met, there will be more "no-problem" time in the classroom for actual learning and teaching.

In this training program, the content is provided in the **Parent Effectiveness Training** textbook (Gordon, 1970), and the **Teacher Effectiveness Training** workbook (Gordon, 1972), containing articles on orientation and theoretical positions, practice exercises, scoring keys, tally sheets, and examples of skill usage. Skill application in classroom situations includes examples of (1) teacher-student individual interactions, (2) teacher-parent conferences,
(3) teacher-student conflict resolution, (4) adult facilitation of student-student conflict resolution, (5) rule-setting class meetings, (6) content-centered class discussions, (7) class meeting conflict resolution, (8) student-centered class discussions, and (9) teacher-pupil planning conferences.

Courses in human relationship skills have been developed for school administrators and for business executives. Although the literature contains descriptive information about the interpersonal skill training courses developed by Gordon, no research has been reported on any of the courses except the Parent Effectiveness Training and the Teacher Effectiveness Training.

There have been some research studies investigating the effects of PET, but most of these studies investigated parental attitude change as perceived by either the parents or the children in a family (Lillibridge, 1971; Peterson, 1971; Stearn, 1970; Garcia, 1971). Knowles (1970) reported a reduction in authoritarianism in families, and Piercy and Brush (1971), in a small pilot study with military dependents, found a positive change in empathic and self-disclosing statements, as measured by the Carkhuff scales, as a result of PET. For the most part the research designs on PET effects were flawed by such procedures as asking parents to test their own children, use of non-comparable control groups, and lack of statistical analyses (Stearn,

Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET) was investigated by Cleveland (1973), who assessed its impact on teachers of social studies. He found no direct significant differences between his treatment and control groups, which he attributed to contamination by uncontrolled variables. Anecdotal evidence collected favored TET, however. Most of the research on the interpersonal skill training programs developed by Gordon is inconclusive because of design defects. Therefore, little is actually known about the effects of such training in producing interpersonal relationship skills. Empirical evidence on the effects of the teacher training course is particularly sparse.

Necessity and Significance of This Study

A review of the literature on interpersonal skills and training programs in interpersonal skill development reveals (1) interpersonal skills are important for effective teaching; (2) interpersonal skills are learned and can be developed; and (3) training programs do exist for the development of interpersonal skills of teachers. There appears to be consensus that teachers need to build and maintain mutual respect, understanding, and cooperative support among students and staff. To the extent that the teacher-pupil relationship is a social interaction, the teacher needs skills to facilitate group functioning and problem-solving. The teacher must know how to instigate
corrective action when problems occur in and between pupils and teacher. Teacher needs and pupil needs must be adequately met, and when a conflict of needs occurs, ways to handle such situations must be worked out. If a goal of teaching is to promote pupil skills in democratic functioning, teachers need skills to promote democratically managed classrooms.

The literature on interpersonal skills reveals that interpersonal teaching skills affect both one-to-one relationships and group functioning, and include both communication skills and interaction skills. Facilitative communication skills have been found to focus on expression of feelings. In our culture most communication is focused on message content, or facts. Feelings tend to be ignored, even when strongly expressed. Special training is needed to teach affective communication skills. To the extent that the teacher-pupil relationship is a helping relationship, teachers must be able to meet security and respect needs of pupils and must project teacher competence and concern in order to develop rapport with pupils. Largely through communication skills focused on affect, teachers learn to create a facilitative classroom climate where the core facilitative conditions are present.

The literature review reveals that most programs for teaching interpersonal skills have focused on a rationale for the need for such skills, identification of specific skill behaviors, modeling or demonstrating such behaviors,
taking samples of skill functioning, practice in the skills, provision for accurate feedback on progress in skill acquisition, and providing emotional support during the learning period. Training programs have attempted to develop trainee capacity for empathy, respect, and genuineness or congruence. Other dimensions of helping are used for in-depth psychotherapy, but these core conditions provide the basis for a relationship characterized by rapport.

According to Ellingsworth, Welden and Rosario (1972), the goals of training programs are: (1) to increase a trainee's set of alternatives, either by adding new skills or strategies or by strengthening those infrequently used, (2) to provide trainees with criteria necessary to select from an expanded set of alternatives, and (3) to teach trainees how to evaluate criteria for the application of the skills so as to make them their own consultants (p. 8).

Training for interpersonal functioning for teachers, then, must cover: (1) helping pupils resolve problems which interfere with their learning and functioning, or meeting pupil needs, (2) resolving self-problems related to the teaching situation, or meeting teacher needs, and (3) resolving interaction and group problems, or meeting group needs. When pupils have problems they cannot learn, and when teachers have problems they cannot teach. Skills to resolve potential and real problems are needed by teachers for effective classroom functioning.
In the studies of interaction analysis to develop interpersonal skills, training for handling conflict situations has not been indicated. The assumption seems to have been that if teachers can be student-centered no problems will arise. Gordon has stressed that in any kind of ongoing relationships, conflicts are common, even when people are feeling cooperative, because individual needs and values often conflict in interpersonal living. Specific training is needed to resolve such conflicts so as to keep the relationships positive and to meet mutual needs.

The investigations of interpersonal skill training programs have focused either on communication skills or on positive interaction skills. Effective two-way communication implies both understanding others and self-expression, yet little has been done to test programs of communication training for teachers to teach initiation of message skills or to assess such skills. Research on training for skills to meet self-needs of teachers has not been done.

In reviewing research on training for counseling and psychotherapy, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) discuss whether training should focus on teaching or treating the trainee. They conclude that most training practices have not assessed meaningful process or outcome criteria. The research has not related training goals to improved functioning of the person being helped. Truax and Carkhuff conclude:

Since accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth and genuineness appear to be central ingredients (com-
mon to a wide variety of theories and even more central to effective practice in counseling and psychotherapy), training programs should at least initially focus most of their attention on the understanding and implementation of these therapeutic conditions (1967, p. 223).

There is an obvious gap in the research literature, since there does not appear to be reported evidence of the effectiveness of operationally defined training programs for developing the kinds of skills deemed essential for interpersonal relationships. Research on training in interpersonal skills for student teachers is scarce. It is not enough to have training programs which appear to focus on development of skills in establishing and maintaining mutual understanding and mutual action. It is equally important, if not more so, to have empirical evidence to attest to the effectiveness of these programs. The interpersonal skill training program for teachers which was developed by Gordon (1972) appears on face value to offer the kind of training which would achieve the desired outcome criteria.

The objectives of the interpersonal skill training program developed by Gordon are compatible with the directions which researchers have indicated are important for facilitative teacher-pupil relationships. The program covers both understanding and initiating skills and focuses on their application in the classroom, especially as applied to methods of problem resolution, areas which other programs have overlooked. Therefore, research evidence to support
this assumption is lacking. This research study was undertaken in an attempt to provide empirical evidence to attest to the degree of effectiveness of this systematically designed training program in interpersonal skill development of student teachers. The investigation was designed to test five hypotheses:

Hypothesis I: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will score significantly higher than subjects in the control group (II) on posttest measures of communicating (a) understanding of affective messages of pupils, (b) empathy, and (c) respect.

Hypothesis II: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will score significantly higher than subjects in the control group (II) on posttest measures of (a) initiating affective teacher messages, (b) congruence, and (c) self-disclosure.

Hypothesis III: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will produce significantly more facilitative than non-facilitative responses to affective communication stimuli while subjects in the control group (II) will produce significantly more non-facilitative responses than facilitative responses to affective communication stimuli on
posttest measures of (a) communicating understanding of affective messages, and (b) initiating affective messages.

Hypothesis IV: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will use more democratic methods and subjects in the control group (II) will use more autocratic or laissez-faire methods for classroom conflict resolution or problem-solving on posttest measures.

Hypothesis V: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will demonstrate more interpersonal emphases and less subject-matter emphases in their classroom behaviors than subjects in the control group (II).

This study set out to provide empirical data relative to the validity of five predictions derived from the major hypotheses:

It is predicted that student teachers who participated in the interpersonal skill training would:

(1) respond to affective messages of pupils with understanding, empathy and respect

(2) express self-feelings in low-threat, congruent and self-disclosing messages

(3) produce more facilitative than non-facilitative responses to both affective messages of pupils and to teacher problem situations
(4) know how to involve affected parties in solving problems or conflicts in the classroom

(5) emphasize feelings and relationships with pupils more than subject matter in classroom behaviors.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Subjects

The 53 subjects for this study were drawn from an enrollment of about 400 student teachers during the spring term, 1974, in the University of Hawaii's College of Education. All subjects were student teaching in elementary, secondary, or special education classes in schools located on the island of Oahu, Hawaii. The 53 subjects were selected from a population of 77 students who volunteered to participate in a human relations training program running concurrently with their student teaching. The program was described at student teacher orientation meetings at the beginning of the spring semester. Fifteen of the 77 students failed to attend the initial meeting and so were dropped from the study. The 62 remaining students were assigned to experimental and control groups on the basis of their availability for the training sessions. Thirty-two elected to begin training immediately, the experimental group, and 30 preferred training later in the semester, the control group. Two subjects were subsequently lost from the experimental group because they attended only one training session. Seven subjects were lost through attrition from the control group. The 30 experimental
subjects were further divided into two teaching groups of 16 and 14, according to their available time for the evening meetings.

The average age of the experimental group was 23.86 and of the control group was 22.76. Of the 53 subjects, only six were over 25 years, and of those, three were between 30 and 40. Most of the subjects were female; there were four males in the experimental and four in the control group. Two-thirds of the volunteers for this study were in elementary education (35 students), and about half of these were in special education.

Because random assignment to groups was not feasible, three measures were used to establish group equivalence between experimental and control group subjects: (1) a personality measure based on variables appropriate to this study (POI), (2) an attitude measure, The Childrearing Philosophy Preference Instrument (Fargo, 1974, revised by Fine, 1974), and (3) pretest measures of communication and problem-solving skills.

(1) Personality Measure: Table 1 shows the group means for the 12 POI personality variables and gives the F-ratios obtained. Figure 1 shows the plotting of the 12 variables by standard scores. No significant differences between groups were found for any of the variables when compared by an analysis of variance test.
Table 1. Group Means and F-ratios for POI Personality Variable Scaled Scores* - Pretests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X-Group $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>C-Group $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time Competent</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Independent vs. dependent</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Holds self-actualizing values</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flexibility in application of values</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>-50.04</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sensitive to own needs and feelings</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>49.74</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Spontaneity</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-regard</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-acceptance</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sees nature of man as good</td>
<td>52.27</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Synergy</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>49.26</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Acceptance of aggression</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ability to have warm interpersonal relations</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In general, scores above the average on these scales (50), but below a standard score of 60 are considered to be most characteristic of self-actualizing adults.
POI Personality Variables*

Figure 1. Pretest POI Personality Variables

Experimental Group (I) ---
Control Group (II) -----

*Variables are labeled in Table 1.
Table 2. Group Rank Differences and Significance Levels in Philosophy Preference (RANKO)

S = Skinnerian  A = Adlerian  R = Rogerian

Experimental Group (N = 30)  Control Group (N = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.300 n.s.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; R</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>.001 ***</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; R</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.001 ***</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

first choice
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last choice

Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Skinnerian  A = Adlerian  R = Rogerian

Figure 2. Childrearing Philosophy Preference Instrument
Scaled Scores - Rank-order Comparisons by Groups
(2) Attitude Measure: The Childrearing Philosophy Preference Instrument was developed by Jean Fargo (1974) for use with parent educators in junior colleges. It was revised and shortened to make it applicable for use with both teacher and parent groups. The revised form (Fine, 1974) used for this study is a forced-choice rank-order instrument representing three distinct childrearing philosophical positions: a) Skinnerian, b) Adlerian, and c) Rogerian. The subjects' scores were subjected to the computer program RANKO which yielded rank differences between the three philosophical positions indicated by group members and also provided a significance measure between the positions. Table 2 gives rank differences between the variables and significance levels. Figure 2 depicts graphically the scaled scores of the two groups in their philosophical orientation at the beginning of the student-teaching semester. Results indicate that both groups were significantly more Rogerian oriented (p < .001) than either Adlerian or Skinnerian, indicating a more child-oriented philosophical position which is compatible with the training course orientation and objectives.

(3) Skill Measurement: Pretest scores of skill measurement were used to establish base lines for each skill and to verify equivalence of groups. Statistical equivalence was ascertained by use of a covariance analysis using the pretest as a covariate. The adjustment of scores on the covariance analysis was negligible, indicating essential
Table 3. Group Equivalence - Pretest Measures of Communication Skills

a. Understanding skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Posttest Differences between ANOVAR &amp; COVARY Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>( S.D. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Initiating skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Posttest Differences between ANOVAR &amp; COVARY Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>( S.D. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
equivalence of groups on these measures at the pretest time. Analysis of variance was used to compare the groups on pretest skills. Table 3 shows group means, standard deviations, and F-ratios on pretest measures of three understanding and three initiating affective message skills. Amounts of differences between analysis of variance and covariance scores for the experimental and control groups are also included. Table 4 gives percentages of facilitative and non-facilitative responses on understanding and initiating affective messages and problem-solving category percentages for both groups on pretest measures. Chi-square

Table 4. Pretest Responses in Percentages

a) Understanding Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-facilitative</th>
<th>Facilitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.275 \text{ n.s.}$

b) Initiating Message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-facilitative</th>
<th>Facilitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .288 \text{ n.s.}$

c) Problem Solving Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian (I)</th>
<th>Laissez-Faire (II)</th>
<th>Democratic (III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.863 \text{ n.s.}$
analyses did not yield any significant differences between groups.

On the basis of these measurements, it seems reasonable to assume that both groups represent samples of the same volunteer student-teacher population.

**Trainer**

All training was conducted by the investigator, a credentialed teacher of Effectiveness Training Associates (ETA) courses. She has had seven years experience teaching Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) and Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET), and for five of these years served as coordinator and trainer for these classes in Hawaii. She holds a secondary teaching certificate and had two years experience as a secondary school teacher. She holds a M. Ed. degree in educational psychology. For the last ten years she has worked as a psychologist for the University of Hawaii, serving as counselor in both the University Laboratory School and the Counseling and Testing Center, was program and personnel evaluator and materials development officer for cross-cultural training, taught graduate courses in elementary school guidance, and worked in educational research, including parent programs for Head Start research. She has also spent four years of this time as a doctoral candidate in educational psychology with special training in counseling with children and adults.
Treatment

The treatment was Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET) (Gordon, 1972), a commercially distributed course for teachers aimed at prevention of problems by teaching skills for "humanizing schools." TET is a 30-hour integrated didactic and experiential laboratory workshop program for teachers focusing on training in three main areas: (a) how to help pupils when they have a personal or learning problem, (b) how to communicate their feelings into clear, congruent, low-threat messages, and (c) mutual democratic problem-solving of conflicts. The course incorporated concepts from Rogerian theory, from Gordon's theory of non-authoritarian leadership, described in his books: Group-Centered Leadership (1955), and Parent Effectiveness Training (1970), and from Maslow's needs theory.

The goal of facilitative affective communication served as a basis for shaping facilitative responses through feedback from both the trainer and from peers, using Gordon's categories of responses as a guide. Throughout the course frequent use was made of role-playing, using large and small groups and dyads to develop skills. Both spontaneous real situations from student-teaching experiences and role-playing situations from the teacher's manual served for skill development practice. Students were encouraged to begin using the skills in interactions with pupils and to share their experiences with class members.
Course Outline

Class 1. Pretests administered
Overview of course
Distribution of texts and workbooks
Attitudes toward child behavior

Class 2. Understanding problem ownership
Individual variations as to acceptability and nonacceptability of child behavior
Responses to child when child owns a problem
12 unproductive responses commonly used
"Active Listening" introduced
Communicating acceptance

Class 3. Skill practice at identifying feelings in messages
Skill practice at responding to feelings
Active listening practice - individual and group

Class 4. Use of skills in content-centered class discussions
Use of skills in student-centered class discussions
Role-playing practice in listening skills, one-to-one

Class 5. Teacher owned problems
Ineffective and effective confrontation
Why I-message is effective
I-message skill practice, combined with active listening
Role-playing practice

Class 6. Discussion of use of power to control class
Alternatives to use of power - democratic procedures
Modification of environment to prevent problems
I-message and active listening practice

Class 7. Introduction of conflict resolution
Defining conflict-of-needs
Discussion of authoritarian (Method I), laissez-faire (Method II), and democratic (Method III) methods of conflict resolution
Examples from tapes

Class 8. Practice in Method III - six steps
Conflict-resolution group meetings
Rule-setting group meetings - policy making
Adult facilitation of student-student conflict resolution
Class 9. How to be an acceptable consultant to children
Value conflicts
Skill practice
Teacher-pupil planning conferences
Contracts and agreements

Class 10. Teachable time - ways to put skills to work in classroom
Keeping flexible and open - self-modification
Effects of use of TET methods (a) on children, (b) on teacher, and (c) on school
Posttests administered

Materials

Parent Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1970) was used as a text for the course. The book supplied a rationale for the skills taught and provided examples of facilitative communication. A workbook, Teacher Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1972), was used to supplement the text. It provided exercises for developing individual and group skills and problem-solving techniques. The teacher's manual provided by ETA served to structure the course. Tapes of counseling sessions, demonstrating use of the skills and conflict resolution, were provided by ETA.

Setting and Description

The experimental classes and testing were held in a regular classroom at the University High School located on the campus of the University of Hawaii. Movable chairs allowed flexible seating for both large circle and small groupings.

The two experimental classes met for ten sessions, from 7:00 to 10:00 P.M., one group on Monday and one on
Thursday evenings, beginning the second week of the semester. A 10-15 minute coffee break took place about mid-class each session. Attendance was taken by a signature sheet passed at each meeting. Students were allowed to make up missed classes in the alternate group.

**Instrumentation**

Skill measurements for this study were based on the premise that interpersonal functioning can be assessed empirically by casting an individual in the helping role (Carkhuff, 1969). The measuring instruments consisted of:

1. A set of six affective pupil stimulus statements (I) to elicit teacher response (see Appendix A). The feelings conveyed by the six statements were: (a) sadness because of being left out, (b) anger at being controlled by others, (c) happiness, (d) ambivalence, (e) feelings of resentment and inferiority, and (f) anger toward teacher about teacher assignments.

2. Two frustrating stimulus situations (II) (see Appendix A) to elicit affective teacher messages to pupils. The situations involved: (a) a pupil coming late to an arranged helping session after school, and (b) pupil non-compliance with routine procedures in the classroom.

3. Four school problem situations (III) (see Appendix A) needing decision and action: (a) strong pupil feelings interfere with planned classroom program, (b) decision between finishing promised work and movie attendance, (c) continuing problem of boys who disturb class, and (d)
minority group children complain about harassment from other pupils.

(4) An assessment of student-teacher interpersonal relationship involvement with pupils in the classroom (The Student Teacher Performance Scale) (see Appendix A).

**Data Collection and Procedures**

At the first class meeting the stimulus statements (I), the stimulus situations (II), and the problem-solving situations (III) were distributed. Subjects were verbally instructed to write exactly what they would say, as a teacher, in response to each stimulus statement or situation. Paper was provided for open-ended responses which were used to obtain an index of skill level and to categorize response types. A personality test (POI) and the Childrearing Philosophy Instrument (see Appendix A), an attitude measure, were also administered during the first class meeting as a check on group equivalence. During the same week, the control group student teachers were administered the pretests at one of three scheduled times.

During the last class meeting, ten weeks later, the same stimulus statements and situations were given to the experimental group subjects with the same directions. During that week control group student teachers came to one of several available meetings for posttests.

About a week before the end of the treatment, University supervisors contacted cooperating teachers on Oahu and distributed The Student Teacher Performance Scale. The
cooperating teachers were asked to rank the student
teacher(s) assigned to them on four positive classroom
emphases. This instrument was used to assess student
teacher relative emphasis on (a) relationships with pupils,
and (b) subject matter content.

Each response to the stimulus materials (I), (II), and
(III) was typed onto a separate slip of paper and coded.
Responses to each stimulus statement or situation, pre and
post, experimental and control, were randomly mixed, along
with the instructor's typed and coded responses to the
stimulus materials. Trained raters rated each response on
the measurement scales indicated.

Carkhuff (1969) cited various research studies which
indicated that trainer level of functioning should be above
the level expected of trainees. Therefore in this study
the trainer responded in writing to the standard expressions
and the standard situations and her responses were rated
along with the trainee responses by raters who did not know
trainer responses were included. The trainer ratings were:
ETA Understanding (I) (1 to 7 levels), 7; Empathy (1 to 7
levels), 6.7; Respect (1 to 7 levels), 6.7; ETA Initiating
(II) (1 to 4 levels), 4; Congruence (1 to 7 levels), 6.5;
Self-disclosure (1 to 7 levels), 7. The problem-solving
responses were all democratic, focusing on needs.

Rater Training
1. Three credentialed and experienced ETA teachers served
   as raters. They met with the trainer for briefing,
review of criteria and discussion of problems involved in assessment.

2. Raters studied the categories individually and discussed them together.

3. Raters simultaneously rated a sample of each category in independent assessment.

4. Raters and trainer discussed the ratings just completed, to compare assessments and to clarify bases for assessments.

5. Additional simultaneous assessments were made together, followed by further consultations.

6. In the final phase of training, the raters made 30 assessments of each response category and subsequently compared and discussed their assessments.

During the process of training, correlations, following the procedures from Dick and Hagerty (1971, p. 6) or Winer (1971, p. 283), between assessments of the raters were computed as a check on the training. When the correlations were over .90, signifying substantial agreement, raters were given typed slips to rate independently. When rater agreement was below .90, all three raters rated each response and consensus was reached on discrepant rating. When there were discrepancies of assignment to categories, consensus was reached, also.

Inter-rater Correlations:

(1) ETA (I):  \( r = .92 \)  (II) ETA (II): 
Empathy:  \( r = .96 \)  Congruence  ) Consensus
Respect:  \( r = .91 \)  Self-disclosure)
(III) Problem-Solving Categories:
ANOV - agreement = .94

Intra-rater Reliability - after three months:

Rater 1: \( r = .94 \)
Rater 2: \( r = .84 \)  Average \( r = .92 \)
Rater 3: \( r = .98 \)

Criterion Measures

Since there has been extensive research using both the Truax and Carkhuff scales for measuring levels of affective communication skills, and since Aspy (1972) modified these scales for in-service teacher training, a combination of all three scales adapted to teacher training was used for skill level measurement for this study. Each level of the present scales has been operationally defined, and the Truax model of small increments has been followed to maximize spread of responses for statistical evaluation. However, since previous research has indicated that the highest levels, which are appropriate for therapist functioning and training, are neither necessary nor desirable for effective classroom teaching (Rogers, 1969), the present scales have been constructed with seven levels, with level five still designated as the minimally facilitative level, as on the Truax scale. Levels eight and nine either have been deleted or have been telescoped into level seven (see Appendix B for scales).

For assessing understanding of affective messages, in addition to the evaluative-type scales, the Truax-Carkhuff-Aspy combination scales, a comparable scale was constructed
using Gordon's categories of roadblocks to communication and his progressively more facilitating listening categories, the ETA Understanding Scale (I). A similar scale, ETA Initiating Scale (II), was devised to assess treatment objectives for sending affective messages. Since the Gordon categories were used for operationally defining levels of the ETA scales, this type of scale will be referred to as a category-type scale. The scales for understanding affective messages and the scales for initiating affective messages were correlated, using all trainee response level-of-skill ratings from this study (pre and post, experimental and control). The following correlations were obtained: ETA Understanding (I) and Empathy, 0.98; ETA Understanding (I) and Respect, 0.97; Empathy and Respect, 0.98; ETA Initiating (II) and Congruence, 0.91; ETA Initiating (II) and Self-Disclosure, 0.92; Congruence and Self-Disclosure, 0.97.

Three scales were used for rater assessments of levels of communicating understanding of affective messages: (1) ETA Understanding Scale (I) (7 levels), (2) Empathy Scale (7 levels), and (3) Respect Scale (7 levels). Three scales were used for rater assessments of levels of initiating affective messages: (1) ETA Initiating Scale (II) (4 levels), (2) Congruence Scale (7 levels), and (3) Self-Disclosure Scale (7 levels). ETA categories were used by raters for tabulating category responses for both understanding and initiating affective messages and for
problem-solving methods. Category information is included in the scales (see Appendix B for samples of all scales).

Cosgrove (1959), from a pool of 900 descriptive phrases of positive teacher functioning, constructed a forced-choice scale to obtain a diagnostic measure of teacher performance on dimensions identified through factor analysis. Four positive teaching behaviors were identified, two of which focused on (1) subject matter knowledge and presentation, and two on (2) affective relationship emphases. The Teacher Performance Scale was devised for student assessment of a classroom teacher, but for this research, the performance scale has been used to assess student teacher classroom emphases as observed by the cooperating teachers, and group averages are used to assess experimental and control group student teacher classroom behavioral emphases (see Appendix A).

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance was performed on the posttest ratings, comparing the experimental and control groups, for each of the criterion measures of level-of-functioning on all open-ended measures of understanding and initiating skills. Facilitative and non-facilitative responses were tabulated to assess areas of weakness and of competence. Facilitative and non-facilitative responses of the two groups were examined by a chi-square technique on both pretest and posttest measures. Problem-solving categories were submitted to chi-square analysis.
The Teacher Performance Scale scores were subjected to the computer program RANKO which yielded rank differences between the four positive teaching emphases indicated by cooperating teachers' evaluations and provided a significance measure between the positions.

The \( p = .01 \) level of significance was chosen as the basis for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses of this experiment.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program for developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers. Demonstration of ability (1) to communicate with pupils on an affective level and (2) to define mutual problems democratically was expected to increase for experimental group student teachers, as compared with control group student teachers, as a result of training in Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET), the independent variable. In addition, student teachers with training were expected to demonstrate more interest in interpersonal relationships in the classroom than control subjects without such skill training.

Pretest measures indicated essential group equivalence on all skill measurements, on problem-solving methods, and on assessments of facilitative and non-facilitative communications. Assessment of the training was directed toward evaluation in terms of (1) achievement of facilitative levels of core condition skills necessary for establishing rapport between teacher and pupils, (2) categorization of responses to pinpoint problem areas in communication skills and to assess movement from non-facilitative to facilitative categories, (3) ability to use the skills for democratic
procedures to resolve conflict in school problem situations, in order to maintain good working relations with pupils, and (4) classroom emphasis on affective behaviors in terms of adequacy and enthusiasm in relating to pupils.

Pre- and posttest measures were taken on nine variables, including four related to listening skills to communicate understanding of affective messages of pupils, four related to initiating affective messages of teachers, and one categorizing classroom problem-solving methods. Student teacher classroom teaching emphases, stressing (1) subject matter and methods of presentation, or (2) personal relationships with pupils and feelings, were assessed by cooperating teachers' posttest rankings.

Analysis of variance on posttest scores (ANOVAR, Veldman, 1967), was used to assess the data on ratings of responses, since a covariance analysis did not reveal any essential differences in means from the analysis of variance. Chi-square analysis was used to assess posttest categorical data. Forced-choice rank data were subjected to the computer program RANKO to determine significant differences in rankings and to graphically represent classroom emphases.

Communication criteria:

Hypothesis I: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will score significantly higher than subjects in the control group (II) on posttest measures of communicating (a) understanding of
affective messages of pupils, (b) empathy, and (c) respect.

Testing for significance of responses relevant to Hypothesis I:

Subjects' level of functioning on listening skills, communicating understanding, was measured by ratings on open-ended responses to six pupil problems, Standard Expressions (I) (see Appendix A). Trained raters blindly rated both pre- and posttest responses on three scales measuring the communication of understanding of affective messages: (a) ETA Understanding Scale (I), based on Gordon classifications and course objectives (1 to 7 levels), (b) Empathy Scale (1 to 7 levels), and (c) Respect Scale (1 to 7 levels) (see appendix B).

A comparison of experimental and control group post-test measures by the F-test (see Table 5) yielded the following results: the mean level of listening skills on (a) the ETA Understanding Scale (I) for the experimental group (Group I), with a mean of 6.28, was significantly greater ($p < 0.0001$) than that of the control group (Group II), with a mean of 1.56, (b) the Empathy Scale for the experimental group (I), with a mean of 5.64, was significantly greater ($p < 0.0001$) than that of the control group (II) with a mean of 2.05, and (c) the Respect Scale for the experimental group (I), with a mean of 6.16, was significantly greater ($p < 0.0001$) than that of the control group (II) with a mean of 2.73. On all three scales, level 5
Table 5. Analysis of Variance of Posttest Rating Scores
Communicating Understanding of Affective Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) ETA Understanding Scale (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>290.4670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290.4670</td>
<td>808.407</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>18.3243</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>308.7916</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.9383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Empathy Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>168.3035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.3035</td>
<td>338.591</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>25.3521</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.4971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193.6532</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.7241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Respect Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>153.5151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153.5151</td>
<td>416.552</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>18.7932</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172.3124</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is considered the minimally facilitative level. The covariance means were essentially the same as the posttest analysis of variance means for all three measures. The results of the effects of training upon the overall levels of affective understanding appear in Table 6, which presents pre- and posttest group means and standard deviations. The data are depicted graphically in Figure 3.

Table 6. Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and Covariance Mean Scores of Experimental and Control Groups - Communicating Understanding of Affective Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Posttest Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Covary Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETA (I)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.73 1.637</td>
<td>6.28 1.174</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.72 1.527</td>
<td>1.57 1.377</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.21 1.467</td>
<td>5.64 1.208</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.10 1.421</td>
<td>2.05 1.342</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.84 1.604</td>
<td>6.16 0.062</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.87 1.432</td>
<td>2.73 1.448</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Communicating Understanding of Affective Messages
The analysis of the data supported Hypothesis I that the training was effective in improving affective understanding skills; the subjects in the experimental group (I) scored significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) than subjects in the control group (II) on the posttest measures of communicating affective understanding, empathy, and respect.

Hypothesis II: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will score significantly higher than subjects in the control group (II) on posttest measures of (a) initiating affective teacher messages, (b) congruence, and (c) self-disclosure.

Testing of significance of responses relevant to Hypothesis II:

Subjects' level of functioning on initiating affective messages was measured by ratings on open-ended responses to two teacher problems, Standard Expressions (II) (see Appendix A). Trained raters blind-rated both pre- and post-test responses on three scales for initiating affective messages: (a) ETA Initiating Scale (II), based on Gordon classifications and course objectives (1 to 4 levels), (b) Congruence Scale (1 to 7 levels), and (c) Self-Disclosure Scale (1 to 7 levels) (see Appendix B).

A comparison of experimental and control group post-test measures by the F-test (see Table 7) yielded the
Table 7. Analysis of Variance of Posttest Rating Scores
Initiating Affective Teacher Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) ETA Initiating Scale (II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>54.5186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.5186</td>
<td>116.860</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23.7915</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.4665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.3120</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.5060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Congruence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>120.7629</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.7629</td>
<td>109.114</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>56.4468</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177.2056</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.4078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Self-Disclosure Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>128.8828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128.8828</td>
<td>122.419</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>53.6928</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.0528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182.5772</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.5111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
following results: the mean level of initiating skills on (a) the ETA Initiating Scale (II) for the experimental group (I), with a mean of 3.13, was significantly greater ($p \leq 0.0001$) than that of the control group (II), with a mean of 1.09, (b) the Congruence Scale for the experimental group (I), with a mean of 4.85, was significantly greater ($p \leq 0.0001$) than that of the control group (II), with a mean of 1.80, and (c) the Self-Disclosure Scale for the experimental group (I), with a mean of 4.73, was significantly greater ($p \leq 0.0001$) than that of the control group (II), with a mean of 1.59. On both Congruence and the Self-Disclosure Scales, level 5 is considered the minimally facilitative level. The covariance means were essentially the same as the posttest analysis of variance means for all three measures. The results of the effects of training upon the overall levels of initiating affective messages appear in Table 8, which presents pre- and posttest group means and standard deviations. The data are depicted graphically in Figure 4.

The analysis of the data supported Hypothesis II that the training was effective in improving affective initiating skills; the subjects in the experimental group (I) scored significantly higher ($p \leq 0.0001$) than subjects in the control group (II) on the posttest measures of communicating affective messages, congruence, and self-disclosure.
Figure 4. Initiating Affective Teacher Messages - Means
Table 8. Pre- and Posttest Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Covariance Mean Scores of Experimental and Control Groups - Initiating Affective Teacher Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Covary Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETA (II)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.54617</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.04908</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.52429</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.35441</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.19920</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.56037</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.13529</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.02458</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.25898</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.46297</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.05340</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.88383</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis III: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will produce significantly more facilitative than non-facilitative responses to affective communication stimuli while subjects in the control group (II) will produce significantly more non-facilitative responses than facilitative responses to affective communication stimuli on posttest measures of (a) communicating understanding of affective messages, and (b) initiating affective messages.
Testing the significance of responses relevant to Hypothesis III:

Facilitative and non-facilitative responses to affective stimuli were assessed according to Gordon classifications (see Appendix B) and class objectives on open-ended responses to stimulus statements, Standard Expressions (I) and Standard Situations (II) (see Appendix A). Each response was subjected to a content analysis for the purpose of categorizing the response, both to pinpoint problem areas in communication skills and to assess movement from non-facilitative to facilitative categories. Because all categories were not used by both groups, the broader categories of facilitative and non-facilitative responses were used for chi-square analyses. The pre- and posttest category and percentage data (1) for understanding skills are shown in Table 9 and (2) for initiating skills are shown in Table 10. The results of the chi-square analysis on posttests of the experimental and control groups for (a) facilitative understanding responses was 257.5148 (p < 0.001) and for (b) facilitative initiating messages was 84.60526 (p < 0.001).

The data on facilitative communication skills support Hypothesis III that the training was effective in improving facilitative communication skills. The subjects in the experimental group (I) produced significantly more facilitative than non-facilitative responses on the posttest (p < 0.001) on both communicating understanding of
Table 9. ETA Understanding Category Tabulations and Facilitative and Non-Facilitative Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>T(-)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>T(+)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest \( X^2 = 1.27520 \) n.s.  Posttest \( \chi^2 = 257.5148^{***} \)  ***\( \chi^2 (1, .001) = 10.83 \)

Non-facilitative Roadblocks to communication

1. Ordering, directing
2. Warning
3. Advising, suggesting, moralizing, information & own opinions
4. Judging, criticizing, disagreeing, evaluating negatively
5. Praising, evaluating positively
6. Ridiculing, shaming, name-calling
7. Interpreting, analyzing, diagnosing
8. Reassuring, sympathizing, consoling
9. Probing, questioning
10. Withdrawing, distracting, humoring

Facilitative communication

11. Simple acknowledgment
12. Invitation to say more
13. Active-listening
   decode message for meaning
   respond to feelings

14. Simple affirmation
15. Giving specific feedback
16. Encouraging self-awareness
17. Constructive criticism
18. Offering solutions
19. Providing praise
20. Recognizing efforts
21. Building confidence
22. Enhancing motivation
23. Promoting growth

Note: The table and list are based on a study by ETA, examining the effects of facilitative and non-facilitative communication strategies. The data presented includes statistical analysis using chi-square tests to compare pretest and posttest results, highlighting significant differences in facilitative communication.
Table 10. ETA Initiating Messages - Category Tabluations and Facilitative and Non-Facilitative Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Non-Facilitative (-)</th>
<th>Facilitative (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest $X^2 = 0.28807$ n.s.  Posttest $X^2 = 84.66526^{***}$

$***X^2(1, .001) = 10.83$

Non-Facilitative Initiating Errors

1. Solution message (roadblocks 1-4)
2. Put-down message (roadblocks 5-9)
3. Indirect message (roadblock 10)
4. Inaccurate intensity of message
5. Sending secondary rather than primary feelings
6. Incongruent message

Facilitative Initiating Components

7. Description of situation or circumstances
8. Concrete or specific effects on teacher
9. Feelings of teacher
affective messages and on initiating affective messages, while subjects in the control group (II) remained at the pretest levels of producing more non-facilitative messages than facilitative messages in response to affective stimuli.

Problem Solving Criterion:

Hypothesis IV: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will use more democratic methods and subjects in the control group (II) will use more autocratic or laissez-faire methods for classroom conflict resolution or problem-solving on posttest measures.

Testing of significance of responses relevant to Hypothesis IV:

Subjects' conflict resolution or problem-solving methods were assessed by categorization of open-ended responses of four conflict stimuli (III) (see Appendix A) into (1), autocratic, (2) laissez-faire, or (3) democratic. The democratic category was further subdivided into whether the democratic solution was by voting or by meeting mutual needs (see Appendix B). Since no control group subjects used the meeting mutual needs category, a chi-square analysis was inappropriate, therefore both democratic procedures were combined for the chi-square analysis.

The results of the effects of training upon problem-solving methods are given in Table 11, where the data are
Table 11. Problem-Solving Methods - ETA Categories
Tabulations and Percentages of Democratic and Non-Democratic Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>T(-)</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>T(+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest $X^2 = 3.86283$ n.s.  Posttest $X^2 = 53.47765***$

$***X^2(1, .001) = 10.83$

I: Authoritarian
II: Laissez-Faire
III: Democratic
   a. by vote
   b. by meeting mutual needs
given both in terms of categories of responses and in terms of percentages of responses of problem-solving methods employed by student teachers. The posttest chi-square analysis, yielding a $\chi^2$ of 53.47765, is significant at the 0.001 level and indicates that the experimental subjects used significantly more democratic procedures, while the control subjects remained at essentially the pretest measures, using more autocratic and laissez-faire methods. When the two democratic methods are viewed separately it seems clear that the training had a pronounced effect on subjects' ability to define problems democratically according to mutual needs. Hypothesis IV is confirmed.

Classroom Emphasis criterion:

Hypothesis V: Subjects in the experimental group (I) will demonstrate more interpersonal emphases and less subject-matter emphases in their classroom behaviors than subjects in the control group (II).

Testing the significance of responses relevant to Hypothesis V:

Student teacher classroom emphases were measured by asking cooperating teachers to rank the student teacher(s) assigned to them on the Student Teacher Performance Scale (see Appendix A), which yields forced-choice ranking of four positive classroom emphases: (A) Knowledge and Organization of Subject Matter, (B) Adequacy of Relations with Students in Class, (C) Adequacy of Plans and Procedures in
Class, and (D) Enthusiasm in Working with Students. A and C are combined for this research to represent subject matter emphases and B and D are combined to represent interpersonal emphases. The results of the raw score rank differences by the computer program RANKO for both groups on their respective emphases are given in Table 12.

Table 12. Student Teacher Performance Scale – Table of Group Raw Score Rank Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>151*</td>
<td>150*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>176*</td>
<td>175*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For a sig. level of 0.001, a diff. of 97 is needed.  
*For a sig. level of 0.001, a diff. of 89 is needed.

Factor A: Knowledge and organization of subject matter  
Factor B: Adequacy of relations with students in class  
Factor C: Adequacy of plans and procedures in class  
Factor D: Enthusiasm in working with students.

The scaled score data are graphically depicted in Figure 5. Both groups placed significantly more emphasis on teacher-pupil relationships than on subject matter content (p < 0.001).
1. Experimental Group (N = 20)

   34 38 63 64
   B D A C

2. Control Group (N = 17)

   29 41 60 70
   B D C A

Scaled Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X (n = 20)</th>
<th>C (n = 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Knowledge</td>
<td>A 63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adequacy</td>
<td>B 34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adequacy</td>
<td>C 64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>D 38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data from all returned forms

Figure 5. RANKO Scaled Score Comparisons - Student Teacher Performance Scale*
The data on classroom emphases support part of Hypothesis V that experimental subjects will favor interpersonal relationships over subject matter content, but failed to support that experimental subjects put less emphasis on subject matter content than control group subjects. Both groups demonstrated more interest in interpersonal relationships.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to test the effectiveness of a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program for developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving methods of student teachers. Previous research has indicated that these skills are important for establishing meaningful relationships characterized by rapport.

For ten weeks during the beginning of the student teaching semester the student teachers in an experimental group received specific training in developing interpersonal skills to help pupils meet needs, to meet self-needs, and to structure classroom problem resolution using democratic methods. The student teachers in a control group participated in the normal student teacher activities.

It was predicted that student teachers who received the interpersonal skill training would (1) respond to affective messages of pupils with understanding, empathy, and respect, (2) express self-feelings in low-threat, congruent, and self-disclosing messages, (3) produce more facilitative than non-facilitative responses to both affective messages of pupils and to teacher problem situations, (4) know how to involve affected parties in solving problems or conflicts in the classroom, and (5) emphasize
feelings and relationships with pupils more than subject matter in classroom behaviors.

Pretests established that the experimental and control groups were not significantly different on either personality or attitudinal measures or on measures of affective communication skills. Both groups, at pretest time, were rated below the minimally facilitative level on affective communication skills. Pretest measures indicated that both groups used more non-facilitative than facilitative understanding and initiating affective message skills at a ratio of about 85 to 15. Pretests also indicated that the experimental and control groups were not significantly different on problem-solving procedures; when presented with classroom problem situations, both groups used between 60 and 70 percent non-democratic (either authoritarian or laissez-faire) methods and only 30 to 40 percent democratic procedures.

Comparison between experimental and control subjects on measures of achievement of research objectives was made by presenting standard problem statements and situations to subjects before and after training, and their open-ended responses were rated on scales measuring these skills. A measurement of positive classroom behavioral emphases of student teachers was obtained from cooperating teachers.

The results of this study, following the systematic training of student teachers in interpersonal skills, indicated:
(1) **Understanding Affective Messages**

The confirmation of the first prediction gives support to Hypothesis I that systematically planned interpersonal skill training as provided by TET is effective in improving affective understanding skills of student teachers.

F-tests comparing experimental and control groups revealed highly significant differences between experimental and control groups on skill level attainment on three measures of communicating understanding of affective pupil messages ($p < 0.0001$). The experimental group scored above the minimally facilitative level of 5.0 on all three understanding measures, averaging 6.28 on the seven-level ETA Understanding Scale (I), 5.64 on the seven-level Empathy Scale, and 6.16 on the seven-level Respect Scale, while the control group average scores dropped slightly below pretest levels on these three scales. Previous researchers have noted that student teachers lose facilitative skills during the student teaching experience and have proposed that this deterioration may be due to the lack of specific training for applying facilitative practices in the classroom situation and the possibility that cooperating teachers may not be using facilitative skills themselves, and thus cannot model or teach these behaviors to trainees (Aspy, 1969; Sorenson & Halpert, 1968; Gewinner, 1968; Muuss, 1969; Osmon, 1959; Hoy, 1967; Iannaccone, 1963; Matthews, 1967; Hartzell, Anthony & Wain, 1973). This research study confirms previous findings that without special training
student teachers do not acquire such skills during student teaching, but rather the facilitative skills they possessed at the onset of student teaching tend to deteriorate under the pressures of the student teaching experience.

The results of this study also confirm previous research findings that understanding skills can be taught in a relatively short training period (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Aspy, 1972) using a combination of didactic and experiential training with provision for practice and accurate feedback. However, the category-of-response type training model used in this study brought trainees to a higher level of functioning in a shorter training period than did training models employing judgmental-type scales for training purposes. The category-type training provided very explicit feedback as to types of categories which each trainee used and gave specific information for shaping progressively more facilitative responses. The category responses were used in constructing the ETA Understanding Scale (I). Since this scale was found to correlate highly with both the Empathy and Respect scales, it seems reasonable to assume that the facilitative understanding categories encompass both empathy and respect.

In this study, the subjects in the experimental group did not differ significantly from those in the control group in affective understanding skills at the beginning of the study. The significant improvement in communicating
understanding, empathy, and respect of the subjects in the trained group after treatment was therefore attributed to the systematically presented skill training program.

(2) Initiating Affective Messages

The confirmation of the second prediction gives support to Hypothesis II that systematically planned interpersonal skill training as provided by TET is effective in improving affective initiating skills of student teachers.

F-tests comparing experimental and control groups revealed highly significant differences in skill level attainment on three measures of initiating affective teacher messages (p < 0.0001). The experimental group scored near the minimally facilitative level on all three measures of initiating skills after training, averaging 3.13 on the four-level ETA Initiating Scale (II), 4.85 on the seven-level Congruence Scale, and 4.78 on the seven-level Self-Disclosure Scale (5.0 is designated as the minimally facilitative level on the latter two). While the scores on the initiating scales did not reach the levels attained on listening skills, the levels reached are comparable to those reported in other research studies after nearly 100 hours of training using the evaluative-type training (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967) and comparable to professional therapist levels (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). Scores for the control group dropped slightly on all three scales after student teaching, as on the listening skill measures. The student teaching experience does not seem to increase a prospective
teacher's ability to express self-needs in facilitative ways unless special training is provided to teach such skills.

The lower level of initiating skills as compared to understanding skills may have several explanations. The course itself may be weaker in developing these skills, the trainer may be less effective in presenting and demonstrating these skills, the higher absenteeism during the sessions devoted to developing these skills as compared to the greater attendance of experimental group members during the listening skill presentations may account for lower skill development, or initiating skills may be harder to acquire because public disclosure of personal problems tends to be discouraged in the American culture. More research is needed to explore the reasons for initiating skills being lower than understanding skills.

Many researchers have measured congruence or genuineness in the therapy context, along with the other core conditions; self-disclosure has usually been considered a facet of genuineness (Carkhuff, 1969). These two skills were considered in the context of the helping role as a means of either establishing the integrity of the helper in the helpee's perception, or as an indication of reciprocal and equalitarian interaction toward the end of treatment (Carkhuff, 1969). Messages designed to get self-needs met were not considered necessary in a therapy situation since it is generally believed that the helper
should be functioning effectively in his or her own life before trying to help others, and the structure of the therapy situation does not involve much mutual action where therapist needs may be affected by client behaviors. It is more likely that in the give-and-take interaction situations needs of all involved must be considered (Johnson, 1972).

Teachers have needs related to official school expectations or job needs, as well as self-needs. These needs must be expressed, understood and respected for facilitative classroom interaction. When facilitative messages characterized by genuineness and self-disclosure are considered as spontaneous sharing of present perceptions, feelings, and thinking, rather than as revealing intimate details about one's present or past, the appropriateness of such sharing in a classroom situation becomes apparent. The teacher needs to be able to initiate messages (1) to honestly express thoughts, feelings, and perceptions which communicate individuality and self-needs in such a way that they may be understood by others, and (2) to model behaviors so that pupils can learn to identify and express their own perceptions, thoughts, feelings, individuality, and self-needs. This give-and-take interaction in classrooms, as well as toward the end of psychotherapy, expresses respect by sharing personal viewpoints.

The Congruence and Self-Disclosure scales were designed to measure sending or initiating skills. The ETA
Initiating Scale (II) provides specific information on ways to formulate messages designed to elicit cooperative behavior from others. Since the ETA Initiating Scale (II) correlates highly with both the Congruence Scale and the Self-Disclosure Scale, it seems reasonable to assume that the facilitative I-message encompasses both congruence and self-disclosure. The specific information and rationale for initiating messages about feelings provided in this training model seems helpful for teaching such skills in a relatively short training period.

In this study, the subjects in the experimental group did not differ significantly from those in the control group in affective initiating skills at the beginning of the study. The significant improvement in communicating self needs with congruence and self-disclosure of the subjects in the trained group after treatment was therefore attributed to the systematically presented skill training program.

(3) Facilitative and Non-facilitative Responses to Affective Messages and Situations

The confirmation of the third prediction gives support to Hypothesis III that a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program is effective in improving the proportion of facilitative responses of student teachers to affective stimuli.

Chi-square analysis disclosed that there was a significant difference in the distribution of facilitative and
and non-facilitative responses to affective stimuli between the experimental and control groups after training \( p < 0.0001 \). Whereas both groups used more non-facilitative than facilitative understanding message skills at a ratio of about 85 to 15 on pretest measures, the posttest measures indicated that the experimental group produced more facilitative than non-facilitative responses at a ratio of 90 to 10, while the control group's ratio was in favor of non-facilitative responses at 88 to 12, identical to their pretest measures. On the measures of initiating facilitative messages, the pretest measures were in a ratio of 89 non-facilitative to 11 facilitative for the experimental group and 86 non-facilitative to 14 facilitative for the control group. On posttest measures the experimental group demonstrated a switch to 73 percent facilitative, while the control group dropped to only eight percent facilitative, a difference significant at the 0.0001 level. These measures were based on tabulations into categories of written responses to standard stimuli, as specified in the training program.

In this study, the subjects in the experimental group did not differ significantly from those in the control group in proportions of facilitative and non-facilitative affective communication skills at the beginning of the study. The specific training rationale and skill practice seems to have enabled the experimental subjects to avoid unproductive verbal behaviors and to use facilitative
responses in teacher-pupil-type communications. The significant improvement in measured communication skills, both in understanding and initiating affective messages, in the trained group after treatment was therefore attributed to the systematically presented skill training program.

(4) Democratic Problem-Solving of Classroom Conflict Situations

The confirmation of the fourth prediction gives support to Hypothesis IV that a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program is effective in improving democratic procedures of student teachers.

Chi-square analysis disclosed that there was a significant difference in the distribution of democratic and non-democratic methods for resolving conflicts in the classroom when the experimental and control groups were compared after training ($p \leq 0.0001$). Whereas both groups used more non-democratic methods (either authoritarian or laissez-faire) before training, 62 percent for the experimental group and 71 percent for the control group, posttest measures showed a change to 76 percent democratic for the experimental group while the control group average dropped from 29 pretest rate to 24 on the posttest after student teaching. Further examination of democratic problem solving showed that two types of democratic problem solving were considered, (1) the more traditional taking a vote on solutions proposed to problems, which accounted for all of
the control group posttest democratic measures (24 percent) and for 31 percent of the experimental group's posttest measures, and (2) the more humanistic oriented definition of structuring the problem-solving process to meet mutual needs of all involved, which accounted for 45 percent of the posttest measures of the experimental group, giving the experimental group a total of 76 percent democratic methods. If a goal of education is to prepare pupils to function in a democracy, then classroom practice should model democratic processes, rather than use authoritarian lectures to instruct about democracy (Aspy, 1970). Teachers need skills to act in equalitarian ways with their pupils as a means of expressing respect and caring.

The training program seems effective in teaching application of communication skills to practical problem-solving use in the classroom setting. Without such training student teachers rely on old methods of structuring classroom decisions about problem situations, usually relying on teacher decisions. The training provided in this study specifies ways to use affective skills for resolving conflict situations thus enabling teachers to give up their "power" in favor of more democratic methods involving everyone concerned in working out solutions which are mutually acceptable.

In this study, the subjects in the experimental group did not differ significantly from those in the control group in proportions of problem-solving categories used at
The significant improvement in use of democratic problem-solving methods in the trained group after treatment was therefore attributed to the systematically presented skill training program.

(5) Classroom Emphases of Student Teachers

It was predicted that student teachers who received special interpersonal relationship skill training would demonstrate more interest in such relationships than would student teachers whose training had been predominantly subject matter oriented. The results of cooperating teachers' evaluations of classroom emphases of student teachers disclosed that all student teachers who were rated were significantly more concerned with relationships with pupils than with emphasizing subject matter. These ratings were essentially the same for the experimental and the control groups.

The prediction that systematically trained student teachers would emphasize feelings and personal relationships with pupils more than subject matter content in their classroom behaviors was confirmed. Hypothesis V was partially confirmed. The hypothesis that student teachers who received a systematically planned interpersonal skill training program would emphasize subject matter content less than subjects in the control group without the special training was not confirmed by the present findings.

The predominance of relationship-with-pupil emphases may be due to a feeling of confidence in subject matter
preparation so that more effort was spent in actual class­
rooms in an effort to relate to pupils, or it may be that
the reason many people go into teaching is because of the
interpersonal aspects of teaching. Efforts to relate to
pupils were found to be of importance to all student
teachers who were rated. The evidence presented by Truax
and Carkhuff (1967) and Carkhuff and Berenson (1967)
suggests that wanting to be helpful is not enough. The
effects of interpersonal relationships are either destruc­
tive or constructive depending on the interpersonal skills
of the helper. Special facilitative interpersonal skill
training is needed in preparing teachers for classroom
interactions if teachers are to be facilitating in relating
to pupils in ways which enable pupils to function at their
best.

Summary

A systematic training program designed to train
prospective teachers in interpersonal relationship and
democratic problem-solving skills (TET) has been effective
in developing these skills to levels appropriate for
effective classroom interaction, assessed by measurements
based on TET course objectives, and also on scales developed
in other helping contexts. The training program defines
specific behaviors and the rationale for their avoidance or
use so that the program is didactically oriented, stressing
ways to implement helping attitudes by facilitative inter­
personal behaviors. The training program which experimentally
tested initiating skills is more comprehensive than programs which focus on only listening skills or on student-centered goals since it also helps teachers meet their own needs by their own knowledgeable efforts. Specifying democratic procedures enables teachers to engage knowingly in these procedures using skills they feel comfortable using. Emotions can become a legitimate part of the classroom because teachers have skills in handling emotions, their own and their pupils, and can use both factual and emotional information in handling conflict situations. They can be their own consultants.

An overview of the research reported herein suggests that there is a growing awareness of the need for human relations training as a necessary part of teacher preparation. Most of such training, however, is modeled on the psychotherapy interview. Communication skills focused on helping another person have been investigated in the field of clinical psychology. The research has been consistent in affirming the importance of the core conditions identified by Rogers: empathy, respect, and congruence. These conditions seem to be present in many diverse treatment orientations.

Ivey (1973) has proposed that the reason these conditions are found in diverse orientations is that they are important for attending behaviors which are necessary in a helping relationship. When a sincere person listens with respect and communicates real understanding, rapport is
developed. It is at breaks or decision points in the communication that individual style or treatment orientation influences responding: one therapist may share a feeling, one may remain silent, one may interpret. These behaviors tend to structure the direction of the therapy.

In the school situation, the establishing of rapport is also necessary and is accomplished in the same way as in psychotherapy. The conditions created by the interpersonal skills of the teacher set the climate of the classroom for whatever subject matter or presentation methods the teacher wants to use.

While the bulk of investigations on human relations in teaching have focused on skills for helping another person, another aspect of the teacher's role has been relatively neglected. The teacher's needs have been considered by many writers, but proposals to help teachers get their needs met have focused mainly on administrative practices or community support strategies. There has been little in the way of equipping a teacher to stand up for himself or herself, to break free of stereotyped "role" functioning, to express individuality in the classroom, to learn techniques for functioning which can allow the teacher to get self-needs met with a minimum of negative side effects, to use communication skills to influence or motivate pupils. Skills for enabling teachers to initiate personally meaningful messages, which are important in interaction situations such as a classroom, have been
tested in this research treatment. Although the skill levels attained were less than those for listening, the experimental group improved significantly in demonstrating ability to use these skills. Further research is needed to learn more about development of effective initiating skills.

While many educational writers have stressed the need for democratic classroom procedures, teacher training has only recently begun to provide training for accomplishing the change from autocratically-managed classrooms to democratically-managed classrooms. Most of the research in this area was inspired by work in social psychology. Through interaction research, such as that developed by Flanders (1965), patterns of behavior and their consequences have been systematically recorded and used for feedback to help teachers encourage more pupil participation in classrooms. Aspy (1972) found that three of Flanders' ten categories were of most importance, along with the three core conditions, for promoting pupil competence. This present study found that teaching democratic problem-solving directly, and focusing on the use of facilitative initiating and understanding skills in communication, produced a significant shift from autocratic to democratic procedures. The treatment program used in this research focused on avoiding specific communication blocks and on strengthening communication skills which encourage both teacher and pupil to function at their best. The conditions
which Aspy found were instrumental in promoting pupil competence are incorporated in the treatment program used in this study, especially in the democratic problem solving which focuses on meeting mutual needs through consensus rather than by using majority vote for democratic decisions.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that further research be directed at:

1. Further analysis of confrontation and self-disclosure skills related to the teaching situation.
2. Follow-up studies to see whether skills developed in the experimentally designed program transfer to the real-life school situation.

This study has demonstrated that the systematically planned interpersonal skill training program is effective in developing affective communication skills and democratic problem-solving behaviors of student teachers in a relatively short training period. With these skills, student teachers can establish and maintain meaningful and rewarding relationships with individual pupils and can create a classroom climate characterized by cooperation and rapport.
APPENDIX A
CHILDREARING PHILOSOPHY PREFERENCE INSTRUMENT

# M F

Instructions: The statements below reflect different points of view on a wide range of issues related to childrearing. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each one by assigning ranks to each of the three choices to each statement. The choice you agree with most should be ranked #1, the choice you agree with least, #3. There are no right or wrong answers, just different approaches and philosophies.

---

Rank Order

1. The way parents raise children most effectively is:
   a. encouraging and rewarding desirable behaviors and changing undesirable behaviors.
   b. encouraging honest communication and helping the child develop in his own unique way.
   c. encouraging cooperation, establishing order, providing natural and logical consequences in a consistent, democratic, and respectful way.

2. You can tell when adults do a good job because:
   a. the child behaves consistently according to the thoughtful prescriptions of the adults.
   b. The child finds his way toward social acceptance by meeting the requirements of the group and by making his own useful contribution to it.
   c. the child accepts himself, guides his own behavior in spontaneous, responsible ways.

3. A child's behavior is motivated mainly by:
   a. the desire to gain pleasure and avoid pain.
   b. the desire to belong and to find a place in the group.
   c. the desire to grow toward health and openness to self and others.
Rank Order

4. A child generally misbehaves because:
   a. of mislearning - he has been rewarded for the wrong things.
   b. he is discouraged. He has not succeeded in his effort to belong through useful means, so he tries to gain social status in mistaken ways through striving for attention, power, revenge or inadequacy.
   c. he has a negative concept of himself and/or a misperception of the situation and acts from these.

5. When a child's behavior creates a problem for the adult, the adult should:
   a. with a minimum use of words, allow natural consequences to follow or arrange logical consequences so that the child will see alternatives for being more cooperative.
   b. determine how the child sees his reality, then give him honest information so that his perception will be more accurate, realistic and positive. The child can then choose to improve or change his behavior.
   c. observe and record frequency and nature of offending behavior, set up a plan and a reinforcement system to help the child move through increasingly closer approximations of desired behavior.

6. Children will learn to be responsible when adults:
   a. provide reasonable limits and engage in open-ended problem-solving at points of conflict.
   b. allow children to experience the consequences of their acts with little interference other than to arrange logical consequences when they do not naturally occur.
   c. give consistent responses so that children can learn, rather than depend on an inner motivation toward lawful behavior.
Rank Order

7. Adults should first:
   a. think, then act, then feel. Intellect and action can generate desired feelings.
   b. feel, then think, then act. Emotion and intellect can generate desired behavior.
   c. observe, then plan, then act. Intellect and consistency can generate desired behavior.

8. When parents turn to experts, they need help with:
   a. deciding exactly what they want to teach the child, then be told precisely how to teach it.
   b. providing learning experiences wherein the parents can clarify their values, learn the process of open and constructive problem-solving and decision making among family members.
   c. clear-cut advice as to new patterns of family relationships and new formulas for finding answers for more efficient and democratic resolution of family problems.

9. Parental agreement (between mother and father) regarding the child's behavior:
   a. is not necessary. Each should decide what he will do. Overcompensating for the other's difference prevents the child from working things out with the other parent for himself.
   b. is essential so that the child will get consistent reinforcement.
   c. is only possible when that agreement is a reflection of the parents' real feelings.

10. When the child violates a rule he already understands:
   a. he should be ignored, so that he will gradually give up that behavior, and should be reinforced for desired behavior that will take its place.
Rank Order

b. he should be given the accurate information he needs in order to see how he is affecting others, then given time to change his own behavior before firmer action is taken.

c. he should suffer the natural or logical consequences of his decision, so that it will move him to respect others and seek a more cooperative way of behaving.

11. Children who fight all the time:

a. should be reinforced when they are playing cooperatively, and/or separated before fighting really gets started.

b. should always be allowed to work it out for themselves without adult interference, for other than safety reasons.

c. if they can't work it out, should be helped to negotiate differences, communicate needs, deal with feelings and arrive at a solution.

12. If a child misbehaves in a public place (i.e., a supermarket), one should say:

a. "First sit quietly in the cart while I shop, then you may look at the toys."

b. "If you will not behave, then I will leave, take you home and return."

c. "When you run around, it's hard for me to get my shopping done, and I feel frustrated."

13. When a child brings home a poor report card, the parent should:

a. really listen to the child's feelings to see if he sees it as a problem.

b. assume it is a natural consequence of how the child decided to use his time and not the function of the adult to intervene.

c. observe study habits, record study behavior, establish a plan to strengthen more effective study behavior.
STANDARD STIMULUS STATEMENTS

Pre- and Posttest

Scored for communicating Understanding, Empathy, and Respect

(Oral directions to group: Write what you, as a teacher, would actually say in response to each of the following pupil messages. Please write your name and the date on each page of your response.)

I

1. I feel so bad--I have no friends. Nobody likes me. All the other kids have lunch together and play together. They always leave me out. Sometimes when I'm alone and all the other kids are together, I feel like crying. Why doesn't anyone like me? I try to be nice, but nothing seems to work. I guess there is nothing I can do.

2. It makes me so mad! Everybody is always telling me what to do and what not to do. When I'm at home, my parents tell me what is best for me. At school, it's the teacher. Even my friends push me around. Sometimes I feel like punching them all in the nose. They had just better leave me alone and let me do things the way I want to.

3. I'm so excited and everything is going great! I ran for president of my class and I won! I guess the other kids really do like me. And next week, during spring vacation, I'm going camping with my family. I'm so happy. It's unbelievable.
4. I think I know what to do, but maybe it's not right. Sometimes I do the wrong thing. What do you think I should do?

5. I just don't know what to do. I try very hard in school, but nothing seems to sink in. I guess I'm not very smart. What really hurts is when I see my parents bragging to others about how smart my brother is; they never even mention me, and I try much harder than he does. Oh, I wish I could do better, but I can't.

6. You give too much homework. I can never get it all done.
STANDARD STIMULUS SITUATIONS

Pre- and Posttest

Scored for Initiating Affective Messages, Congruence, and Self-Disclosure. (Oral directions to group: Write what you, as a teacher, would actually say in each of these circumstances. Please write your name and the date on each page of your response.)

II

1. One of your students has missed several days of school. You made an appointment with him to work after school for an hour. You explained to him that you had to leave after an hour because of another previous engagement. He strolls in 45 minutes late, saying, "Hi."

2. There is a special program in the auditorium. Your class is to go as a group. Two boys are dawdling and making the whole group late.
STANDARD STIMULUS SITUATIONS
Pre- and Posttest

Scored for Problem-Solving Procedures. (Oral directions to group: Write what you, as a teacher, would actually say in each of these circumstances. Please write your name and the date on each page of your response.)

III

1. At the assembly, the principal just tightened all the disciplinary measures and school safety rules, since the rules were getting lax and some accidents were the result. Also there has been vandalism to the building on weekends recently. Your students return to the classroom very angry and upset at the tighter rules. They feel the problems had nothing to do with them—and yet they have to suffer the consequences. You had planned to finish the unit they were on because you have a deadline for getting grades in.

2. Your class has agreed to pitch-in and help with posters for a special PTA function. It is now the last possible moment to work on them. A messenger comes from the office and announces that a special movie is to be shown right away. It is up to each teacher whether or not her class can come.

3. Most of the students in your class are well behaved. However, there are two boys who fight with each other and with anyone else who even slightly displeases them.
They seldom talk, just begin hitting. They always seem to be the ones who start all the trouble. Something needs to be done.

4. A clique of boys from your class comes to see you, to complain. They are all members of a racial minority. They tell you some of the pupils in your class call them names and threaten to harm them after school. They don't want trouble--just want to be left alone.
STUDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE SCALE

Name of student teacher ________________________________
Evaluator _________________________ Date ____________

School ____________Subject ____________ Grade ______

Directions: In each set, please rank the 4 phrases to indicate how well they apply to this student teacher. The phrase which best describes the student teacher should be ranked #1, the least descriptive phrase in each set #4, etc..

Set a.

____ Always on time for class
____ Pleasant in class
____ Very sincere when talking with students
____ Well read

Set b.

____ Contagious enthusiasm for subject
____ Did not fill up time with trivial material
____ Gave everyone an equal chance
____ Made clear what was expected of students

Set c.

____ Classes always orderly
____ Enjoyed teaching class
____ Friendliness did not seem forced
____ Logical in thinking

Set d.

____ Encouraged creativeness
____ Kept course material up to the minute
____ Never deliberately forced own decisions on class
____ Procedures well thought out

Set e.

____ Authority on own subject
____ Friendly attitude toward students
____ Marked tests very fairly
____ Never criticized in a destructive way
Set f.

____ Good sense of humor
____ Spaced assignments evenly
____ Students never afraid to ask questions in class
____ Well-organized course

Set g.

____ Accepted students' viewpoints with open mind
____ Increased students' vocabulary by own excellent usage
____ Students always knew what was coming up next day
____ Students willingly worked for teacher

Set h.

____ Always knew what he/she was doing
____ Appreciated accomplishment
____ Did not ridicule wrong answers
____ Well informed in all related fields

Set i.

____ Always had class material ready
____ Covered subject well
____ Encouraged students to think out answers
____ Rules and regulations fair

Set j.

____ Always managed to get things done on time
____ Course had continuity
____ Made material significant
____ Understood problems of students
CHILDREARING PHILOSOPHY PREFERENCE INSTRUMENT KEY

1. (a) S, (b) R, (c) A
2. (a) S, (b) A, (c) R
3. (a) S, (b) A, (c) R
4. (a) S, (b) A, (c) R
5. (a) A, (b) R, (c) S
6. (a) R, (b) A, (c) S
7. (a) A, (b) R, (c) S
8. (a) S, (b) R, (c) A
9. (a) A, (b) S, (c) R
10. (a) S, (b) R, (c) A
11. (a) S, (b) A, (c) R
12. (a) S, (b) A, (c) R
13. (a) R, (b) A, (c) S

S = Skinnerian - Adult Oriented
A = Adlerian - Group Adjustment
R = Rogerian - Child Oriented
ETA UNDERSTANDING SCALE (I) (7 Levels)

UNDERSTANDING CATEGORIES (1 through 13)

Level 1. "Roadblocks" to communication - communicate non-acceptance.

1. Ordering, directing, or commanding
   Telling the pupil to do something, giving an order or a command.

2. Warning, admonishing, threatening
   Telling the pupil what consequences will occur if he behaves a certain way, alluding to the use of the teacher's power.

3. Moralizing, preaching, obliging, advising, giving suggestions or solutions, persuading with logic, arguing, instructing, lecturing.
   Telling the pupil what he "should" or "ought" to do. Telling the pupil how to solve his problems. Trying to influence the pupil with facts, counter-arguments, logic, information, or the teacher's own opinions.

4. Judging, criticizing, disagreeing, blaming
   Making negative judgments or evaluations of a pupil.

5. Praising, agreeing, evaluating positively
   Offering a positive evaluation or judgment of a pupil.

6. Name-calling, ridiculing, shaming
   Making a pupil feel foolish, stereotyping or categorizing him.

7. Interpreting, analyzing, diagnosing
   Telling the pupil what his motives are, or analyzing why he is doing or saying something; communicating that teacher has him figured out or has him diagnosed.

8. Reassuring, sympathizing, consoling, supporting
   Trying to make the pupil feel better, talking him out of his feelings, trying to make his feelings go away, denying the strength of feelings.

9. Probing, questioning, interrogating
   Trying to find reasons, motives, causes; searching for more information to help the teacher solve the pupil's problem.
10. Withdrawing, distracting, humoring
   Trying to get the pupil away from the problem;
   teacher withdraws from the problem, distracting
   the pupil, kidding him out of his feelings,
   pushing the problem aside.

Level 2. Neutral statement with an added negative
   implication.


11. Simple acknowledgment
   Verbal and non-committal responses to a pupil message
   ("Oh, I see," "Um-humm," "Really," "Interesting," "No-kidding").

Level 4. Down-graded Level 5
   Door opener with over concern or excessive
   verbiage.

Level 5. Door opener

12. Door opener. Verbal responses which are invitations
   to say more (no roadblocks present)
   (Minimally facilitative level)

Level 6. Facilitative response, but without the depth or
   spontaneity of a Level 7 response. Part of
   message may be understood.

Level 7. Positive, facilitating and accurate response

13. Active-listening - Messages which convey back to the
    pupil empathic understanding of his communication.
    Decoding the words used to express an idea or
    feeling and feeding back the decoded message of
    what he or she understands the sender's message to
    mean, for verification. Teacher does not send back
    a message of his own, but feeds back what he feels
    the sender's message meant.
EMPATHY SCALE (7 Levels)*

Level 1: Teacher seems completely unaware of even the most conspicuous of pupil's feelings. Responses are not appropriate to the mood and content of the pupil's statements. There is no determinable quality of empathy and, hence, no accuracy whatsoever. The teacher may be disinterested or actively offering advice, but is not communicating awareness of the pupil's feelings.

Level 2: Teacher shows an almost negligible degree of accuracy in responses. Response may block off pupil. Level 2 is distinguishable from Level 3 in that the teacher ignores feelings rather than displaying an inability to understand them.

Level 3: Teacher's response conveys slight evidence of feelings which are only somewhat appropriate to pupil's experience. Teacher shows an inability to understand pupil's meaning, in contrast to lower levels where feelings are ignored. Teacher's response subtracts noticeable affect from pupil's message.

Level 4: Teacher usually responds accurately to pupil's most obvious feelings, but the total message does not convey the importance of the feelings; tones down the feelings, or teacher may tend to add a phrase or sentence to the message to make the total effect of the response less than interchangeable. Sensitivity and awareness do exist in the teacher, but teacher is not entirely "with" the pupil in the current situation or experience. The desire and effort to understand are both present, but the accuracy is low.

Level 5: Teacher's responses are essentially interchangeable with the expressed feelings of pupil in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning. They neither add nor detract from the meaning of the experience. Level 5 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 6: Teacher recognizes most of pupil's present feelings, including those which are not readily apparent. Teacher may not respond to the accurate intensity of the less apparent feelings. Response does not have the spontaneity of a Level 7 response.
Level 7: Teacher responds accurately to pupil's present feelings and adds to meaning; is "with pupil--tuned in to pupil's wave length." Teacher shows awareness of the precise intensity of most of the emotions.

* The Truax Accurate Empathy Scale has been modified for present use. Levels 7, 8, and 9, at the high end of the scale, have been telescoped into level 7, because classroom rapport is not as intensive as psychotherapy involvement. Wording has been made appropriate for classroom use, incorporating wording and ideas from the Carkhuff and the Aspy scales to clarify meaning.
RESPECT SCALE (7 Levels)*

Level 1: Expressions of teacher communicate a clear lack of respect for pupil; convey that pupil's feelings and experiences are not worthy of consideration, or that pupil is not capable of acting constructively on his own. Teacher structures situation so that pupil takes no part in solution of problem; gives unnecessary detailed suggestions. The response is a cliche. The teacher is the sole evaluator.

Level 2: Teacher's response is a cliche, but the response is not destructive to the pupil.

Level 3: Teacher response communicates little respect for feelings, experiences, and potentials of pupil; responds mechanically, mostly in cliches, or ignores many of pupil's feelings; does not seem concerned with feelings expressed. Communicates doubt that pupil will handle situation "correctly."

Level 4: Teacher's response is basically Level 5, but some sentence or phrase leaves a little doubt whether the total message is minimally facilitative.

Level 5: Teacher communicates a positive respect and concern for the pupil's feelings and experiences and his ability to deal constructively with the situation. Teacher conveys that who the pupil is and what he does or feels matter to the teacher. Level 5 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 6: Teacher's response communicates a high level of respect and concern for the pupil, but lacks the spontaneity of a Level 7 response.

Level 7: Teacher communicates a deep respect and concern for feelings, experiences, and potentialities of pupil. Teacher's responses enable pupil to feel free to be himself and experience being valued as an individual.

* Scale adapted from Carkhuff Scale: Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes and from teacher evaluation scale developed by Aspy: In-Service Training Scale: Teacher's Respect for Students. Upper levels of the scale have been telescoped into level 7 of the present scale to be appropriate for classroom rapport use. Scale levels have been expanded between levels in model scales to correspond to Empathy Scale levels.
ETA INITIATING SCALE (II) (4 Levels)

INITIATING CATEGORIES (Numbers 1 through 9)

Level 1. Errors in sending
1. Solution message (roadblocks 1 through 4)
2. Put-down message (roadblocks 5 through 9)
3. Indirect message (roadblock 10)
4. Inaccurate intensity of message
5. Sending secondary rather than primary feelings
6. Inaccurate or incongruent message

Level 2. "Low-threat" message - one component only*
Level 3. "Low-threat" message - two components only*
Level 4. "Low-threat" message - three components*

* Components of low-threat messages are:
7. Description of situation or circumstances
8. Concrete or specific effects on teacher
9. Feelings of teacher stated
CONGRUENCE SCALE (7 Levels)*

Level 1: Teacher's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to pupil and appear to have a destructive effect on the pupil. Teacher's communications are ritualistic, mechanical, or seem practiced; there is no vitality. Teacher may be defensive.

Level 2: Similar response to Level 1, but the teacher is not highly defensive and verbalizations do not appear to have the destructive effect of a Level 1 response.

Level 3: Teacher responds in a "professional" manner that has a rehearsed quality. Teacher responds more according to "role" than by expressing what he personally feels or means, but there is a little evidence of some vitality; some normal conversational expressiveness.

Level 4: Teacher's response to situation is very close to being minimally facilitative, but some phrase or sentence detracts from congruence.

Level 5: Teacher is sincere, but does not show any real involvement. Response is appropriate, neither enthusiastic nor dull; normal vitality, but reveals little of self. Level 5 is minimally facilitative level.

Level 6: Teacher reveals self appropriately. Expressions are congruent, but lack the spontaneity and involvement of a Level 7 response.

Level 7: Spontaneous expression of feelings. Uses words like in normal conversation. Is clearly being himself; is non-destructive in interacting with pupil. Expressions are congruent with feelings. Teacher seems to mean what he says. He is open in both positive and negative feelings; is at ease.

* Scale adapted from Carkhuff Scale: Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes and from teacher evaluation scale developed by Aspy: Measuring a Teacher's Genuineness. The upper levels of the scale have been telescoped into level 7 of the present scale to be appropriate for classroom rapport use. Scale levels have been expanded between levels in model scales to correspond to Empathy Scale levels.
SELF-DISCLOSURE SCALE (7 Levels)*

Level 1: Teacher actively attempts to remain detached from pupil and discloses nothing about his own feelings or personality to pupil. If he does disclose himself he does so in a way that is not tuned to the pupil's interests and may even retard the pupil's general progress. Teacher actively attempts to remain ambiguous and an unknown quantity to the pupil.

Level 2: Teacher discloses nothing about his own feelings or personality, but is not destructive to the pupil as in a Level 1 response.

Level 3: Teacher does not volunteer personal information about himself or his reactions. He may respond with facts, but presents no more information than is actually necessary.

Level 4: Teacher volunteers some personal information but tends to send broad category feelings like "anger" or "upset" instead of more personal feelings of discouragement or frustration.

Level 5: Teacher volunteers some personal feelings, beliefs, attitudes, or perceptions, but is somewhat guarded and hesitant. Level 5 is the minimally facilitative level.

Level 6: Teacher is at ease in revealing his own feelings and perceptions, but his communication lacks the spontaneity of a Level 7 response.

Level 7: Teacher's expressions reveal his own uniqueness. He is free, spontaneous, enthused, involved. He reveals his own feelings, beliefs and perceptions easily.

* Scale adapted from Carkhuff Scale: Facilitative Self-Disclosure in Interpersonal Processes Scale. The upper levels of the scale have been telescoped into Level 7 of the present scale to be appropriate for classroom rapport use. Scale levels have been expanded between levels in model scale to correspond to Empathy Scale levels.
PROBLEM-SOLVING CATEGORIES

1. Authoritarian
2. Permissive or Laissez-faire
3. Democratic
   a. Defines problem in terms of solutions (voting)
   b. Defines problem in terms of needs of participants
STUDENT TEACHER PERFORMANCE SCALE KEY

(Cosgrove (1959) Diagnostic Rating of Teacher Performance)

A. Knowledge and Organization of Subject Matter
B. Adequacy of Relations with Students in Class
C. Adequacy of Plans and Procedures in Class
D. Enthusiasm in Working with Students

Set a:  
   a) C
   b) B
   c) D
   d) A

Set b:  
   a) D
   b) C
   c) B
   d) A

Set c:  
   a) C
   b) D
   c) B
   d) A

Set d:  
   a) D
   b) A
   c) B
   d) C

Set e:  
   a) A
   b) D
   c) C
   d) B

Set f:  
   a) D
   b) C
   c) B
   d) A

Set g:  
   a) B
   b) A
   c) C
   d) D

Set h:  
   a) C
   b) D
   c) B
   d) A
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