

A Study Concerning The Possible Use Of Videotape  
For Developing Interpersonal Skills In  
A Teacher Training Program

by

J.F. Feeney

**Saint Mary's University Library**

Thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

Department of Education

St. Mary's University

December, 1971

© Copyright

## Acknowledgements

The author is deeply grateful to Dr. T.J. Hefele for contributing so generously of his time and assistance to this study. In addition, special thanks are due to Dr. Hefele and his wife, Rosemary, for the special encouragement and support so helpful in successfully terminating this thesis.

Special thanks is extended to Judy Alward for her many long hours of involvement and hard work in rating the videotapes.

Appreciation is also extended to Glen Neary who so generously contributed his time in videotaping and his participation in the initial phases of the data-gathering process.

Finally, the author is grateful to Professor Fred Dockrill, Denis Purcell and Bob MacConnell and all others who participated or assisted in this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. METHOD . . . . .	16
III. RESULTS . . . . .	19
IV. DISCUSSION . . . . .	21
APPENDIX A . . . . .	24
APPENDIX B . . . . .	27
REFERENCES . . . . .	42

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Fabun, in Dynamics of Change, brings out a number of points regarding the process of change. Change in previous centuries, represented a natural, gradual, evolutionary process affecting very few directly and traumatically. The 20th century can in no way be delineated in this fashion. Within a short period of ten years, the most dramatic occurrences since the evolution of man have taken place. Our society has been characterized by deep-set, expanding and continuing mutations in economy and technology, from which waves have swept out and altered all our lives and institutions. Technology has created an atmosphere of rapid and accelerated change and a society which is far from stable. It has been expressed by learned men of our century that knowledge has doubled--even quadrupled--since the early nineteenth hundreds. Events occurred so rapidly that all individuals have witnessed, in a few years, changes in rules of behaviour and points of view that had endured for centuries. We are possessed by the most brilliant technology in the world, surrounded by affluence, abundance, and plenty. Science and technology have multiplied energy, mechanized industry and produced voluminous knowledge, but they have also destroyed old modes of conduct. They have upset fundamental ideals and left our system of values in a

complete state of chaos. People are in a position where they are no longer sure about the major components of their culture. Science and technology have largely dissolved the simple community, and with it, have gone the feelings of intimacy and face-to-face relationships that maintain the attitudes of solicitude, empathy and mutual help. The warm human relationships between individuals of old fashioned community life have been replaced by a whole complex or network of confusing processes. In the contemporary community, people have been herded together into congested, impersonal urban areas. The result--many individuals left vulnerable and exposed, frustrated and anxious (Ogburn, 1954).

The conflict between the new and the old, between the traditions of established society and the emergent values and patterns of the new, creates a need to isolate a compatible set of rules for uniting the needs of society with the drives and concerns of the individual. The western world finds itself in a value crisis that reaches into and creates dilemmas in the lives of its people. Few escape its influence; the consequences resulting from such innovations have become in some way a personal, individual matter for concern. Needless to say, man is not prepared for this exploding, disrupting, chaotic force.

No area has felt the pressures of technological and scientific advancement any more than the school and other institutions of learning. Students are openly, even violently, revealing their discontent with their present educational environments. They are no longer willing to emulate outmoded values, follow obsolete standards and methodologies. Students, however, are not only rejecting the old but also the emergent system. They are rejecting the depersonalization of the modern world

and its present societies. Children need more than jobs and opportunities for upward mobility. Schools today, students feel, are failing as institutions for coping, in human terms, with revolutionary, technological, and economic changes. This is what young militants and rebels are saying to us about their families, schools and society in general: Dehumanizing settings are not likely to nurture human qualities. Present schools are dehumanizing and depersonalizing, with an alienating effect on young people. Facts and small bits of information do not satisfy present educational needs; more essential to this educational process is an exploration of the formation of attitudes, feelings, beliefs, values, understanding and empathy (Meade, 1963).

Miller (1967); Anderson (1966); Brown (1963) all basically manifest the same attitude toward contemporary educational change. They feel that our educational effort today still remains approximately in the same position that it maintained twenty-five years ago. Students are thought of as containers or storehouses to be filled with enormous amounts of knowledge and information. Schools function, almost solely, in this mechanical fashion, serving only the manpower needs of technology and filling more heads with virtually useless information. Even in the light of educational research findings, education tenaciously clings to its traditional role. Educators retain their traditional educational moulds regardless of the development of more effective and efficient means of achieving their objectives. All through this 20th century, many schools continue their accustomed practices in education, attempting to maintain the security offered in the past. Students continue to be shaped to fit the school programme. Individuals are herded into areas

dictatorially ruled over by 2 x 4 x 6 teachers (2 covers, 4 walls, 6 periods) with school personnel holding to standard textbooks, conventional classrooms and the usual number of periods a day. The teacher's major role as an educator is one of lecturer--the teacher talks, the child listens. Other role expectancies involve the direction and supervision of student work assignments. The teacher is a classroom disciplinarian controlling student behavior by reprimands and threats of punishment. Under this authoritarian figure, the child is expected to sit motionless on a hard seat, without scraping his feet or gazing out the window; he is expected to listen, to answer questions by raising his hand. Conformity is the expectancy of numerous educational institutions; it is demanded of its students and stringently enforced by its educators. Those exceeding its boundaries, exerting their independence to its exclusion, or in any way attempting to challenge its position are severely reprimanded. Children, in brief, are expected to accommodate a Procrustean system of education.

Greek mythology tells us of the cruel robber, Procrustes (the Stretcher). When travelers sought his house for shelter, they were tied onto an iron bedstead. If the traveler was shorter than the bed, Procrustes stretched him out until he was the same length as the bed. If he was longer, his limbs were chopped off to make him fit. Procrustes shaped both short and tall until they were equally long and equally dead (Goodlad & Anderson, 1963, p. 85).

The comparison is an excellent one, for many present systems are committing this same particular crime, the slow students being stretched to fit grades, while the quick are being compressed and contracted to fit the same grade. In time they are forced to adapt to a particular group mold. Since the school's stated aim is the fulfillment of each individual child's needs, any such state of affairs is a blatant and

dictatorially ruled over by 2 x 4 x 6 teachers (2 covers, 4 walls, 6 periods) with school personnel holding to standard textbooks, conventional classrooms and the usual number of periods a day. The teacher's major role as an educator is one of lecturer--the teacher talks, the child listens. Other role expectancies involve the direction and supervision of student work assignments. The teacher is a classroom disciplinarian controlling student behavior by reprimands and threats of punishment. Under this authoritarian figure, the child is expected to sit motionless on a hard seat, without scraping his feet or gazing out the window; he is expected to listen, to answer questions by raising his hand. Conformity is the expectancy of numerous educational institutions; it is demanded of its students and stringently enforced by its educators. Those exceeding its boundaries, exerting their independence to its exclusion, or in any way attempting to challenge its position are severely reprimanded. Children, in brief, are expected to accommodate a Procrustean system of education.

Greek mythology tells us of the cruel robber, Procrustes (the Stretcher). When travelers sought his house for shelter, they were tied onto an iron bedstead. If the traveler was shorter than the bed, Procrustes stretched him out until he was the same length as the bed. If he was longer, his limbs were chopped off to make him fit. Procrustes shaped both short and tall until they were equally long and equally dead (Goodlad & Anderson, 1963, p. 85).

The comparison is an excellent one, for many present systems are committing this same particular crime, the slow students being stretched to fit grades, while the quick are being compressed and contracted to fit the same grade. In time they are forced to adapt to a particular group mold. Since the school's stated aim is the fulfillment of each individual child's needs, any such state of affairs is a blatant and



serious contradiction (Silberman, 1970).

Technology and scientific advances in educational philosophy have been demanding a new role of the school and its personnel in terms of their relationships with students. For too long, schools have been pre-occupied with the dissemination of information (Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives in the schools in Ontario, 1968). With a stable society, and a prevailing status quo, they could afford, possibly, to maintain this role, but with present changes this kind of learning situation becomes no more than a mechanical function. Individuals need much more to develop their intellectual, social, and emotional stability. Schools and their personnel must work to promote the most effective and efficient utilization of human resources. They must maximize interaction between teachers and students. A new humanistic psychology is needed, a psychology capable of dealing with man's experience, and one which is interpretive of students' feelings, values, and beliefs. The internal life of the learner, what goes on inside of his mind, is of paramount importance. Educators must have a greater realization of the "self" of students, must eliminate the old idea that this area is outside of the teacher's concern and that his role or function is only to crowd as much subject matter into the child's brain as possible (Anderson, 1966; Brown, 1965). In helping individuals realize themselves, schools must become committed to the fullest understanding of the potentials and limitations of formal education.

In the search for the source of educational discontent, numerous areas have been explored and investigated. Improvements in single aspects of the educational scene were envisioned as permanent solutions to large

problems. Architects envisaged a new school structure, with audio visual materials and innovative learning environments, as a solution or partial solution for educational upheavels (Manning, 1965). Educators committed themselves to the support of new curricula as the necessary force in solving the educational dilemma (Brown, 1965).

An explanation of or solution for the dilemma in education will not come from extensive examination of any one of these particular areas. The answer, in fact, lies within all these facets of education. Each single improvement has a contribution to make in elevating and improving the present educational scene. It is only when all these areas are attacked together that a proper focus on the problem will be attained.

Such a unification of the specified areas undoubtedly provides the necessary physical environment for educators and students, but the focusing is still not as keen as it could be. The most important factor is yet to be examined--people. Without people (students, teachers, administrators, etc.) properly interacting in this environment, the most elaborate and sophisticated physical plant has little or no value. The effectiveness of ultra-modern buildings, expensive facilities and equipment has been negated in educational institutions throughout this decade. The first priority in the school must be effective communication; the second may well be the physical structure.

Because of the key position or role which the teacher plays in facilitating and promoting student development and adjustment, it is here that our new technology may assist him in his responsibility for narrowing the much talked about "communication gap" that exists today. From observation of present institutions, as an experienced and seasoned

educator, it would seem obvious that this responsibility is, however, not being honored. When the teacher fails to relate successfully to the student, the school itself fails to meet its goals and its very raison d'être is nullified.

Teacher training institutions bear a heavy responsibility for selecting and preparing young teachers who will be able to function effectively in an unstable social context. Commanger (1966) describes the need to prepare teachers who are able

...to deal with these vast and shocking problems of the uneducated and miseducated: victims of racism, victims of poverty, and neglect, victims of urban growth and urban blight, victims of the breakdown of our social fabric and of the family fabric (p. 57).

Nelson (1969) states that

...the increased use of narcotics, frequency of juvenile crimes and prevalence of psychiatric cases in teenagers, testifies to the need for a heavy curricular emphasis on those disciplines and those teaching strategies which lend themselves to close interpersonal relations (p. 279).

It must be agreed that effective teachers must transcend the transmission of subject matter and tool skills. They must produce

...significant changes in motives, attitudes, ...self acceptance, independence, and autonomy; they must try to encourage creativity and problem-solving activities, and help pupils become more self-actualizing; they must hope children will learn to respect the points of view of others and to accept others as persons (Ringness and Larson, 1965, p. 4).

The objectives, such as those cited by Nelson and Ringness and Larson, imply that the more affective aspects of the teaching-learning process be stressed in teacher training. Although these are the areas of development which are of paramount importance in the teaching situation,

more such techniques of method should be currently employed in teacher training programs.

Observation would reveal that there are certain elements which are common to the multitude of approaches taken to prepare an individual for the teaching field: a general education composed mainly of a survey of the humanities and the social and physical sciences, specialization in content area and professional training. It is in the latter phase of their training that the students are given work which deals directly with the teaching process, culminating in some kind of clinical or student experience (Stratemeyer & Lindsay, 1958). Conant (1963) asserts that: "The one indisputable essential element in professional education is practice teaching (p. 142)."

Although cognitive aspects of teaching are essential in teacher training, the experience of student teaching is cited as the vital or critical area of teacher preparation.

An important result of such an experience should be the student teacher's improved ability to deal effectively and efficiently with students. It has, in fact, been noted that the level of the interpersonal encounter between the teacher and the pupil is a critical variable in teacher effectiveness (Flanders, 1965; Gage, 1963; Joyce, 1968; Rogers, 1969). In most cases, the quality of this student-teacher interaction lies with the teacher. Withall (1949) stated that what a teacher is (how he relates and interacts with others), may be more important to the full development of his pupils than anything he does. Other researchers have shown a strong relationship between human relations skill and pupil achievement. Lewis, Lovell and Jessee (1965)

emphasized that the interpersonal relationship is a very important ingredient for positive change; students who perceived their relationship with the teacher as approaching the direction of an ideal psychotherapeutic relationship made greater gains than those students who perceived a non-therapeutic relationship with their teachers. Davidson and Lang (1960) reported that the more positive the children's perception of their teachers' feelings, the better was their academic achievement and the more desirable their classroom behavior as rated by teachers.

Such relationships involved a number of important variables or factors. Although no rank has been given to these factors, one trait is repeatedly mentioned throughout educational literature as necessary for success in teaching...understanding (Dugan, 1961). Dixon and Morse (1961) have supported this assumption with research; they found that teachers who communicated high levels of empathy (understanding) were rated as better teachers by the pupils than were teachers who communicated low levels of empathy. | ?

Warmth, another variable of high importance for success in teaching was mentioned. Reed (1961) showed that the warmth of a teacher was positively related to pupils' interest in science. Cronbach (1963) concluded that in studies of teacher success, warmth consistently appears as one of the most important qualities. Stephens (1965) explained that a warm, accepting attitude is especially important for pupils who have already come to think of the world as hostile, critical and unaccepting. Christensen (1960) found this warmth of teachers to be significantly related to the vocabulary and arithmetic achievement of

primary grade pupils.

Bowers and Soar (1962) stated that the teacher must be able to perceive herself and others clearly and represent herself honestly in communication with others; the teacher must be able to use her "self" openly, clearly and honestly in her interactions with her pupils. In short, the teacher must be genuine.

With these findings in mind, positive steps must now be taken to provide programs where prospective teachers can learn effective interaction in the classroom. It is no longer sufficient for teachers to master their subject field and to have a command of sterile, wholly academic teaching methods, when they fail or perform only marginally, in communicating their knowledge to the students. In brief, teacher trainees must develop the related skills necessary for the constructive interaction with their pupils.

While teacher training programs have always manifested an interest and concern for the interpersonal functioning of their trainees, more emphasis could be given to this aspect of their program. The absence of methods and techniques for determining and improving the functioning level of student teachers in interpersonal relationships has, undoubtedly, contributed to the unsatisfactory treatment of this significant area. Without a practical model, required for the incorporation of these interpersonal variables into the actual training of teacher trainees, this aspect of teacher education would have continued to be neglected.

A viable model, which was developed, did not come in the field of education, but rather as a result of research in the field of psychotherapy. Movement towards a model began when Eysenck (1952) and Levitt

(1957) claimed that psychotherapy was a fraud, in that it was ineffective with both adults and children. Such challenges were met by a number of psychologists who maintained a deep confidence in the effectiveness of the psychotherapeutic process. After some years of research, they discovered and concluded that the earlier findings were not totally true; helping relationships could be both effective or ineffective--for better or for worse (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Traux and Carkhuff, 1967). Effectiveness was a relative thing which was dependent upon the personal impact of the psychotherapist on his patients. Such impact involved the degree to which the therapist possessed and displayed certain variables: empathy (understanding), respect, concreteness, immediacy, confrontation and genuineness (see Appendix B), in his interaction with patients. The researchers were convinced also that a practical means could be found of relating those variables to psychotherapeutic training programs. Positive results were realized by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) and Carkhuff (1969). They discovered and developed reliable scales capable of measuring the previously mentioned interpersonal variables and the levels of interpersonal functioning of psychotherapy trainees in these variables (see Appendix B). In brief, this program involved the rating of excerpts from actual counseling sessions conducted by psychotherapy trainees. Thus, a standard of selection and acceptance for trainees in psychotherapy training programs was determined. Their work, however, did not terminate with the mere identification of those who had reached or not reached the standard of acceptance. On the contrary, Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) contended, and clearly demonstrated, that men could be trained to fit counseling

positions, that many people possessed the potential to become competent counselors and that their potential could be considerably improved through programs of interpersonal skill training.

The programs commenced with individuals' examining their own experiences, exploring their own feelings and exploring the intergroup and interpersonal relationships and processes. The belief was that these people had characteristics and qualities which, if given the proper training and direction, would enable them to properly and constructively interact with others. The heightened awareness of self and others gained through the program, it was found, made the individual more understanding, accepting and keen on improving human relations.

Having successfully met the earlier challenge condemning psychotherapy, and making movements toward the training of counselors and psychotherapists, Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) suggested that these interpersonal variables were relevant for all human relationships. Studies were conducted in a variety of interpersonal situations, such as friendship (Martin, Carkhuff, and Berenson, 1966); race relations (Banks, 1969; Banks, Berenson, and Carkhuff, 1967); and college student training (Berenson, Carkhuff, and Myrus, 1966). In addition to these areas, these studies yielded a long overdue model for selecting young teachers and training them in the variables necessary for good classroom interpersonal relationships and communication.

Hefele (1969) took the model utilized by Carkhuff and Berenson and adapted it to a teacher training program. His research determined to study the role of interpersonal communication factors in the graduate education of teachers of the deaf, and also determined to assess the



influence of such factors on the achievement of deaf students. Positive results emerged in all areas of his study. His data clearly demonstrated the value of the interpersonal training program, and a series of recommendations for the implementation of the results in teacher selection and training was formulated.

Berenson (1971) carried out a subsequent study on teacher training. His purpose was to explore the effects of human relations training on the classroom performance of elementary school student teachers as measured by classroom verbal interaction analysis, competency ratings and written situational reactions. Berenson's study also recorded positive findings; after human relations training he noted highly significant differences in interpersonal functioning for the experimental group over each of the control groups. There was a marked improvement in the experimental group's level of interpersonal functioning.

Such findings are a definite source of encouragement for the teaching field. These discoveries by Carkhuff and Berenson provide many possibilities for improving or upgrading the quality of teacher trainees, and even teachers presently occupying permanent teaching positions. As a result of their findings, educational institutions can be more selective in the acceptance of candidates and the individuals whom they train. With a well-developed program of this sort, educators could discriminate those having the potential for improved interpersonal functioning and those without the potential. In addition to this, the readiness of a teacher trainee to enter the teaching field could be assessed. Those functioning at an adequate level could be

permitted to enter the field, whereas others would be retained until they had reached the required level. Steps in addition to these could be taken to assess those already working in the teaching field. Individuals identified as functioning at an adequate level could be eliminated from teaching or encouraged to provide for improved interpersonal functioning if they wished to continue in their jobs. With a program such as this, innumerable positive changes could be initiated, and with them the prevention or elimination of many destructive influences in our educational institutions. It is with these thoughts in mind that we hope, in the present study, to modify and adjust the techniques outlined by Hefele (1969) and Berenson (1971) and to further investigate the area of teacher training.

The mammoth changes which have shaken our world as a result of the rapid advancements in science and technology have been discussed. They have been presented as the: breakdown of stabilizing and revered values, the dehumanization and depersonalization of our world, and the inability of much of society to properly interrelate and communicate with each other.

In addition, it has been expressed that nowhere have these pressures and breakdowns been experienced more than in the schools and educational institutions. Teachers and students alike are without guidelines or direction for improving and maintaining warm, sound human relationships. With the lack of these good human relationships, teachers and students develop chronic misunderstandings, fail to accept and respect each other and are unable to share similarities or become enriched by differences.

It has been further revealed, however, that these interpersonal problems need not prevail but are capable of being eradicated or at least minimized. Individuals can be trained to interrelate and interact more effectively and efficiently with others around them (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). Further studies were highly productive in demonstrating that teachers could be trained to function effectively in interpersonal and affective problem areas (Berenson, 1971; Hefele, 1969; Kratochvil, 1968).

The present study arises because of these positive findings in the belief that teachers play the vital role in promoting effective interpersonal relationships in the classroom, and because universities and colleges are conducting inadequate teacher training programs. The result, it is hoped, will be the assessment and definition of procedures for improving selection and training of young teachers, and hopefully the elimination of many interpersonal problems in the classroom.

In brief, the present study set out to examine (via videotapes) the relationship between teacher training exposure to and brief discussion of certain interpersonal variables (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967), and their subsequent interpersonal functioning in the classroom.

## CHAPTER II

### Method

Subjects. The subjects were twenty-one volunteer students enrolled in the 1970--1971 Bachelor of Education program at St. Mary's University. Thirteen subjects were placed in the experimental group and given training through exposure to videotape, and eight were placed in the control group and given no training. The imbalance occurred as a result of volunteers, for one reason or another, leaving the study.

Procedure. Prior to the training sessions, videotapes of teachers in actual classroom situations, were prepared to be viewed later by the subjects in the experimental group. Also, prior to training sessions, the subjects themselves, both the control group and the experimental subjects, were videotaped in a classroom situation during their practice teaching.

The experimental group was familiarized with the concepts of responsiveness and initiative. After the explanation of these terms, the subjects were exposed in four 2 1/2-hour sessions over a period of four weeks, to the videotaped films of teachers within actual classes and to their own pre-test tapes. Periodic breaks in viewing were provided in order that the subjects might question and discern what they had been viewing. Responsiveness and initiative,

as pointed out by the researchers were illustrated by the films which, in general, showed teachers of varying degrees of competence. Subjects were asked to make some judgement as to the level at which these teachers were functioning in these variables, on an interpersonal functioning scale devised and modified from Carkhuff's (1967) model (see Appendix A). Such a training group, it was believed, would, in exposing the teacher trainee to actual teaching situations, clarify some of the interpersonal variables outlined as important in effective interpersonal communication and help him to accurately assess his own interpersonal functioning and take steps to improve it.

in what ways?

After approximately ten hours of this training program over a period of three to four weeks, the experimental subjects were again videotaped during their practice teaching. The control subjects were also filmed again after the same lapse of time. These films were then rated by the researchers on the two variables considered characteristic of effective teaching initiative and responsiveness. (For the scale of measurement and instructions given to the raters, see Appendix A.) The raw scores were recorded and the variance between the experimental group and the control group was calculated.

The research personnel conducting this study were especially concerned with the individuals needed to rate the interpersonal functioning of the teacher trainees. Since these raters would occupy a major position in the program, efforts were made to be as selective as possible when securing rating personnel. The volunteers were initially accepted and specially trained in modified techniques and methods for raters in interpersonal relationships which had been pre-

viously constructed and utilized by Carkhuff and Berenson. The initial stages in training required the raters to comprehend and identify those interpersonal variables necessary for teachers who hoped to properly interact and communicate with students. When this was accomplished, the rating trainees were asked to rate, on a one to five scale, the level of the teacher trainees interpersonal functioning of the degree to which he possessed and manifested the feelings behind these variables. All those who were finally selected to rate were individuals who had acquired a complete comprehension of such variables and who had developed skills in reliable and valid rating.

1 wbu?

## CHAPTER III

### Results

Means and variances for the responsiveness and initiative dimension for the training and control groups are contained in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

T-tests were used to discern any differences between the post-training scores of the groups on both initiative and responsiveness. Results of both t-tests yielded non-significant results (responsiveness =  $t = -.034$ ,  $df \Rightarrow 19$ ;  $p .25$ ; initiative =  $t = -.16$ ,  $df \Rightarrow 19$ ;  $p .25$ ). It was therefore not possible to reject the null hypothesis of no difference between the training and control groups.

TABLE 1

Means and Variances for Training and Control Groups

	<u>Responsiveness</u>		<u>Initiative</u>	
	$\bar{x}$	s	$\bar{x}$	s
Training				
pre	1.79	0.96	1.96	0.90
post	1.96	0.86	1.97	0.80
Control				
pre	1.68	0.64	1.81	0.75
post	1.99	0.75	2.11	0.78



## CHAPTER IV

### Discussion

As indicated by the results, the study failed to support the stated hypothesis. Similar studies, described in the introduction have shown, however, that such an area of exploration should not be considered useless, and that interpersonal training programs can and indeed do produce positive and important results. Previous studies (Berenson, 1971; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Hefele, 1969) have shown marked differences in the interpersonal functioning of trained and untrained subjects.

The same confidence in interpersonal training is displayed and exhibited in the present study. It is believed with the knowledge and experience gained through the study and the utilization of the data, significant results could be obtained in further study. For future research, a number of suggestions are provided.

It is suggested that considerable exposure to (not only to videotapes, but all means available), and participation in the interpersonal functioning should be made available to the experimental. Recommendations were also made for longer training periods than the present study allotted. The study was conducted in a shorter time than recommended by previous studies (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). This shorter period could have been the deciding factor or at least, an

influence on the study's failure. It is believed that if the training were extended to a longer duration, there will be a greater, noticeable impact on the training group and a marked difference will be noticed when compared with the control group. Rigidly controlled training sessions and assessment periods is imperative to the success of such a venture. It is essential that such operations occur at designated times. Additional care and planning should be exercised here, safety checks should be provided so as to insure maximum efficiency in this phase of the study. Control of the time factor is imperative if the study hopes to measure subjects accurately and procure positive results.

The degree of success resulting from such training also greatly depends on the capacities and potentials of the subjects selected for the study. A prerequisite for subject participation, in a study of this nature, is potential for reasonably rapid improvement in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, some sort of screening procedure should be conducted prior to participation in the study to insure proper selection of subjects. Such screening and selection of suitable participants should be automatically carried out by the school of education, but if this proves not to be the case, definite steps should be taken by the researcher in constructing such a selection program. No such procedures were conducted in the present study--this may account for the negative results. Future researchers having need of a viable model of selection or reference for construction of their own model could refer to Carkhuff, 1969. Carkhuff provided scales for initially determining the functioning level of subjects prior to

participation in the study, and thus a means of deciding the degree of improvement after the training period. The model presented, the procedures, scales, methods outlined, have already proven a success in past studies involving selection and training of individuals in interpersonal relationships.

The study indicates a possible need to provide some sort of incentive to insure subject participation and attendance. These factors must be held constant. A breakdown or loss of volunteers means the waste of many long hours of research and, of course, the destruction of the study. A number of suggestions are possible for providing this incentive, but one simple solution for precluding this problem in future research could evolve through the school of education itself. It could offer some sort of course credit or possibly eliminate some of the working load for students wishing to participate in a program of this kind. Once the school received an explanation of the program, the benefits that could be derived from it, and the recognition it could possibly receive for its part, it assuredly would be happy to provide any assistance it possibly could to the program.

Appendix A

Evaluation of facilitative interpersonal functioning of teacher trainees; a scale for measurement.

"The responsive teacher is a person who is living effectively with himself and who discloses himself in a genuine and constructive fashion in response to the pupils. He communicates an accurate empathic understanding and respect for all of their feelings and guides discussions with them into specific feelings and learning experiences."

"Initiative is displayed by the teacher who communicates confidence in what he is doing, is spontaneous and intense, and is open and flexible in his relationships with them and overtly committed to the welfare of all the pupils. His involvement is partly evidenced by the amount of appropriate verbal and physical activity in which he engages with the pupils throughout the lesson."

You will view videotape recordings of actual teaching sessions in which the teachers are working with ordinary pupils. You are to rate the first five-minute segment of each half-hour lesson. Rate each five-minute segment on two variables mentioned above 1.0, 1.0+, 2.0-, 2.0, 2.0+, 3.0-, 3.0, 3.0+, 4.0-, 4.0, 4.0+, 5.0-, 5.0, using the following continuum below. (Responsiveness and initiative are described by the same continuum.)

- 1.0 none of these conditions are communicated to any noticeable degree by this teacher.
- 2.0 some of the conditions are communicated and some are not.
- 3.0 all conditions are communicated at a minimally facilitative level.

- 4.0 all conditions are communicated and some are communicated fully.
- 5.0 all conditions are communicated fully, simultaneously and continually.

Appendix B

Appendix B, basically provides a further breakdown of Appendix A. This section initially gives a brief definition of those variables utilized in evaluating the interpersonal functioning of teacher trainees in initiative (concreteness, confrontation, immediacy), and responsiveness (empathy, respect, genuineness). In addition, the appendix provides a detailed description of the criterion used in establishing an individual's level of interpersonal functioning based on the five-point scale described in Appendix A.



SCALES OF ASSESSMENT OF INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONING

(Carkhuff, 1969 a, pp. 315--328)

SCALE 1

EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:

A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Empathic understanding is defined as the extent to which the first person or helper accurately and spontaneously responds to the second person's or helpee's statements and feelings. The verbal behavior of the helper is characterized by a "movement toward levels of feeling and experience deeper than those communicated by the client (helpee), yet within a range of expression which the client can constructively employ for his own purposes" (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967, pp. 26--7).

Level 1

The first person appears completely unaware or ignorant of even the most conspicuous surface feelings of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person does everything but listen, understand or be sensitive to even the surface feelings of other person(s).

Level 2

The first person responds to the surface feelings of other person(s) only infrequently. The first person continues to ignore the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

Example: The first person may respond to some surface feelings but

tends to assume feelings which are not there. He may have his own ideas of what may be going on in the other person(s) but these do not appear to correspond with those of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person tends to respond to things other than what the other person(s) appear to be expressing or indicating.

### Level 3

The first person almost always responds with minimal understanding to the surface feelings of the other person but, although making an effort to understand the other person's deeper feelings almost always misses their import.

Example: The first person has some understanding of the surface aspects of the messages of the other person(s) but often misinterprets the deeper feelings.

In summary, the first person is responding but not aware of who that other person really is or of what that other person is really like underneath. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

### Level 4

The facilitator almost always responds with understanding to the surface feelings of the other person(s) and sometimes but not often responds with empathic understanding to the deeper feelings.

Example: The facilitator makes some tentative efforts to understand the deeper feelings of the other persons.

In summary, the facilitator is responding, however infrequently, with some degree of empathic understanding of the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

Level 5

The facilitator almost always responds with accurate empathic understanding to all of the other person's deeper feelings as well as surface feelings.

Example: The facilitator is "together" with the other person(s) or "tuned in" on the other person's wavelength. The facilitator and the other person(s) might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human living and human relationships.

In summary, the facilitator is responding with full awareness of the other person(s) and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his most deep feelings.

## SCALE 2

THE COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT OR POSITIVE REGARD IN  
 INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES;  
 A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

The communication of respect or positive regard is characterized by the initial suspension of critical judgements, warm and modulated tones, intense attention, commitment to accurately understand, genuineness and spontaneity (Carkhuff, 1969).

Level 1

The first person is communicating clear negative regard for the second person.

Example: The first person may be actively offering advice or telling the second person what would be "best" for him.

In summary, in many ways the first person acts in such a way as to

make himself the focus of evaluation and sees himself as responsible for the second person.

#### Level 2

The first person responds to the second person in such a way as to communicate little positive regard.

Example: The first person responds mechanically or passively or ignores the feelings of the second person.

In summary, in many ways the first person displays a lack of concern or interest for the second person.

#### Level 3

The first person communicates a positive caring for the second person but there is a conditionality to the caring.

Example: The first person communicates that certain kinds of actions on the part of the second person will reward or hurt the first person.

In summary, the first person communicates that what the second person does or does not do matters to the first person. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

#### Level 4

The facilitator clearly communicates a very deep interest and concern for the welfare of the second person.

Example: The facilitator enables the second person to feel free to be himself and to be valued as an individual except on occasion in areas of deep personal concern to the facilitator.

In summary, the facilitator sees himself as responsible to the second person.

Level 5

The facilitator communicates a very deep respect for the second person's worth as a person and his rights as a free individual.

Example: The facilitator cares very deeply for the human potentials of the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is committed to the value of the other person as a human being.

## SCALE 3

FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:  
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

The communication of facilitative genuineness is characterized by no negative cues of a discrepancy between what the helper is saying and what he appears otherwise to be experiencing, a spontaneous openness to be himself in a nonexploitative manner and a sharing of experience (Carkhuff, 1969).

Level 1

The first person's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the second person(s) and appear to have a totally destructive effect upon the second person.

Example: The first person may be defensive in his interaction with the second person(s) and this defensiveness may be demonstrated in the content of his words or his voice quality and where he is defensive he does not employ his reaction as a basis for potentially valuable inquiry into the relationship.

In summary, there is evidence of a considerable discrepancy between the first person's inner experiencing and his current verbalizations or where there is no discrepancy the first person's reactions are employed solely in a destructive fashion.

### Level 2

The first person's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment or when his responses are genuine they are negative in regard to the second person and the first person does not appear to know how to employ his negative reactions constructively as a basis for inquiry into the relationship.

Example: The first person may respond to the second person(s) in a professional manner that has a rehearsed quality or a quality concerning the way a helper "should" respond in the situation.

In summary, the first person is usually responding according to his prescribed "role" rather than to express what he personally feels or means and when he is genuine, his responses are negative and he is unable to employ them as a basis for further inquiry.

### Level 3

The first person provides no "negative" cues between what he says and what he feels, but he provides no positive cues to indicate a really genuine response to the second person(s).

Example: The first person appears to make appropriate responses which do not seem insincere but which do not reflect any real involvement either. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

### Level 4

The facilitator presents some positive cues indicating a genuine

response (whether positive or negative) in a non-destructive manner to the second person(s).

Example: The facilitator's expressions are congruent with his feelings although he may be somewhat hesitant about expressing them fully.

In summary, the facilitator responds with many of his own feelings and there is no doubt as to whether he really means what he says and he is able to employ his responses whatever their emotional content, as a basis for further inquiry in the relationship.

#### Level 5

The facilitator is freely and deeply himself in a nonexploitative relationship with the second person(s).

Example: The facilitator is completely spontaneous in his interactions and open to experiences of all types, both pleasant and hurtful, and in the event of hurtful responses, the facilitator's comments are employed constructively to open further areas of inquiry for both the facilitator and the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is clearly being himself and yet employing his own genuine responses constructively.

### SCALE 4

PERSONALLY RELEVANT CONCRETENESS OR SPECIFICITY OF  
EXPRESSION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:

#### A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Concreteness or specificity of expression is communicated when the first person or helper guides the discussion toward personally

relevant material, deals with specific details and instances and responds to even vague and abstract communications in terms that are within the helpee's current feelings and experiences (Carkhuff, 1969).

### Level 1

The first person leads or allows all discussion with the second person(s) to deal only with vague and anonymous generalities.

Example: The first person and the second person discuss everything on strictly an abstract and highly intellectual level.

In summary, the first person makes no attempt to lead the discussion into the realm of personally relevant specific situations and feelings.

### Level 2

The first person frequently leads or allows even discussions of material personally relevant to the second person to be dealt with on a vague and abstract level.

Example: The first person and the second person may discuss "real" feelings but they do so at an abstract, intellectualized level.

In summary, the first person does not elicit discussion of most personally relevant feelings and experiences in specific and concrete terms.

### Level 3

The first person at times enables the second person(s) to discuss personally relevant material in specific and concrete terminology.

Example: The first person will help to make it possible for the discussion with the second person(s) to center directly around most things which are personally important to the second person(s) although



there will continue to be areas not dealt with concretely and areas which the second person does not develop fully in specificity.

In summary, the first person sometimes guides discussions into consideration of personally relevant specific and concrete instances, but these are not always fully developed. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative functioning.

#### Level 4

The facilitator is frequently helpful in enabling the second person(s) to fully develop, in concrete and specific terms, almost all instances of concern.

Example: The facilitator is able on many occasions to guide the discussion to specific feelings and experiences of personally meaningful material.

In summary, the facilitator is very helpful in enabling the discussion to center around specific and concrete instances of most important and personally relevant feelings and experiences.

#### Level 5

The facilitator is always helpful in guiding the discussion so that the second person(s) may discuss fluently, directly and completely specific feelings and experiences.

Example: The first person involves the second person in discussion of specific feelings, situations and events, regardless of their emotional content.

In summary, the facilitator facilitates a direct expression of all personally relevant feelings and experiences in concrete and specific terms.

## SCALE 5

### CONFRONTATION IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Confrontation occurs when the helper raises questions or makes statements with increasing specificity about:

...discrepancies between the helpee's expression of who or what he wishes to be and how he actually experiences himself; discrepancies between the helper's verbal expression of his awareness of himself and his observable or reported behavior; discrepancies between how the helper experiences the helpee and the helpee's expression of his own experience (Carkhuff, 1969, pp. 210).

#### Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior (ideal vs. real self, insight vs. action, helper vs. helpee's experiences).

Example: The helper may simply ignore all helpee discrepancies by passively accepting them.

In summary, the helper simply disregards all of those discrepancies in the helpee's behavior that might be fruitful areas for consideration.

#### Level 2

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

Example: The helper, although not explicitly accepting these discrepancies, may simply remain silent concerning most of them.

In summary, the helper disregards the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior and, thus, potentially important areas of inquiry.

### Level 3

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper, while open to discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, do not relate directly and specifically to these discrepancies.

Example: The helper may simply raise questions without pointing out the diverging directions of the possible answer.

In summary, while the helper does not disregard discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, he does not point up the directions of the discrepancies. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

### Level 4

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper attend directly and specifically to the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

Example: The helper confronts the helpee directly and explicitly with discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

In summary, the helper specifically addresses himself to discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

### Level 5

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper are keenly and continually attuned to the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

Example: The helper confronts the helpee with helpee discrepancies in a sensitive and perceptive manner whenever they appear.

In summary, the helper does not neglect any potentially fruitful inquiry into the discrepancies in the helpee's behavior.

## SCALE 6

### IMMEDIACY OF RELATIONSHIP IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Immediacy is communicated when the verbal expressions of the helper attempts to relate the helpee's responses to himself in a direct and explicit manner (Carkhuff, 1969, pp. 192--3).

#### Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard the content and affect of the helpee's expressions that have the potential for relating to the helper.

Example: The helper may simply ignore all helpee communications, whether direct or indirect, that deal with the helper/helpee relationship.

In summary, the helper simply disregards all of those helpee messages that are related to the helper.

#### Level 2

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper disregard most of the helpee expressions that have the potential for relating to the helper.

Example: Even if the helpee is talking about helping personnel in general, the helper may, in general, remain silent or just not relate the content to himself.

In summary, the helper appears to choose to disregard most of those helpee messages that are related to the helper.

#### Level 3

The verbal and behavior expressions of the helper, while open to

interpretations of immediacy, do not relate what the helpee is saying to what is going on between the helper and the helpee in the immediate moment.

Example: The helper may make literal responses to or reflections on the helpee's expressions or otherwise open-minded responses that refer to no one specifically but that might refer to the helper.

In summary, while the helper does not extend the helpee's expressions to immediacy, he is not closed to such interpretations. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitation.

#### Level 4

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper appear cautiously to relate the helpee's expressions directly to the helper/helpee relationship.

Example: The helper attempts to relate the helpee's responses to himself, but he does so in a tentative manner.

In summary, the helper relates the helpee's responses to himself in an open, cautious manner.

#### Level 5

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the helper relate the helpee's expressions directly to the helper/helpee relationship.

Example: The helper in a direct and explicit manner, relates the helpee's expressions to himself.

In summary, the helper is not hesitant in making explicit interpretations of the helper/helpee relationship.

## References

- Anderson, R.H. Teaching in a World of Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1966.
- Banks, G. Effects of lay counselor training on the interpersonal functioning of black and white adults with black and white adults and children. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1969.
- Banks, G., Berenson, B.G., and Carkhuff, R.R. The effect of counselor race and training upon Negro clients in initial interviews. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 70--72.
- Berenson, D.H. A study of the effects of human relations training on the classroom performance of elementary school student teachers. Doctoral dissertation. Fordham University, 1971.
- Berenson, B.G., Carkhuff, R.R., & Myrus, P. The interpersonal functioning and training of college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 441--446.
- Bowers, N.S., and Soar, R.S. The influence of teacher personality on classroom interaction. Journal of Experimental Education, 1962, 30, 309--311.
- Brown, B.F. The appropriate placement school: A sophisticated non-graded curriculum. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1965.
- Brown, B. The nongraded high school. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Carkhuff, R.R. Helping and human relations. Vol. 1. Selection and training. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R.R. Toward a comprehensive model of facilitative interpersonal processes. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1967, 14, 67--72.
- Carkhuff, R.R., and Berenson, B.G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1967.
- Christensen, C.M. Relationships between pupil achievement, pupil affect-need, teacher warmth and teacher permissiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 169--174.

- Commanger, H.S. Challenges of teacher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C., Annual Meeting, 1966.
- Conant, J.B. The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, 142.
- Cronbach, L.J. Educational Psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1963.
- Davidson, Helen H., and Lang, G. Children's perceptions of their teacher's feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement and behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1960, 29, 107--118.
- Dixon, W.R., and Morse, W.C. The prediction of teaching performance: empathic potential. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 323--329.
- Dugan, R.R. Personality and the effective teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 335--337.
- Eysenck, H.J. The effects of psychotherapy: an evaluation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 319--324.
- Fabun, D. Dynamics of change. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Flanders, N.S. Teacher influence, pupil attitudes and achievement. Cooperative Research Monograph, 1965, Washington, D.C., Project No. 12, OE-25040, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Gage, N.L. (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Goodlad, J.I. and Anderson, R.H. The nongraded elementary school (Revised edition). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.
- Hefele, T.J. The role of teacher interpersonal communication factors in the graduate education of prospective teachers of the deaf and the influence of such factors on the academic achievement of deaf students. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1969.
- Joyce, B.R. The teacher-innovator: a program to prepare teachers. Final Report, 1968, Teachers College, Columbia University, OE-58021, Project No. 8-9019, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

- Kratochvil, D.W. The effects of parent and teacher offered levels of facilitative conditions upon indices of student physical, emotional, and intellectual functioning. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.
- Levitt, E.E. The results of psychotherapy with children. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 189--196.
- Lewis, W.A., Lovell, J.T. and Jessee, B.E. Interpersonal relationship and pupil progress. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 396--401.
- Manning, R. Hard thoughts on education. Architects' Journal, 1965 (June 30).
- Martin, J.C., Carkhuff, R.R., & Berenson, B.G. Process variables in counseling and psychotherapy: a study of counseling and friendship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 356--359.
- Meade, E., Jr. Recent innovations in American secondary education. In L.W. Downey & L.R. Godwin (Eds.), The Canadian secondary school: An appraisal and a forecast. Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd. and W.J. Gage Ltd., 1963.
- Miller, R.I. The nongraded school. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967.
- Nelson, L. The nature of teaching. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blairsdell, 1969.
- Ogburn, W.F. Why the family is changing. Sociologus, 1954, 4, 160--170.
- Provincial committee on aims and objectives of education in the schools of Ontario. Living and learning. Toronto: The Newton Publishing Co., 1968.
- Reed, H.B. Teacher variables of warmth, demand, and utilization of intrinsic motivation related to pupil science interest. Journal of Experimental Education, 1961, 29, 205--229.
- Ringness, T.A., and Larson, E.A. Effect of clinical evaluation on supervision of student teachers. Final report, November 30, 1965, Washington, D.C. Project No. S-195, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Rogers, C.R. A theory and therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In Koch, S. (Ed.) Psychology: A study of a science, Vol. III, Formulations of the person in the social context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.



Silberman, C.E. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Stephens, J.M. The psychology of classroom learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Stratemeyer, F.B., and Lindsey, M. Working with student teachers. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1958.

Traux, C.B., and Carkhuff, R.R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Withall, J. The development of a technique for the measurement of social-emotional climate in classrooms. Journal of Experimental Education, 1949, 17, 347--361.