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ABSTRACT

THE COLLEGE CLASSROOM: AN INTERVENTION THEORY
APPROACH TO ITS STUDY

BY

TERRANCE M. WAPSHALL

I am concerned that much potential for learning is being lost in the college classroom. My intent is to explore an approach which addresses this problem. I have two goals for this work: 1) to propose a "self-correcting" model of researching the college classroom which concurrently constructs and tests a theory of college classroom learning, while helping an instructor and class improve the quality of their learning experience; and 2) to prepare myself for work as an educational consultant by becoming more aware of the knowledge and skill I need to be effective.

One type of attempt to improve the quality of instruction involves the use of student ratings of instructors. It is often assumed that this feedback provides an effective way for instructors to improve their courses, or their ratings. Some reasons are presented to account for this lack of effect.

The major assumption of this study is that the college classroom (instructor and students) is an organization which can be profitably studied and helped by employing established organizational diagnostic principles and intervention strategies. A number of comparisons are made between the college classroom and a work group. The purpose is to show that some benefits may be accrued in the college
classroom, by adopting styles of leadership and decision-making which have proved to be effective in work groups.

A major aim of the first section of the paper is to point out the importance of process issues in the college classroom. The classroom's psychological environment is explored to determine the messages being conveyed to the students through it. The work of Marshal McLuhan is discussed as it applies to process in the classroom.

The next section of the paper describes the method of the study which is an adaptation of Chris Argyris' approach to studying organizations. Argyris' model is based on the assumption that, "...thoughtful analysis and effective action can go hand in hand." The interdependence of theory and application is seen as the basis for scientific progress. I believe that by combining theorizing and application in this study, I can learn more about and make more useful comments about the college classroom, than I could be separating these processes. To implement this, I intervened with a college professor and his class during a semester course. As used here, to "intervene" means to enter into an ongoing system or relationships, to come between or among persons, groups, or objects for the purpose of helping them. My intervention activities primarily involved: 1) helping the client system (instructor and students) generate valid information about their structure and functioning, 2) helping them develop free and informed choice toward any changes they want to make in their structure and functioning, and 3) helping each member become internally committed to the course of action or change selected.

The essential test of the utility of my approach involved comparing the competence of the client system in the period before I began to intervene, with the period after my interventions took place.
How well a system accomplishes its core activities over time and under different conditions is an indication of its competence. For Argyris, the core activities of any system are: 1) to achieve its objectives, 2) to control its internal environment, and 3) to adapt to, and maintain control over, the relevant external environment. Competence was assessed on both an individual and group level. Individual competence is seen as relating to behaviors of: 1) accepting responsibility for one's ideas and feelings, 2) being open to ideas and feelings of others and from within oneself, 3) experimenting with new ideas and feelings, 4) helping others to own up to, and to experiment with ideas and feelings, and 5) accomplishment of these behaviors in such a way that one adds to the norms of individuality, concern, and trust. Group competence is seen as relating to a high frequency of psychological success, shared leadership, expressed concern for the effectiveness of the group as a system, continued examination of group processes to reduce blocks, reduction of the gap between leader and members, and continued attention to the accomplishment of challenging group tasks.

In order to make an assessment of competence using these criteria, data were collected from the client system approximately one-third of the way through the semester. This was accomplished through the use of individual interviews, a questionnaire, and observation of each class session. These data revealed a substantial discrepancy between the instructor's and students' view of how the class was progressing. Most of the students had expectations for the course which were not being met. In addition, many of the students did not feel that the course objectives were being achieved. In contrast, the instructor thought the class was coming along fairly well. The client system was
experiencing difficulty in performing its core activities of achieving its objectives, and controlling its internal and external environment.

At mid-semester these data were given to the students and instructor. On the basis of the data, they decided to make several changes in the structure and functioning of the class. I continued my relationship with the client system and helped to implement these changes.

At the end of the semester I collected data from the client system in order to assess any change in competence which may have resulted from my interventions. Both the instructor and students felt the quality of the course improved during the second half of the semester. They were better able to achieve their objectives, control their internal environment, and adapt to and control the relevant external environment. This enhanced performance of its core activities coincided with a closer approximation to the ideal of competent group structure and functioning.

I think these findings show the utility of studying the college classroom using a group framework. The assumptions of this framework help to elucidate aspects of the situation which can lead to an understanding that can be directly applied. In addition, it appears that student feedback, when employed in the context of a thorough process analysis, can be effective in improving instructor ratings.
INTRODUCTION

Basically I began this study because I believe much human potential, time, and effort is being wasted in the college classroom. I am curious to know whether or not this can be remedied. While in college I felt a lack of satisfaction with the learning process. I felt helpless to do anything about it. I had neither the knowledge nor the skills to do anything about the frustration. I now feel I am in a position to do some productive thinking about what continues to be an unsatisfactory situation for many faculty and students.

Very simply, in many instances college instructors and their students are not satisfied with the quality of education in their classrooms. This dissertation is a formalization of my wonderings about developing a model and a set of intervention behaviors which would not only help us to evaluate the problems in the college classroom, but also lead to changes within the classroom which would significantly improve the teaching/learning process.

I have essentially two goals for this work:
1) to propose a "self-correcting" model of researching the college classroom which concurrently constructs and tests a theory of college classroom learning, while helping an instructor and class improve the quality of their learning experience.
2) to prepare myself for work as an educational consultant by becoming more aware of the knowledge and skills I need to be effective.

In an effort to legitimize work on this topic and to demonstrate that others share a similar view of the college classroom with me, I will present a few findings of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. This was a national survey conducted between 1968 and 1972.
It collected information from 115,000 faculty members and 200,000 students at 189 colleges and universities (Trow, 1975).

Although most faculty and students were in general satisfied with the quality of education at their institutions, there were several areas in which both groups felt improvement was needed. I have selected findings which were most relevant to my concerns about the college classroom.

Nine out of 10 undergraduates and three-quarters of the faculty (see Table 1.), with very little variation across institutional quality, would like courses to be "more relevant to contemporary life and problems," and nearly as many agreed that more attention should be paid to students' emotional growth (faculty: 71%, students: 83%). Clear majorities of undergraduates would also like to see grades abolished (and one-third of faculty agree) and all course work made elective. All these possible changes fall within the domain of curricular structure and the conduct of instruction that has traditionally been controlled by the faculty. On the latter two proposals, which are both more radical and more specific, student and faculty views were sharply in opposition to one another, especially at universities.

On a variety of other issues, however, faculty and students were much more closely aligned. For instance, in seeing American colleges as "crushing creativity" in favor of conformity (to which half of each group agreed) or in seeing research and specialization as threats to teaching and scholarship. And clear and substantial majorities, ranging from seventy-five percent of the faculty to ninety-six percent of undergraduates, felt that teaching effectiveness, rather than scholarly publication, should be the primary criterion for faculty promotion. Finally, forty-three percent of the undergraduates indicated
that they were either almost all the time or fairly often "bored in class these days."

One major action taken to address this dissatisfaction has been the widespread solicitation of evaluative student response to teaching. I will present a brief overview of this research as an example of the effectiveness of this approach with respect to the instructor's behavior. It is considered self-evident that the instructor's behavior is one of the most important determinants in the quality of education in the classroom.

It is often assumed that student ratings provide valuable information for course redesign, but there is no convincing evidence that teachers use this information effectively to improve their courses, or their ratings (Kulik and Kulik, 1974). Several studies are available on the effect of feedback on college-level instruction. Miller (1971) reported that end-of-semester student ratings for teaching assistants who had received midsemester feedback were similar to end-of-semester ratings for teaching assistants who did not receive feedback. Thomas (1969) also reported no significant improvement in ratings of vocational agricultural teachers after they received midsemester ratings, and Pambookian (1974) found no overall improvement in psychology teaching fellows who had been rated at mid-semester. In a major study, Centra (1973) investigated the effectiveness of feedback at five different types of colleges. On each of 23 items of a rating questionnaire, end-of-semester ratings of teachers receiving feedback were nearly identical to those of teachers not receiving feedback. This finding was consistent for instructors in all disciplines from both sexes, and with varying amounts of teaching experience.
There are several possible explanations for the failure of rated teachers to improve their standings in subsequent ratings. One possibility is that too wide a range of teachers has been studied. Both Centra (1973) and Pambookian (1974) believe that student feedback is more helpful to some teachers than to others. In Centra's study, teachers who held unrealistically high opinions of their teaching practices at midsemester appeared to be most affected by feedback. In Pambookian's study, teachers who received average ratings changed more than teachers rated either favorably or unfavorably. Centra's and Pambookian's results are suggestive rather than definitive.

Another limitation in the feedback studies is their relatively short time span. Most studies investigate teacher improvement from mid-semester to end-of-semester. Instructors may need more time to incorporate information from ratings into course redesign. Centra presents some data suggesting that in the long run student feedback leads to modest improvement in a wide range of teachers. A third limitation of the feedback studies is the scant information given back to faculty members. The teachers receive ratings from their own classes, but not from the classes of others. Without a set of norms or basis of comparison, it may be difficult to interpret student ratings. Finally, even if teachers are able to interpret their ratings and have the time to improve their courses, they may not know what to do. Expert consultants may be necessary to help teachers develop strategies for improvement. In most of the studies, such consultation was not provided.

The failure of rated teachers to improve may reflect a deeper problem. At some level, teachers may react to ratings as an alien intrusion into the instructional process (Kerlinger, 1971). Impersonal,
anonymous, and judgmental ratings may seem too global to give direction, too delayed to be timely, ratings may come to seem another bureaucratic imposition to the harried teacher, who needs something more personal, more immediate, and more specific to stimulate him or her.

At this point I would like to outline the approach I have chosen to address the problems of the college classroom. I must emphasize that this is only one of many possible approaches. I want to find out which particular aspects of the college classroom I can bring to light by focusing on process rather than content.

The major assumption of the study is that the college classroom (instructor and students) is an organization which can be profitably studied and helped by employing established organizational diagnostic principles and intervention strategies. Cohen (1976) suggests that:

No matter what style of teaching one uses, the classroom is an organization like other organizations: goals must be set, decisions made, work allocated, members recruited, motivated, controlled and rewarded, etc. Whether or not the instructor chooses to make explicit the parallels between external organizations and the classroom, how such issues as leadership, structure and control are handled will have great impact. Students probably learn as much from our classroom managerial behavior as they do from the content we teach...

In particular it can be useful to conceive of the class as a work group (Riskind, 1971). A work group consists of a supervisor and all the people who report directly to him/her. In both the work group and the college classroom, two basic roles exist: a teacher or supervisor role, and a student or supervisee role, occupied by a group of persons of similar status. In each case the teacher/supervisor represents the organization in which the work group operates. For the teacher it is the university, and for the supervisor it is the company. In this capacity the teacher spend some time as the formal authority in
the classroom and the supervisor is required to maintain control of his/her group and to increase their productivity. Both the teacher and supervisor are faced with the task of encouraging their group to work toward pre-established goals or ones they have decided upon themselves. Finally, both the members of the class and the work group are motivated by such extrinsic factors as salary, grades, promotions, and degrees as well as by intrinsic factors—pride in one's work or intellectual growth and the satisfaction of successfully meeting one's responsibilities.

Of course there are important differences. The nature of the work done in one case is the intellectual development of the student; in the other, it is the production of a product or service. The product in an industrial setting is generally more clearly defined and more readily quantifiable than is the case in the university. Another possible difference is that in industry the task often requires the cooperation of an entire work group, whereas in the academic setting the task is usually highly individualized. Keeping these differences in mind, let us now look at the class as a work group.

Rensis Likert (1961) in his work on the relationship of management styles to organizational effectiveness, has studied work groups of high and low effectiveness to see in which ways they differ. He concludes that high productivity, low costs, small turnover, low absentee rate, and high level of employee motivation and satisfaction are related to the pattern of leadership in the work group. One difference he finds between high and low productivity groups concerns patterns of communication within the group, among subordinates, and between subordinates and their immediate superiors.

Looking at the process of how decisions are made in the work
group, Likert concludes that in the more effective work group, each member relates to all the other members and the supervisor as part of the group. Channels of communication and decision are both horizontal and vertical. Likert and his associates have also found that in such a situation the members of the work group actually begin to take on some of the leadership functions of the group, that peers begin to exhibit some of the same leadership behaviors shown by the supervisor.

In less effective work groups, the pattern of communication generally follows what Likert refers to as the "man-to-man" pattern. Here, each subordinate relates almost exclusively to the supervisor. Little horizontal communication occurs. Each subordinate works at building an exclusive relationship with his/her superior, for it is this relationship which is seen as having the greatest potential payoff. Each subordinate will try to identify him/herself with the positive results of the group's effort; he/she wants to be more "visible" than his/her peers. According to Likert, a group managed in this style is less productive and its members less highly motivated than a group in which horizontal communication is encouraged.

Clearly the interaction in most classroom settings is closer to the man-to-man pattern than to the pattern characterized by high peer leadership. Likert's work suggests a more optimal solution to the problem of motivating students than to encourage students to select and strive for purely self-centered goals. It offers little help in reaching that solution. Establishing a group with effective horizontal communication and peer leadership is difficult, particularly in a
classroom setting with a group that meets for only a few hours a week. For a teacher who has a semester goal of teaching certain material or skills, little time is left for the group process. Perhaps we need to experiment with class groups that stay together over longer periods. This study will explore possibilities for improving group process.

Another way of looking at the question of how an instructor influences the class process is to ask about the kind of leadership he/she provides. The literature on leadership is extensive, but relating to the issue under discussion, the theory of leadership devised by David Bowers and Stanley Seashore (1966) provides a useful framework. Their work isolates four major factors of leadership:

- **Support**: the extent to which a supervisor shows personal consideration for his/her subordinates by being approachable and hearing what they say.
- **Interaction Facilitation**: the extent to which a supervisor encourages his/her subordinates to work as a team and to share ideas and opinions.
- **Goal Emphasis**: the extent to which a supervisor encourages his/her subordinates to work as a team by setting an example of commitment to the goal.
- **Work Facilitation**: the extent to which a supervisor gives his/her subordinates the tools (training, ideas, help in planning) to do a more effective job.

Their work indicates that effectively managed work groups are those in which the supervisor provides leadership along all four factors. Subordinates in such groups tend to provide one another with leadership of the same caliber.

Leadership that is strong on all four factors emphasizes both
task and socio-emotional aspects of the job. Such a leader must set high standards for his/her subordinates and give them the tools to reach these standards; he/she must be supportive of them as people and at the same time help them to build their own channels of support and communication. To draw the parallel to the classroom, Flanders (1960) observed that a teacher must strike a balance between dependence and independence in the classroom. Balanced leadership of this kind may be difficult to provide within the time pressures of a semester.

I am suggesting that the instructor is in essence the leader of a work group. The basis of his/her success lies in his/her skill as a content expert as well as in his/her ability to provide leadership that strikes a balance between expertise and authority on the one hand, and alertness to the interpersonal "climate" of the class on the other. One of the teacher's legitimate functions, then, is to encourage the students to express their feelings.

The aim of the preceding discussion is to point to the importance of process issues in the college classroom. Most often attention is directed exclusively at the content of education indicating little awareness of what is being communicated and learned via the process. The purpose in treating the instructor and his/her students as an organization is to bring to light the importance of looking at process issues in the classroom just as they are studied in other organizations.

The ideas of Marshall McLuhan are particularly relevant here. Many of his observations are reaffirmations of ideas previously expressed by others concerned with education, such as John Dewey and A. H. Whitehead. McLuhan's statement that "The medium is the message,"
can be thought of as a restatement of Dewey's belief that "we learn what we do". From this perspective, the most important impressions made on a person come from the character and structure of the environment within which the person functions--the environment itself conveys the critical and dominant messages by controlling the perceptions and attitudes of those who participate in it. Dewey stressed that the role an individual is assigned in an environment--what he/she is permitted to do--is what the individual learns. In other words, the medium itself (the environment) is the message. "Message" in this sense refers to the attitudes one is enticed to assume, the sensitivities one is encouraged to develop, and the perceptions which are sanctioned.

One aim of this study is to explore a college classroom's environment and to determine what messages are being conveyed to the students through this environment. It is generally assumed that a classroom lesson is largely made up of two components: content and method. The content may vary in topic or importance, but it is always thought to be the substance of the lesson. It is thought that content exists independently of the student, and does not interact with the method by which it is conveyed. The method is thought to be the only manner in which the content is presented. It supposedly has no message of its own. While content and method are thought of as separate, content is almost always considered to be more important and the method by which it is presented is incidental. Postman and Weingartner (1969) apply McLuhan's concept of the content/method issue in the following way:

That, 'the medium is the message,' implies that the invention of a dichotomy between content and method is both naive and dangerous. It implies that the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs.
Postman and Weingartner are saying that there is no way to separate content and method with regard to their impact on the student. And further, to assume that the method has no influence, or not be aware of its influence, is potentially destructive. In addition, they contend that the most significant learnings a student obtains in a situation are derived from its process aspects. I agree with them and will attempt to shed light on the process of the college classroom.

Process Issues In The College Classroom

Throughout this paper I will try to be explicit about how my values and needs may influence the study and the conclusions I draw from it. Keniston (1970) has emphasized that this is important by pointing out that,

... the most truly scientific strategem in the study of man is a persistent effort to make conscious and explicit one's own motivations and preconceptions; and that the most objective students of society are those whose values are most clearly stated, not those who claim that 'as scientists' they have no values. The major effort of the student of man or society must always be to retain his own openness to his own presuppositions and to what he studies, so that he retains the capacity to be surprised by proving himself wrong. If the writer's preconceptions and values are made explicit, the reader is at least allowed to challenge these assumptions as stated and not required to ferret them out as imbedded in 'objective' reporting and interpretation. (pp. 8-9)

At this point, I would like to express my views on the effects of ignoring process issues in the college classroom, and the relation of my values to this research.

In the traditional classroom, the student learns again and again that he/she must keep silent, pay some minimal attention to the lecture, and be sure to pick up the changes in tone or other cues that will indicate the material that will be useful on forthcoming tests. These are
complex skills and are learned with different degrees of success by different students. Similarly, the student is getting continual reinforcement for an attitude and value that says that the formal learning situation is irrelevant to the most important things in his/her life. He/She develops the attitude that the formal learning situation is relevant only insofar as he/she can obtain the necessary grades to achieve the status that his/her academic degree might mean for him/her.

My point is that a great deal in the way of values, attitudes, and biases is communicated to and encouraged in students by the process in most college courses. Postman and Weingartner (1969) contend that since the content of many courses is readily forgotten, what remains with the student are the values and attitudes instilled in him/her by the process. Most courses in college are based on a lecture format, and most class meetings are taken up with lectures by the instructor. I would like to examine what can be, and often is communicated to the student by this format.

The instructor, along with those responsible for the structure of the university, is saying that the best way for the student to learn is to sit down and listen to someone talk. It is not only offered as the best way, it is the only way which will be recognized, through certification, as official learning. It is assumed that the student cannot learn on his/her own, and that it is best for the student to remain passive and unemotional. This is the case even though feelings are real, always present, and relevant for learning. A dominant view in education and our society goes counter to the statement that feelings are real. Indeed, we are taught that feelings interfere with our learning and with the smooth operation of our society.
The instructor almost always decides upon the content of the course and what questions will be addressed without input from the students. This is decided before the instructor meets the students and is communicated to them via the syllabus. This procedure represents what is thought to be an innocuous disregard of students' learning needs and expectations, both of which are widely known to affect learning significantly. In effect, the instructor is saying that he/she is not concerned with what the students think is worth knowing, since he/she has already decided this. It seems to me that a basic ability any person in our society needs in order to survive and be fulfilled is the ability to decide for him/herself what is worth knowing. Otherwise, and taken to an extreme, a person is doomed to perpetual dependence on some form of authority or other.

Another value communicated in the typical lecture course is that some information is intrinsically worth knowing independent of any felt need. Indeed, much of the formal educational enterprise can be seen as an exercise in creating a need where none was initially felt.

Perhaps the most potent process issue in the college classroom is the manner in which the student is evaluated. Here again, the student is left out of the process of deciding what is worth knowing. For an examination, the instructor selects a number of informational units from the larger population which he/she has decided to be the content for the course. He/She is saying that of all the information selected for the course, this information is really important. This practice negates any freedom the student exercised in deciding what to study for the test. A useful test strategy for the student is to develop a value system toward the information which is as consistent with that of the instructor's as
possible. But, the most destructive consequence of the typical evaluation procedure is that the student takes no responsibility for judging the quality of his/her learning. In fact, this is actively discouraged by the message that the only evaluation that really counts is that which is given by the instructor. This issue could serve as the basis of an entire treatise. This grading practice runs counter to the development of capacities for self-evaluation, trust in one's own judgment, and confidence in oneself. This process paves the way for continued reliance on others for an evaluation of one's own experience and knowledge. I feel very strongly that this practice is the main ingredient in pushing students off center and prolonging an immature dependency.

In general, the situation in the college classroom encourages the student to give up responsibility for his/her learning. I believe this leads to a passive, unquestioning, conforming and unresponsive citizenry. This is very much in line with the thesis underlying Ivan Illich's collection of essays in Deschooling Society (1971). I am not saying that the educational system is totally responsible for the nature of our society. It does appear to be in collusion with other institutions in our society (the health care system, multi-national corporations, the government) in the task of seducing people into giving up greater amounts of responsibility for and control over their lives. My point is that higher education does not seem to recognize the extent to which its procedures are antithetical to its long-treasured goals of independence of thought, critical reflection, and involved responsibility to society.

I believe that what students think and feel is legitimate and
and important, that the student collegiate experience itself is at least as important as the tangible products of that experience (e.g., a degree, increments of specific kinds of knowledge, job potential), and that the specific beliefs, attitudes and conclusions that are molded in college will have a sustaining effect on the lives of these men and women in the years to follow. Faculty judgments and institutional evaluation and certification are important but the ideas, attitudes and events of the students' existence are equally, perhaps more, important. I believe that a happy, reinforcing collegiate experience that induces positive attitudes toward formal and informal learning, toward oneself, and toward the future is essential to American society. Though institutional authorities may be objectively and professionally correct in their plans, programs and judgments, they are "wrong" if students despise learning, have no confidence in themselves, and are unhappy and cynical.
THE STUDY

The next section of the paper describes an adaptation of Chris Argyris' approach to studying organizations. I have modified his model and use it as a means of investigating process issues in the college classroom. Research on the learning process in higher education is beset with a large and diverse collection of theory and method (Kunkel et al, 1972). The point here is not to propose yet another theory of education. Rather, an effort is made to put forth a research framework, based on extensive experience with organizations, which represents a self-correcting style of theory building and application. As used here, self-correcting means developing a "theory" of a college classroom through observation and then testing this theory in that classroom for validity. It is an attempt to address both the need for heuristic theory in education and the more humanly felt need of instructors and students for a more effective and satisfying learning experience.

Argyris' model (1970) is based on the assumption that, "thoughtful analysis and effective action can go hand in hand". He draws heavily on Lewin's (1951) position that sound research leads to systematic theory; yet systematic theory is needed to guide sound research. The interdependence of theory and application is seen as the basis for scientific progress. It has been the custom of most social scientists to separate theorizing and application. That is, separating the processes of understanding human beings from those of helping them move toward fuller functioning. Argyris contends that this schism,
... has been one of the primary reasons for inhibiting systematic research in the area of planned change and consulting, and for preventing the behavioral sciences from becoming simultaneously more relevant and more systematic.

Most researchers agree that theory needs empirical validation, but in the area of educational research as in other areas of social science, there exist two relatively independent groups, the theorists and the practitioners. Neither of these groups seems to be very helpful to the other. Indeed they are often antagonistic. The theorists continue to conceptualize with only token gestures at application, and practitioners continue gaining experiences which are non-additive because of their lack of conceptual framework. Argyris holds that as long as these two groups remain separate, and more importantly, as long as the processes of theorizing and application in this study I can learn more about and make more useful comments about the college classroom, than I could by separating these processes.

I will now begin a fairly lengthy description of my adaptation of Argyris' model to the study of the college classroom. I do this because I think it is necessary to make explicit the assumptions I have about people and the way they behave as a group in the classroom.

I plan to intervene with a college instructor and his class during a semester course. As used here, to "intervene" means to enter into an ongoing system of relationship, to come between or among persons, groups, or objects for the purpose of helping them. Implicit in this definition is the assumption that the system exists independently of the intervenor.

There are three basic requirements for intervention activity regardless of the substantive issues involved (Argyris, 1970). First,
the interventionist must help the client system generate valid information. This information should describe the factors, plus their inter-relationships, that create the problem for the client system. I will assist the instructor and class in generating valid information by interviewing them, observing them, and by asking them to respond to a questionnaire. A second condition which must be met is the free and informed choice of any changes in structure or function of the system by the client. This insures the continued discreetness and autonomy of the client system. I will give the information I collect to the instructor and students, help them understand its meaning, and help them make changes in the structure and/or function of the class if they feel change is warranted. Lastly, each member must be internally committed to the course of action or change selected, experience a high degree of ownership, and feel responsible about the choice and its implications. This point of internal commitment is reached when the group member supports the choice because it fulfills his/her own needs and sense of responsibility, as well as those of the group. I will remain with the group if they have decided upon change to help implement the change and develop commitment to it.

Criteria For Competence In The Classroom

In helping the class generate valid information about its functioning, I will be using criteria developed by Argyris to evaluate the quality of its structure and functioning. By presenting these criteria, I will be making explicit the theoretical assumptions I hold about people working as a group in a college classroom.

For Argyris (1970), the core activities of any system are
1) to achieve its objectives, (2) to control its internal environment, and (3) to adapt to, and maintain control over, the relevant external environment. How well the system accomplishes these core activities over time and under different conditions is an indication of its competence. In short, it is the interventionist's task to help the client system become more competent in carrying out its core activities.

It is assumed that a system is better off to the extent that it is in control of its own behavior and destiny. For this, it is necessary for the system to solve its problems and execute its decisions in such a way that it can continue to be in control. In this way, the criteria for system competence and effectiveness are related to problem solving, decision making, and decision implementation. I will be looking at how well these behaviors are carried out by the instructor and the class.

Problem solving and decision making are conceived of as intricate processes of thinking that are best differentiated in terms of their product. Problem solving is that thinking which results in the solution of a problem. Decision making is that thinking which results in the choice among alternative courses of action. Decision implementation includes those processes necessary to carry out the decision so that the system creates the product or the effect that was intended.

Problem solving requires valid information. Decision making requires choice. Implementation requires internal commitment. In the long run, the interventionist helps the client system become more competent by focusing on the three primary tasks: generating valid information, developing free and informed choice, and developing internal commitment to the decisions.

Argyris has developed five general criteria which I will use to
evaluate the competence and effectiveness of the client.

1. The information needed to understand the relevant factors should be available and understandable by the relevant parts. Only when information is understandable does it meet the initial conditions for it to be used effectively.

2. The conditions should not only be available and understandable; it should also be usable or manipulatable by the system. One cannot expect effective behavior if the variables necessary to solve a problem and make and implement a decision are beyond the ability of the system to manipulate.

3. The cost (in terms of time, people, and material resources) of obtaining, understanding, and using the information should not be beyond the capacity of the system.

4. The problem should be solved and the decision made and implemented in such a way that it does not recur (relevant only for the problems under control or influence of the system.

5. The four previous criteria are accomplished without deteriorating, and preferably with increasing, the effectiveness of the problem solving, decision making, and implementing processes.

These five criteria are related to my three primary tasks with the instructor and class. The need to have relevant and understandable information is related to the task of generating valid information. Free choice from a set of alternatives is possible if these alternatives are within the capacity (skill-wise and resource-wise) of the system to manipulate. Internal commitment is related to the execution of deci-
sions in such a way that the problem does not recur and that the existing level of competence is not deteriorated.

**Evaluation Of The Subsystems Of A Social System**

What follows is a description of how the five general criteria of competence depicted above will be specifically applied to the instructor and class as a group, and to each of them individually. The competence criteria can be applied to the behavior and performance of any system (and part of a system) which has the capacity to problem solve, and make and implement decisions. These subsystems are: individuals, groups (formal or informal), intergroups (formal and informal), and the system as a whole (operationally defined by the system's norms, policies, and practices).

The task then, is to identify the conditions under which these different subsystems behave most competently. If this task can be achieved, the interventionist will have the criteria necessary to evaluate the competence of each of the parts as well as the system as a whole. It must be kept in mind that the conditions to be discussed are ideal states and indicate aspiration levels for the clients and the interventionist to assess the system's actual competence and to define strategies and tactics in order to increase the competence.

Since this study deals with the college classroom, only the first two levels will be considered (individual and group) although it is important to be aware of the influences on this system from the larger system (department, college or school, university, state, etc.).

Let us now examine the conditions under which individuals and the group will tend to be maximally competent in their problem solving,
decision making, and decision implementation. These conditions constitute the theory being tested in this study. I am assuming the college classroom can be productively studied using a group process framework. By maximally competent is meant the capacity of the individual or the class (1) to produce, understand, and use relevant information, (2) to solve and implement the solution in such a way that the problem remains solved, (3) to accomplish one and two in such a way that the existing level of competence of the problem solving, decision making, and implementing activities is not reduced and is preferably raised.

The Individual

Three characteristics of individuals are hypothesized to relate positively to the competence and effectiveness criteria. That is, the more closely these characteristics are approximated, the higher the probability the individual will fulfill the competence criteria. Argyris describes the three characteristics this way:

1. **Self-acceptance** refers to the degree to which the individual has confidence in himself and regards himself positively. Self-acceptance is observed by watching an individual behave and seeing to what extent he/she is capable of creating conditions in which he/she and others are able to increase their self-acceptance. The higher the self-acceptance, the more he/she will tend to value others because he/she knows that only by interacting with human beings who value themselves will he/she tend to receive valid information and experience minimally defensive relationships.

2. **Confirmation.** An individual experiences a sense of confirmation when others experience him/her (or aspects of his/herself) as he/she experiences him/herself. Confirmation is needed to validate one's view
of, and confidence in, one's self. All individuals experience the world through their own set of biases which are related to self. They will see what their own selves encourage or permit them to see. The possibility of error is therefore present. The awareness of this potential for error creates a basic posture of uncertainty and doubt regarding one's impact. This in turn creates a predisposition to inquiry into the accuracy of the individual's perception and experience of reality. Hence the need for confirmation. The more frequent the confirmation, the greater the sense of confidence in one's potential to behave competently. The greater the sense of confidence, the greater the probability that the individual will be accepting of others and strive to help others confirm themselves and their efforts. These conditions may form the foundation for effective work relationships.

3. Essentiality. The more the individual is able to utilize his/her central abilities and express his/her central needs, the greater will be his/her feelings of essentiality to him/herself and to the system. The more the individual is able to utilize only his/her peripheral abilities and needs, the less essential will he/she feel about the system. The more essential the individual tends to feel, the more committed he/she will tend to be to the system and to its effectiveness.

Argyris suggests that one of the most effective ways to help individuals increase their degree of self-acceptance, confirmation, and essentiality is to generate conditions for psychological success. Psychological success occurs as:

a) the individual is able to define his/her own goals

b) the goals are related to his/her central needs, abilities
and values
c) the individual defines the paths to these goals
d) the achievement of the goals represents a realistic level of aspiration for the individual. A goal is realistic to the extent that its achievement represents a challenge or a risk that requires hitherto unused, untested abilities.

It is quite obvious already that very few college classrooms provide conditions for individual competence as outlined here.

There are behavioral manifestations of these three characteristics which can serve as indicators of feelings of self-acceptance, confirmation, and essentiality by the individuals in the system:

1) owning up to, or accepting responsibility for one's ideas and feelings;
2) being open to ideas and feelings of others and those from within one's self;
3) experimenting with new ideas and feelings;
4) helping others to own up to, be open to, and to experiment with ideas and feelings;
5) accomplishment of these behaviors in such a way that one adds to the norm of individuality (rather than conformity), concern (rather than antagonism), and trust (rather than mistrust).

The theoretical framework suggests the idea that these behaviors are differentially potent in what each contributes to competence. Owning up to ideas is found most frequently and is least potent. Being open to ideas is next most frequent and more potent. Experimenting with ideas is quite rare but is very potent when it occurs. Owning up to, being open to, and experimenting with feelings is
somewhat less frequent than experimenting with ideas but is almost as potent as the latter. Helping others to own up to ideas is slightly less frequent than being open oneself, while helping others to be open and to experiment with ideas or feelings is as rare as experimenting, but also as potent. In short, the more individuals in systems are able to express their feelings related to the substantive issues, the more they are able to help others do the same, then the higher the probability is that the system in which they work will manifest competent problem solving, decision making, and implementation.

Characteristics of Helpful Information

It is necessary now to be more specific about these behaviors of owning up, openness, and experimentation in order to see how they can facilitate group competence.

It is important that information communicated be directly verifiable to the largest extent possible. We need to distinguish between information, be it the expression of either ideas or feelings, that can be verified directly by self and others versus information that must be validated by reference to some conceptual scheme. The first type of information includes categories of behavior that are directly observable. The second utilizes categories that are inferred. The more the information used is composed of inferred categories which refer to a conceptual scheme, the greater the dependence of the individuals upon the conceptual scheme if they are to verify the information they are using. This dependence decreases the probability of experiencing self-acceptance or trust in others and in the group because the key to success, trust, and effectiveness
lies in knowing the conceptual scheme in the mind of the other. Information, therefore, should be directly verifiable insofar as possible. To generate information that is directly verifiable requires that it remain as close to the observable data as possible.

Information given should be minimally attributive. Attributive information is that which posits hypothetical motivations for another's behavior. The function of such attributive information is to attribute something to a person which the sender infers exists and about which the person is supposedly more or less unaware. Telling a person what his motivation may be, even if correct, tends to lead to the experience of failure because the person must assign responsibility for the insight to someone else. This sets up the possibility, if continued, for dependence on others for increasing self-knowledge. If the sender, however, intervenes and gives the raw data of which he infers the person is unaware, then the person is able to judge for himself the possible validity of the inference.

The third major characteristic of helpful information is its minimal evaluation of the recipient's behavior. There are two reasons for this. First, such information reduces the probability of making the receiver defensive, thereby creating conditions under which accurate listening will be increased. Effective change does not require the communication of all information. Openness is useful to the extent that it helps the individuals receiving feedback to learn. Second, minimally evaluative information describes the receiver's feelings about the sender's messages without designating them as good or bad. This places the responsibility for evaluation, if there is to be any, on the individual trying to learn about him/herself or
his/her performance. He/She, and only he/she, has the responsibility of deciding whether he/she plans to change his/her behavior. Again, placing the responsibility on the individual increases the probability that if he/she changes, and it is his/her decision, he/she will tend to experience a sense of psychological success.

Information should be **minimally contradictory**. A fourth major characteristic of facilitative behavior is its unconflicted or consistent meaning. Information which contains contradictory messages will tend to decrease the effectiveness of interpersonal relations. This point was illustrated by Bateson et al (1956) in their concept of the double bind. Mr. A. says to Mr. B, "I love you, but get lost". Mr. B. will receive two contradictory messages which place him in a bind. Does A love me, or is he lying? Is love associated with distance? How will I judge which part of A's message is valid? In the extreme case, a high frequency of double binds may contribute to neurotic or psychotic behavior. One of man's basic needs is to be competent, and he therefore abhors situations of imbalance. Brown (1962) concludes, "... human nature abhors imbalance... a situation of imbalance in the mind threatens to paralyze actions".

The fulfillment of the competence criteria requires that the individual minimize the contradictory messages that he intentionally or unintentionally communicates to others. The contradiction or imbalance can exist between (a) words and feelings, (b) words and feelings versus behavior, and (c) verbal versus non-verbal behavior.

Groups

Groups are systems with organic parts. Individuals are one important organic part of a group. Therefore, the group increases its
probability of being effective to the extent that its individual participants have a relatively high degree of self-acceptance, confirmation, and essentiality; that they own up to, are open toward, and experiment with ideas and feelings; that they help others do the same; and that they tend to communicate these behaviors by using directly verifiable information and by minimizing attributions, evaluations, and contradictions. However, groups are systems which can facilitate or inhibit the experience of these phenomena by individuals. There are, therefore, group activities which make it easier for individuals as they strive to increase the group's effectiveness. The next section describes criteria I will use to assess the competence of the instructor and class as they function as a group (Argyris, 1970).

Criteria For Group Competence And Effectiveness

1. A high frequency of psychological success. This means that the processes of influence within the group are so structured that members can define their goals and the paths to their goals, and select goals that are central to their needs, and can define the goals so that they represent a challenge to the member's competence.

In order to accomplish this, the processes of influence must be under the control of all the members. This means that no one individual is appointed as the formal leader. Leadership becomes a shared function. The leader at any given time is the individual whom the group members perceive as able to help them fulfill their goals most effectively. Power in the group resides in all the parts and is willingly delegated to the individual who will help the group accomplish its present task. Power is also easily taken away and
to another when someone else manifests more competence to help the group either with the same or with different tasks. Under the concept of member-controlled, functionally-shared leadership, there are fewer feelings of failure if the leadership role is passed on to someone else because the person cares for the effectiveness of the group and realizes that all the members do also. This leads to another property of effective groups.

2. The members have identified with the health of the system and care very much about its effectiveness. They see, for example, how their personal competence is intimately related to the group's effectiveness.

3. Group members are able to focus, whenever necessary, on the internal workings of the group, evaluating and modifying the group processes. They are concerned with questions such as:
   a) Are all members able to make the contributions they are capable of and are striving to make?
   b) Is there concern for the additive quality of these contributions? Are individuals interested in developing a coherent group product when they make their contributions?
   c) Are individuals free not only to express their views but to be open to new views and to experiment with new ideas and feelings? Are members attempting to help others own up to, be open toward, and experiment with new ideas and feelings?

4. As individuals experience a greater degree of psychological success, concern for the group, and share of leadership, there tends to follow a reduction of the normal gap between leader and nonleader. Formal power is less needed since the basis for influence is competence. This leads to a decrease in the usual feelings of dependence and submissive-
ness toward the leader, as well as the usually accompanying ambivalent feelings of hostility and warmth. The reduction of both phenomena tends to reduce the probability of bind-producing behavior and increases the probability that the group will get on with the task.

5. Members can develop confidence in their group's ability to solve problems and make and implement decisions as they successfully perform these activities in achieving a task. As the members increase their feelings of confidence in the group and trust of each other, the attractiveness of the group increases.

To summarize, a high frequency of psychological success, shared leadership, expressed concern for the effectiveness of the group as a system, continued examination of group processes to reduce blocks, reduction of the gap between leader and members, and continued attention to the accomplishment of challenging group tasks will increase the probability that the group will tend to manifest a high degree of system competence. These conditions will also tend to provide opportunities for individuals to increase their self-acceptance, feelings of confirmation, and essentiality. These, in turn, will increase the members' identification with and concern over the group which, in turn, will tend to increase the focus on stimulating even further opportunities for psychological success, shared leadership, and all other criteria of effective groups described.

Process Concerns In Research

I now feel that I need to spend some time talking about why I am using this particular approach. As I mentioned earlier, there are undoubtedly many useful ways of investigating the college class-
room. As has been evidenced by much of the foregoing, I believe that "how" you do something is as important, and sometimes more important, than "what" you do. I seek to point out the importance of the message being communicated to the students by the structure and functioning of the college classroom.

Any research effort belies many assumptions the researcher has about the nature of human beings and how they behave, and about life and how one may come to know about it. The difficulty lies with the processes typically used to generate valid information. Recent explorations (Kelman, 1968) suggest that commonly accepted, frequently taught criteria for, and methods of, rigorous research may have built in unintended consequences. These unintended consequences arise when individuals (subjects in the case of research) are considered to be whole human beings with needs such as self-acceptance, a feeling of inner worth, and a sense of competence. Apparently, the unintended consequences can have significant impact on what subjects are willing to say and on how committed they may be to diagnose and to solve their problems.

Most traditional methods of research tend to place subjects in a situation vis-a-vis the researcher that is similar to the superior-subordinate relationship. This is not a neutral encounter for most people. The subjects may adapt by becoming dependent. They may also fight the research by actively rejecting a positive, contributive role or by covertly withdrawing their involvement and thereby providing minimally useful data.

At this point I would like to discuss my values in relation to research with individuals and groups.
I believe values and attitudes about human nature are often communicated in the research situation, and even by much of the social science enterprise, which are unrecognized and at times anti-humanistic. This is an issue I have thought about a great deal, and I am still a long way from resolving the issue satisfactorily. I do not know if it is possible to carry out a scientific study of human nature without promoting anti-humanistic values. The best way for me to present the various aspects of this argument which goes on within me is to quote Herbert Kelman, who has also thought about this issue at length and is a good deal more articulate on it than I at this point.

There is a close and continual relationship between social science and social values. On the one hand, social research has a potentially important impact on the values that are held and achieved within society. It may contribute to forces favorable to some values and unfavorable to others... On the other hand, values have an important impact on social research... it is impossible to carry out social research, particularly on socially significant issues, that is unaffected by the values of the investigator and the groups to which he belongs. The choice of problem, the approach to it, and the interpretation of the findings inevitably reflect the value assumptions and preferences the investigator brings to his research. As a matter of fact, in view of the closeness of interaction between values and social research, I would maintain that we must rethink our whole conception of social research. We will have to abandon the illusory goal of separating values from research process and move toward a definition of social science as an activity that is necessarily and deliberately embedded in a value-oriented and policy-relevant process.

A central characteristic of the scientific study of man is that the investigator views man and society as objects, which he places at a distance and differentiates sharply from himself so that he can observe them from the outside. Because of the nature of the object of his study, he can achieve this separation and distancing only to a limited degree, and he is well-advised to be mindful of this limitation. Yet, the rules and procedures of the scientific approach are designed to approximate these conditions as much as possible. It is this objectification of man that represents the special strength of empirical social science and its unique contribution to the study of man.

The very same characteristic of social science, however, also represents its clash with humanistic values. The values held by individuals or societies are closely linked to their conception of
the nature of man--to the model of man to which they subscribe. Humanistic values rest, at least in part, on a conception of man as a choosing agent and an end in himself. The working model of social science, on the other hand, takes man as an object, buffeted about by external or internal forces beyond his control. This is, of course, particularly true of those theoretical approaches that use a mechanistic or a homeostatic model, but it is inherent in the deterministic approach common to all scientific models of man. John Seeley, who has written extensively and widely about these problems, says in this connection: 'I do not think science can live without the principle [of determinism], and I do not think men can live with it--as applied, at least, to themselves' [1960, p. 6]. Elsewhere he speaks of 'the peculiar problem posed... in reference to beings whose most immediate intuition of themselves in their most important matters is the overwhelming intuition of choice' [1960a, p. 84].

The danger is, to quote Seeley once more, that as man 'becomes to himself... a scientific object, an object of mere curiosity or curiosity in the service of manipulation, he ceases pari passu to be a self, ceases to be an object of libidinal investment, ceases to be his own habitable home, and becomes what he has made himself, a true object for engineering, the true fruit of science... It is not at all clear... that a science of man in the traditional sense of the word 'science' is possible without self-destruction--by each of himself, or of most by some [1960b, p. 4], (1968, pp. 111-112).

This was and is the conflict I have over the consequences of studying human beings with means which are incongruent with the societal values I uphold. Most research studies I am acquainted with place the subject in a situation in which he/she is treated as an object and data source. Even the term, subject, implies that the person is to be subjected to someone's control or treatment. This situation has much in common with any relationship in which there is a large power differential between persons. Feelings of submission, dependency, resentment, ignorance, and awe can describe subject affect in experimental studies. In contrast, the experimenter may feel powerful, in control, knowledgeable, and insensitive. I do not believe that these feelings reside only in and for the duration of the experimental study. There is a general belief among many in our society that psychologists
probably know more about us than we do ourselves. This is a replication of the experimental situation on a large scale.

Primarily I am concerned with process issues in the college classroom, but this interest stems from a deep concern about process throughout our society. This is why I tried to do a study in which those who participated were not placed in a situation in which anti-humanistic values and attitudes were communicated to and encouraged in them.

The aim is to make modifications in the established concepts of research methodology in order to increase the probability of generating valid information, and to create conditions for free choice and internal commitment. The basic strategy for modification is (1) to create relationships with clients where they have more influence over the design, execution, and analysis, and (2) to utilize research methods which are readily understood by the participant. The thrust of this approach, which Argyris terms "organic", is to minimize dependent and submissive relationships. The intention is to involve the clients in the introduction, design, execution, feedback, and evaluation of any and all aspects of the program and to provide for them many opportunities for psychological success, feelings of essentiality, development of confidence and trust in others, and effective group relations. These attitudes in turn increase the probability that the participants will provide valid information, will make informed choices, and will develop internal commitment (Argyris, 1970).
Sequence Of Design Implementation

I approached an instructor (Associate Professor with tenure) before the beginning of the semester and described the proposed study to him. I mentioned that I wanted to work with an instructor and class for a semester to learn more about the college classroom and test a model for intervening which would improve its effectiveness. We talked about his goals for the course (see Appendix C) and how much class time I would need for the study. He agreed to participate.

The course title was, "Exploring Teaching," and was designed for students who were considering a career in teaching (see Appendix C). Each student was required to participate in a two-hour weekly seminar for fifteen weeks, and work five hours per week in a school placement. The course was a prerequisite for admission to the Education department. Fifteen students were enrolled (three men and twelve women), and all were in their second or third year of college with the exception of one student who already had received an undergraduate degree.

The next step was to extend this "entry" behavior to the class members. While having established the beginnings of a relationship with the instructor and received his consent to participate, it was necessary for the class to come to this same decision on their own. I visited the class the second session of the semester. The instructor only announced that I was coming to propose a study with them, and he did not communicate to them his desire to participate. The students may have inferred that since I was talking to them, the instructor had agreed to participate. Nevertheless, I tried to create a situation in which the students felt free to decline participation if they so
desired.

With the instructor not present, I told the class who I was and described the project. I indicated that my goal was to learn more about the college classroom and test a model of intervening in order to improve its effectiveness. I told them that it was possible that the course may turn out to be more satisfactory for them as a result of this work, but emphasized that this was something I could not promise. I spent a good amount of time responding to their questions and actively tried to get them to voice any reservations they might have about participating. I noted that I would not consider myself a private consultant to the instructor, and perceived myself as being either accepted or rejected by the entire group. I emphasized that the success of the project depended a great deal on how much we trusted each other. I wanted to make it easy for them to confront me if they felt anything I was doing was injurious to any one of them or the group. I made it clear to them that the whole project depended upon arriving at a true picture of the group's functioning, and that I very much needed their honesty with regard to their ideas and feelings about the course, instructor, the project, and me. I noted that if our relationship was not a good one, the whole project was questionable. Again I urged them to voice any reservations. Apparently their questions and reservations had been satisfactorily dealt with as they decided unanimously to participate.

Data Collection Preceding Feedback Session

Beginning with this entry session and continuing with every class section thereafter, I attended and tape recorded each class
meeting. I observed and tried to categorize the interactions which took place. In particular, I was looking for behavior relating to: owning up to, being open to, and experimenting with ideas and feelings, as well as helping others to express these behaviors also (see Appendix A). In addition, I kept a log of my own personal impressions of what was or was not happening in the class.

Beginning with the fourth week of the semester, I interviewed all the students (15) and the instructor individually. These interviews lasted approximately forty-five minutes and covered a range of topics including ideas and feelings about the: students, instructor, evaluation, problems with the class, possible changes, whether or not course objectives were being met, etc. (see Appendix B). Ample time was allowed, and all participants were encouraged to discuss any ideas or feelings they felt were relevant to the course. All participants agreed to allow the interviews to be recorded. I assured them that anything they said was confidential and would not be released to the instructor or other students without their permission. All participants were given a transcript of their interview to check it for accuracy and to make any additions or deletions they desired. The transcripts were given to the participants approximately one week after the interview was conducted. I encouraged them not to edit the transcripts extensively as this would increase the value of the feedback report which would be partly composed of the interviews.

The final element in the overlapping data collection phase was the administration of a questionnaire to the students which asked for their reactions to the instructor and the course (see Appendix C). I administered the Teaching Analysis By Students (TABS), developed at
the University of Massachusetts, at the sixth class session.

The purpose of the multi-faceted data collection procedure was to generate valid information about the structure and functioning of the class and instructor as a group. I was hoping for and got a good deal of overlap in the picture of the class portrayed by each of the data collection measures. In addition, a variety of data collection devices allowed the participants to express their views in a way most comfortable for them.

Data Collected Prior To The Feedback Session

Although the raw data do not appear here, they are included in Appendix C (pp. 66-107), and I think it is important that the reader be quite familiar with them. The summaries I provide here are only outlines which cannot serve as a complete picture of the people I worked with and the situation we were involved in. It is important to hear the participants talk about the course and themselves in their own words.

The first interview with the instructor was held approximately one week before the feedback session. At this time he felt the course was proceeding fairly well (see Appendix C, pp. 70-71). He pointed out, however, that in some respects the class was moving more slowly than he would like it to, and wished that he had been able to get into some planning with the students sooner. The level of student interaction and achievement was pleasing to him. He felt that the course objective of helping the students decide about a career in teaching was progressing pretty well. In general, the instructor believed that he was being successful in meeting the objectives with the class and that he was having the desired impact on them. In addition, he mentioned that
he enjoyed teaching in this class.

The student interviews were conducted one to two weeks prior to the feedback session. I interviewed each student individually for approximately forty-five minutes. Almost all of the students had expectations for the course which were quite different from the way it actually proceeded (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 72-73). All but two took the course because it was required to get into the education program. A major source of surprise and consternation for most of the students came when they realized that they were responsible for establishing their own field placements. The students were under the impression that assignments to teachers would already have been made for them. This situation got the course off to a bad start and left some students with feelings of antagonism toward the instructor. In addition, the majority of the class members saw little or no relationship between the seminar activities and their field work experiences, and were confused by this. Also, many of the students felt that the discussions in the seminar were not relevant to their needs because of the various placements they each had. The comments of those in the elementary schools were not seen as valuable by those in the high schools, and vice versa.

With few exceptions, the class members said that while the field placement was useful in deciding whether or not to go into teaching, the seminar was not helping with this decision. Most of the students did not see the value of the seminar. Many voiced feelings of confusion and boredom. A smaller group of students thought the classtime activities were useful and interesting.

Most of the students had positive reactions to the instructor.
However, many had trouble understanding what he wanted them to do, and were somewhat disconcerted by his not finishing activities which were begun. A few of the class members felt that the instructor was not sensitive to their needs and did not answer their questions adequately.

I want to point out that at no time did any of the students confront the instructor with their problems or concerns about him or the course. This lack of communication on their part may explain some of the discrepancy between the instructor's view that the course was progressing fairly well, and the overall student view that the course was going poorly.

The questionnaire data was consistent with that collected in the interviews and provided a quantitative index of the salience of some of the issues already presented. I will have more to say about this data later when it is compared to the results of the second administration of the TABS questionnaire which took place at the end of the course (see Appendix C, pp. 103-107).

The Feedback Session

At the seventh class the feedback session took place. The feedback report (Appendix C, pp. 69-82) served as the basis of this session. The feedback report consisted of a transcript of the first interview with the instructor, paraphrased remarks and quotes from the student interviews, and selected results from the TABS questionnaire. As had been decided earlier, no one was identified by name in the report except the instructor.

The feedback session consisted of two parts. During the first part, the instructor was not present while I discussed the feedback
report with the students. I felt that the students may have been inhibited in discussing the report if the instructor was present, especially at the beginning. I talked about this concern with the instructor and students and it was decided that the instructor would join us after about forty-five minutes. This format gave the students a chance to develop confidence in expressing their reactions to the instructor and course in a less risky atmosphere, and provided for a more open interchange with the instructor when he came in during the second part of the feedback session.

The students said that the report accurately reflected their view of the course and the instructor. Many were gratified to learn that others shared their ideas and feelings. We spent approximately forty-five minutes discussing and clarifying their feelings about the course and instructor, and what changes they felt would improve the class. My main input referred to the obvious lack of communication between the students and the instructor regarding their feelings on how the course was going (process concerns). A change which I felt essential was the creation of an environment in which the students frequently informed the instructor of the impact he and the course were having on them. As of this point in the semester, the instructor and students had quite different opinions on how the course was going. I felt that no other change in the course or instructor could lead to much benefit if the students continued to leave the instructor in the dark about their feelings. In addition, I thought the best time to start was now. I said that I wanted to bring the instructor into the session at this point and continue the discussion of how they felt and what changes needed to be made. There was a great deal of reluctance
expressed toward this suggestion. I felt very strongly that the project would not be worth continuing if they were not willing to take this step. Several students voiced the fear that expressing negative feelings to the instructor would result in their failing the course. Others feared that their comments would not be taken seriously, or would receive no response at all. Still others felt that it would do no good; that nothing would change anyway. There was a possibility that the study could have ended at this point. However, with some ambivalence, the class unanimously decided to have the instructor join us and continue the session.

When the instructor joined us I told him of the students' fear of reprisal or lack of response with regard to expressing negative feelings. He said that he understood this feeling and realized that it was common among students. He mentioned that he certainly had no intention of creating this impression nor was he aware of any behavior on his part which may have engendered it. He assured the students that by expressing negative feelings they were not endangering their grades, and that he would like to be told when they felt he was not responding appropriately to their comments. The remaining time was taken up with a discussion of desired changes in the course format and instructor's behavior. The nature of the discussion was not as open as it was before the instructor joined us, and the students were more tentative in their remarks. I suppose this was to be expected. Nevertheless, it represented the most forthright communication between the instructor and students up to that point, and both instructor and students said that it had been very valuable. Most important in my mind was the opportunity for the instructor and students to slip out
of and become more aware of the roles which they had been playing thus far. It was a chance to air the different expectations for the course which formed the basis for many of the difficulties encountered. And it provided for focusing on the process of the class, which had thus far been quite poor and impeding attainment of the objectives.

Changes in Course Structure and Format Decided Upon at Feedback Session.

1) Change in question asking and answering behavior. When student directs question to instructor, this means he/she wants the instructor to respond. If a student wants another student to respond to the question, he/she will indicate this. After the instructor responds to a question, the person who asked the question will indicate whether or not he/she is satisfied with the response.

2) The instructor will try to be explicit in explaining the connection he sees between seminar activities (exercises, discussions, readings) and the students' field experience.

3) Class members will try to give the instructor regular feedback regarding the impact he and the course are having on them.

4) The instructor will have small group interviews with class members in lieu of classtime periodically.

Suggestions for future classes:

1) The instructor will prepare a statement on how his seminar will be conducted and what expectations he has for those taking it. This statement will be available for students at pre-registration.

2) Students will be told at pre-registration that they will be responsible for arranging their own placements.

At this point my continuing with the class was discussed. I said that I would like to continue coming to class and take an active
role in helping to implement these changes. I would act as a process consultant and help to create internal commitment to the changes. The instructor and all class members agreed to this change in my role. Thus began the implementation phase of the study. For the remaining part of the semester, I periodically made interventions regarding the extent to which the class was or was not implementing the changes which had been decided upon.

These interventions included periodically asking the students whether or not they were satisfied with the instructor's response to their questions in class. At other times, when the instructor asked for feedback and got little or none, I tried to explain the possible consequences of this behavior to the students. Several students felt their silence had no impact on the instructor and other class members. At these times, I described my reactions to their silence and encouraged other group members to do so also. The silent students were often surprised to learn that many interpreted their silence as disapproval of or disinterest in what was occurring. In general, the interventions were intended to enhance communication among the students, and between the students and instructor.

Data Collected At End Of Course.

At this time I would like to present a summary of the data collected at the end of the course. Again, I think it is quite important that the reader be familiar with the raw data which are located in Appendix C (pp. 82-107).

The second interview with the instructor was conducted after the end of the semester, and covered a range of topics including: any differences he perceived in the course after the feedback session, my
abilities in relation to him and the class, and changes he had decided to make when teaching the course in the future. As was the case with our previous interview, a transcript of the recording was made and checked by the instructor for accuracy.

The instructor felt a greater openness in communication and a more relaxed atmosphere after the feedback session as compared to the period prior to it (see Appendix C, pp. 82-85). He did not think that he would have known how the students felt about how the course was going without my interventions. In retrospect, the instructor thought it would have been even more beneficial if the feedback session had come sooner. He felt that I was sensitive and supportive toward him in what might have been an anxiety-producing situation. In addition, he mentioned a number of changes he had decided to make in the course the next time he taught it. These included: being more explicit about the nature of a seminar and the kind of active involvement required of the students, making individual conferences a part of the course from the beginning, making fewer assumptions that the students understand his goals, and setting up the placements for the students. It appears that this work with him and the class will have effects which will go beyond those observed in this study (see Appendix C, pp. 85-87).

At the last class I asked someone not connected with the study or class, but familiar with the design and method of the project, to talk with the students regarding my work with them. I wanted to provide an opportunity for the students to express any reactions to me or the study which they did not present to me personally. I have no evidence that they did not feel free to do so, but I wanted to cover that possibility. In addition, I wanted as much feedback as possible about
the consequences of my work with them. The discussion was open-ended and a number of issues were raised including: improvement in the class after the feedback session, the importance of giving the instructor feedback about his impact, the probability of the course continuing in an unsatisfactory manner if the intervention had not been made, and my role after the feedback session (see Appendix C, pp. 88-95).

All the students were present at this session and all but one said that the course had improved since the feedback session and that it was a consequence of the study. All but three or four of the students felt freer to talk with the instructor about the course. The difference in the class after the feedback session was noted, and it was brought out that there was less need to confront the instructor about the course because it was progressing in a more satisfactory direction. Half the class felt the instructor began to explain more clearly the connection between the course goals and class activities. One student mentioned that she probably would speak up in future courses if she had the same feelings as in this one. She said that she had not realized how beneficial this could be. Most of the class said the instructor was much more direct in responding to their questions. One student said she still sensed a barrier between the students and the instructor, and that my work had made them more aware of it. Finally, the students noted that there were not many opportunities for me to help improve interaction between them and the instructor after the feedback session because of the number of guest speakers, a movie, and other activities which involved less interaction with the instructor.

Preceding this discussion, I asked the students to respond in writing to a number of questions regarding my work with them (see
Appendix C, pp. 95-102). These questions asked for information about the quality of the course since the feedback session, changes in the instructor's behavior, value of the changes made in the course, and the value of the study to them.

All but one of the students said the quality of the course improved after the feedback session. Thirteen said that the instructor responded to questions more frequently. All but two said that the seminars were more relevant to their field placements. About half felt the small group conferences were beneficial. All but one said my work in the class helped it to become more valuable for them. And, all but two said this research was an effective way for improving the quality of a course.

The TABS questionnaire results provide something in the way of quantitative support for the views discussed. These results could have had more meaning if I had administered the questionnaire in several other sections of this course. This would have provided a context within which to assess the observed improvement (see Appendix C, pp. 103-107).

The second administration of the TABS took place at the last class meeting, approximately eight weeks after the first administration. Fourteen students were present as compared to the full class of fifteen at the first administration. The first thirty-eight items of this fifty item questionnaire focus on instructor teaching skill, and the remaining twelve relate primarily to student reactions to the course.

For the second administration of the TABS, the students were asked to make their responses to the items within the context of the second half of the semester, after the feedback session. It is in-
eresting to note that the mean of the first thirty-eight items for the first administration was 2.52, while the mean for the second was 2.14, which indicates an improvement in the ratings of the instructor's teaching skill (these means exclude #5 responses). Of the first thirty-eight items, the students indicated that the instructor improved his performance during the second half of the semester on thirty-one, made no change on three, and performed at a lower level on four.

For several of the remaining twelve items, the difference in the students' responses between the first and second administration is worth mentioning. On item forty-three, nine students indicated they were "learning a great deal" for the second half of the course, whereas only four felt this way for the first half. Ten felt their "attitude toward the instructor was becoming more positive", for the second half, and three felt this way for the first half. Eight were "becoming more positive toward the subject matter", in the second part of the semester, and four felt this way for the first part. Ten wanted the course to be "more structured" before the feedback session, and five wanted it "more structured" afterward. Finally, while seven students rated the course as either good or excellent for the first part of the semester, ten rated it this way for the second part. On this same item, four rated the course as poor, before the feedback session, and only one rated it this way at the end of the course.
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In the analysis of the results I will try to show that as the class and instructor achieved a closer approximation (increased competence) to the ideal of group functioning presented earlier, they were more effective in achieving their objectives and maintaining adequate control over their internal and external environments. Further, I will discuss how the changes the group made were consistent with the criteria of competent functioning and thus constitute a test of the assumption that the college classroom functions as a group.

As mentioned earlier, Argyris (1970) believes that the core activities of any group are (1) to achieve its objectives, (2) to control its internal environment, and (3) to adapt to, and maintain control over the relevant external environment. What I would like to do now is compare the facility with which the group (class and instructor) carried out these activities during the first half of the course with their performance in the second half.

With regard to the group's objectives (see Appendix C, pp. 67-68), perhaps the most important comment I can make is that the students played no role in determining the objectives they were supposed to achieve. I am not talking now of the propriety of the objectives with regard to the students' learning needs. By having the objectives predetermined by someone else, there was no opportunity for the students to develop a feeling of success. According to Argyris, this feeling of success depends upon the individual's opportunity and ability to: define his/her own goals; choose goals which are related to his/her central needs, abilities, and values; define the paths to these goals;
and establish goals which represent a realistic level of aspiration for the person. My quarrel here is not with the content of the objectives but with the manner in which they were derived. I believe that a portion of the disaffection expressed by the students toward the first half of the course was a consequence of their non-involvement in defining the goals. It may have turned out that the students would have derived very similar goals on their own, but they would have had a greater feeling of ownership toward them. As it was, there was much diversity among students in their learning expectations and purposes for taking the course (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 72-73). It is clear from the interviews I conducted with the students that there was a fair amount of confusion and dissatisfaction with the seminar. Most of this stemmed from a lack of correspondence between their expectations for the seminar and the way it turned out. My belief is that the students would have been more committed to the objectives and the success of the course if they had been involved in the formulation of the objectives.

In contrast, the instructor felt the class was progressing very well in some respects (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 70-71). He felt confident that he was being successful in meeting his goals with the class. The instructor did feel, however, that some of the students may not have agreed with the manner in which he was helping them toward these goals. But in general he felt he was having the desired impact.

I would like now to discuss how the group became more competent in performing its core activities during the second half of the semester. It is important that the reader have a good grasp of the data in Appendix C, since a number of my conclusions are not derived from specific findings. Rather, they are judgments based upon a consistent picture
which emerges from several sources of data (e.g., interviews, observations, TABS, etc.). The body of data is interdependent and assumes most meaning when taken as a whole.

The group appeared to be more competent in achieving its objectives during the second half of the semester. This increase was correlated with a change in function and structure of the group which brought it closer to the picture of an ideal group. In the middle of the semester and one week prior to the feedback session, the class held a planning session. This session addressed the instructor's objective of increasing the students' ability to function in seminar planning (see Appendix C, p. 61). The instructor directed the class to plan the activities for the remaining class periods. The class divided up into three groups of five and discussed how the remaining time in the semester could best be used. Initially there was some confusion among the students as to the nature of their task. The instructor's directions were for them to decide what they wanted to learn, and plan a way for that learning to take place. He gave examples of possibilities such as guest speakers and discussions on specific topics.

At the planning session the class decided upon a number of activities which represented departures from the format of the course up to that point. They decided to invite a number of guest speakers to relate information on teaching as a career, and set aside a time to learn more about the graduate program at UNH.

It is clear from the comments of both the instructor and the students (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 80-107), that the second half of the course was more valuable than the first part in meeting their learning needs. I believe that the students' involvement in defining the
objectives for this part of the course contributed significantly to their satisfaction. This feeling of satisfaction correlated with a change in group functioning which brought it closer to the ideal of group functioning. Thus, I conclude that the class was more able to achieve its objectives, the first core activity of any group, by moving closer to the criterion of group competence.

The second core activity which, according to Argyris, a group must be involved in is the maintenance of its internal environment. It should be noted at this point that there is overlap among the three core activities, and that distinctions are being made here for ease of discussion. Control of internal environment refers to the ability to maintain a level of cognitive and affective interaction such that progress toward the objectives is facilitated. I will compare the group's ability to control its internal environment prior to the feedback session with the period during and after the feedback session.

Student interview and questionnaire data indicated an inability on the part of the students to control either the direction or the tone of the classtime activities (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 75-80). They were dissatisfied but did not, and felt they could not, do anything about it. Most students found it difficult to understand the point of what the instructor was doing and found little value in what went on in the class periods. Most of the statements reflect feelings of frustration and helplessness (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 75-77).

I would like to add that the instructor in this course was one of the most concerned and sensitive faculty members I have encountered. He seemed to be constantly searching for ways to make it easier for
students to approach him with their needs and feelings for the course. Still, before the feedback session, no student confronted the instructor with feelings of dissatisfaction or frustration. I am assuming that one of the reasons for this behavior is the general opinion among students that to express feelings of this sort to an instructor is both inappropriate and dangerous. This is substantiated by the students' remarks in the feedback session prior to the time the instructor came in (see pg. 41).

So, the state of affairs in the group with regard to control of its internal environment was one of incompetence in the period of the course before the feedback session. This situation was improved somewhat at the feedback session and thereafter (e.g., pp. 40-42, and Appendix C, pp. 85-87 ). This session contrasted with previous class meetings in the higher level of openness and directness displayed. The instructor and class decided upon several changes (see p. 42) designed to improve the communication effectiveness and bring the processes of control more under the influence of all the members. Although the enhanced level of communication which characterized the feedback session diminished at later class meetings, the group was able to manifest a greater degree of control over its internal environment than was the case before the feedback session (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 96-98 ). Again, this greater control represents a closer approximation to the ideal and correlates with a higher estimate of worth of the course by the group.

Lastly, Argyris contends that any group must also adapt to and maintain control over the relevant external environment. I want to show how the group increased its ability on this dimension during
the second half of the course. As I mentioned earlier, the three core activities overlap and much of what has been said already is pertinent to maintaining control over the relevant external environment. Actually, before the feedback session the instructor could not be thought of as part of the class group. Some of the class members saw the instructor as an adversary (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 77-80). In effect, the instructor was the relevant external environment for the class. It is clear from the data and what has been said earlier that the class was not, and did not feel the potential for, influencing the instructor's behavior. During the feedback session the students realized that the instructor could be influenced to more effectively meet their learning needs. This helped to alleviate their feelings of frustration and helplessness. Almost all students noted a change in the instructor's behavior for the second half of the semester (e.g., Appendix C, pp. 96-98, 103-107). In addition, the group (now including the instructor) was able to solicit and acquire needed information from sources outside itself (guest speakers, etc.). These activities by the group represent an increased degree of control over the external environment relative to the first half of the course. In performing this activity with greater facility, the group became more similar to the ideal of competent group functioning. As this similarity increased, so did feelings of satisfaction and value for the instructor and students.

My conclusion is that increased facility in performing the three core activities and increased feelings of satisfaction and value are associated with a group which closely approximates the competence criteria in its structure and functioning. This was the case in the
group I worked with and I assume would be the case for similar college classes. I think these findings show the utility of studying the college classroom using a group framework. The assumptions of this framework help to focus on certain aspects of the situation which can lead to the kind of understanding which can be directly applied.

It appears, then, that student feedback, when employed in the context of a thorough process analysis, can be effective in changing instructor behavior. These findings may help to place the conclusions of Kulik and Kulik (1974), Miller (1971), Thomas (1969), and others regarding the failure of feedback in bringing about improved instructor ratings. It seems clear that the timing, specificity, and sensitivity with which feedback is collected and given are important determinants of its eventual effectiveness. Overall, it is important to understand that feedback is only one part of a set of necessary components in the effort to establish a more effective learning environment.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

It has become increasingly important for me to expend my energy in ways and directions which have the potential for impact. I need to know that what I do makes a difference. I like the idea of being actively involved with people, working with them on problems that are real to them. I want to see and experience the results of my efforts. My activity for this dissertation has had and/or will have an effect on me, the instructor, his future students, the class members, their future instructors, and my committee members indirectly.

I am at a stage in my professional development in educational research where this type of study is very appropriate. It makes sense to me to do a study of a more exploratory, qualitative nature. In the future, when my knowledge and skill in this area are greater, I may do studies in which my purpose will be to demonstrate functional relationships among variables. My point here is not to argue for the absolute correctness of one research approach over another. I want only to show that, given my purposes and interests, this was the appropriate study for me to do at this time.

In that my main goal was to understand what goes on in the college classroom, especially that which contributes to a quality learning experience, there are several general ways I could have approached this task. The aim was to make a start on a theory which would predict how and why a college classroom would behave under various conditions. I could have looked at two or more classrooms, noted their similarities and differences, and tried to make some
conclusions about which factors are involved in a desirable classroom setting. Another possibility would have been to study one classroom as it (and if it) underwent change. Both of these approaches are valuable and have produced interesting results.

There is a third approach, which I have chosen and which can be a more powerful test of a theory when studying an on-going group. In this approach, I became actively involved (intervened) with a class and its instructor, and helped plan and execute changes which tested aspects of a theory of college classrooms. My view was that the class I was working with was its own best control. That is, I could best test the utility of the model I was proposing by comparing the behavior of the class before changes were implemented, with its behavior after and during implementation. No other class and instructor would have had the same goals, history, and expectations.
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APPENDIX A.

OBSERVATION CATEGORIES
OBSERVATION CATEGORIES

INDIVIDUALS

1) Owning up to, or accepting responsibility for one's ideas and feelings.
2) Being open to ideas and feelings of others and those from within oneself.
3) Experimenting with new (for the person and the group) ideas and feelings.
4) Helping others to own up to, be open to, and to experiment with ideas and feelings.

The accomplishment of these behaviors should occur in such a way that one adds to the norms of individuality, concern, and trust. Further, the manner in which these behaviors are expressed is important:

a) Expression of ideas or feelings (information) should be based upon directly observable behavior.

b) Information should be minimally attributive (i.e., sender should give the raw data from which he makes inferences about another's motivations).

c) Information should be minimally evaluative (i.e., describe the receiver's feelings about the sender's messages without designating them as good or bad).

d) Information should be minimally conflicted or inconsistent (i.e., the individual should minimize the contradictory messages that he intentionally or unintentionally communicates to others.)
GROUP

1) Processes of influence are under the control of all members. These processes are structured so that members can define their goals and the paths to their goals, and select goals that are central to their needs, and can define goals so that they represent a challenge to the member's competence.

2) Members take responsibility for the effectiveness of the group.

3) Willingness of group to focus on its own process when necessary.

4) Reduction in gap between leader and non-leader.

5) Members develop confidence in the ability of the group to solve problems and implement decisions. Attractiveness of the group increases for the members.
APPENDIX B.

STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
STUDENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What are your reasons for taking this course?
What do you expect to learn in this course?
Are you learning what you want to learn?
Is what you are learning important to you?
How relevant is the learning in this course to your life? Examples?
Regarding your grade, do you know how you're doing in the course?
Do you know what the instructor wants? Do you care?
Which is more important to you, the grade or what you learn?
What factors help you get the most out of the course? What factors help you put the most into the course?
What factors prevent you from getting the most out of the course? What factors prevent you from putting the most into the course?
Do you feel that what you say makes a difference in the class?
Do you have any control over what happens in class? Would you like to have some control?
Does the instructor pay attention to your emotional growth? Would you like him to?
Are you ever bored in class? How much of the time?
Do you know the other students in the course? Is this important to you?
Are you getting your money's worth?
What do you like most about the course? Instructor?
What do you dislike most about the course? Instructor?
What qualities would the ideal college instructor have?
How does this instructor measure up?
What would the ideal course be like?
What qualities would the ideal college student display in the classroom?
How do you measure up?

Do you agree with the objectives set for this course?

Is this course meeting your expectations?

Is this course meeting the objectives which were set for it?

Do you know what the objectives for this course are?

Are your goals for learning the same or different than those set by the instructor for this course?

How would you evaluate the instructor in terms of: openness to new ideas and information, risk taking, trust, conformity to pressure from outside?

How would you evaluate yourself on the same characteristics?

If you could alter one thing about the instructor's behavior, what would that be?

What are the most important unsolved problems of this class?
APPENDIX C.
EDUCATION 500
"EXPLORING TEACHING"

COURSE SYLLABUS

Overview

Education 500 is designed for students who wish to consider a career in teaching. You serve as an aide not as a student teacher and quite likely not in the subject area of your academic major. You have a chance to explore many facets of that school: teacher roles in the classroom, learning, faculty rights and responsibilities, school politics, school buildings, student attitudes and behaviors, the effects of schooling on students and so on. Throughout the course you'll be asked to look candidly at yourself and the profession. Is teaching right for you? Are you right for teaching?

You'll work with an experienced teacher, observing and working both in classrooms and around the school, learning how to use different kinds of books and equipment; and when you and your teacher agree that you're ready, you'll begin to work with students: tutoring, talking, perhaps some teaching. The key to your involvement is how well you can develop a good working relationship with your teacher and the students.

General Objectives

1. You will begin to make tentative generalizations based on your experiences, readings and discussions about:

   a. the current structure, process and results of the public schools.
   b. the ways students learn, relate to subject matter, behave and are controlled.
   c. the diverse roles of teacher and the complexity of effective communication which teachers face in their work with learners.
   d. your desired life style and its interrelatedness to a commitment to teaching.

2. You will begin to set goals for yourself regarding a future career and initiate specific actions toward those goals.

*On specified dates our seminar will meet at the Wentworth School to meet with school personnel on topics on which they can make major contributions. It is your responsibility to know where we will be meeting from week to week.
3. You will identify areas of needed improvement in yourself and your academic studies which relate to being a good teacher.

4. You will increase your ability to: a) function in seminar planning and discussions, b) interact successfully with teachers, principals, students, and other school personnel.

5. You will increase your need for further information about:
   a. educational structure and change
   b. human development and learning
   c. alternative teaching methodologies
   d. alternative educational philosophies

Course Requirements

The course requires your active participation in a two hour weekly seminar and a minimum of five hours of work per week in the school, scheduled on a regular, "you-can-count-on-me" basis. If you cannot meet these commitments every week, plus travel time, you ought to enroll in Ed 500 another semester when your schedule will permit such commitments.

Preparations are expected both for each seminar and for the field work. The seminar preparations include readings from the text and handouts, regular written reports on your field work, bi-weekly 20 minute conferences with the instructor, a weekly writing assignment and a final "assessment paper". Good English (including spelling, syntax, organization, etc.) is expected in all written work. No exams are planned.

Seminar Topics

Topics for the seminars deal with such issues as authority and teaching; job requirements and teaching; teaching as a life style; the job market; teacher education at UNH; teaching as a career direction for you; how you'll be "graded". Also we will probably want to allow time for trying to make sense out of what happens to you from week to week in your field work and for trying to provide information which will help you function more effectively in the schools.

Evaluation

Ed 500 is a "credit-fail" course. Your weekly well thought out preparations and participation at each seminar and in the school, assure you of "credit". "Credit", however, does not indicate the quality of these participations and preparations. Quality is crucial to good teaching and to our students' lives. We will focus on ways for constantly bringing quality to bear on all aspects of our work.
FEEDBACK NOTES

The following pages contain quotes and paraphrased responses from interviews with the instructor, students, and data from selected items of the questions. Responses from student interviews have been grouped around issues, problems and ideas. There is no significance to the ordering of statements within each grouping. I have attempted to include every major issue discussed in the interview.

You will notice that the feedback contains some contradictory assertions. Where two or more points of view were expressed on an issue, I tried to include comments showing each point of view, and made no attempt to suggest that one point of view was more "correct" or accurate than another. All comments in this report should be read as the opinions of individuals, and these opinions are not necessarily shared by others in the class. Responses to questionnaire items were selected for inclusion on the basis of pertinence to issues raised in the interviews. Interview responses may be thought of as qualitative while those from the questionnaire provide quantitative information on the issues.

Terry Wapshall
In some respects, I think the course is going very well, and in other respects very slowly. Not badly, just slowly. It's taking a long time to get into planning with the students. I believe it should have come two or three weeks ago. Which says, I think, that I need a tighter organization, not necessarily better, but tighter. I suppose I could improve on that. There may be some ill effects of not having the planning session sooner for some people. For some it may be disconcerting when coupled with sometimes not finishing a task on the designated day, or in one case not taking it up again. It's not disconcerting to me and it wouldn't be if I were a student in a class because one never accomplishes completely what one sets out to accomplish. Somehow it always takes more time and effort than is available.

It's taking longer than I thought to convey some of the skills, understandings, and attitudes necessary for the assignment in chapter four of the text. It took longer than this the last time I taught the course, but it's still taking too long. I'm not alarmed about it but I'm kind of amused at my naivete.

I like the decent level of interaction among the students. The interaction among the students is at a much higher level than in past classes. I am pleased with the level of achievement of the students. I'm talking about their thinking and the kinds of questions they're asking. I also like the amount of participation among students in the small groups. That's going much better than in the past.

I think twelve of them have already made up their minds that they want to be teachers. I still see it as my responsibility to provide even those twelve with negative evidence about teaching, so that they reconsider their decisions about teaching. This decision can always be looked at again and reassessed. This goal is going along pretty well. I think, at this point, we need to get away from the book a little bit and have them interact with teachers, superintendents, get some information about what the teacher education program is like here at UNH, so they can decide whether or not they want to get into it, get some teacher reactions as to what it's really like to be a teacher, the personal lifestyle of a teacher, what the community expects of a teacher, and so on. It would also be good for them to talk with someone about job prospects in the future. Someone from the placement office, perhaps.

If everything worked out perfectly in this course, the person coming out of it would have a definite idea about whether or not they want to go into teaching, and know the reasons why or why not. These reasons would be very explicit, rather than some hazy feeling. They would have an intellectual conviction to support the emotional feeling. Both should be present. I hope they would have more insight into themselves as students, and more insight into teachers. They would realize that students' assumptions about teachers often speak more about the students themselves than the teachers. And
vice-versa. Teachers assumptions about students speak more about teachers than the students. I think this is important. They would also know a lot about other aspects of teaching such as how much a teacher makes, what teaching conditions are like, and so on. This kind of information is supportive to the other more important goals. Awareness of these, more or less, mundane items is necessary too.

I am most effective with students who want very much to succeed in teaching. They are very highly motivated, professionally oriented, which I suppose, are the ideal students to work with. In a sense all the people in this class are in this category. I get a feeling that all of them are seriously interested in finding out whether or not they want to teach. Maybe this is why I feel good about this group. I haven't always felt this way about previous Ed 500 groups. I can't think of a single person, I may be wrong, in the class who gives me the impression that they don't want to explore whether or not they want to teach. This doesn't necessarily mean they always agree with what I'm trying to do, or the way I'm trying to help them achieve that goal.

I'm pretty confident that I'm being successful in meeting these goals with the class. Again, some people may not agree with the process and the content I'm using. I think that, in general, the kinds of things I'm presenting are focused enough and obvious enough to them. I'd say that I'm 60 to 70% certain that I'm having the desired impact. It might be higher.

If I could change something about the way the course has gone, I sure would like to avoid the feeling that the PE majors have. I'm not sure how much of that comes out of what I've done this semester, or what they might have heard about me from two PE majors who didn't pass last semester. I get a strong feeling that this group of PE majors is very different from the two people last year. I'd like to know from these people more specifically what assumptions I communicated to them and how. I think this bothers me more than anything. I'd like to avoid the mix-up in terms of transportation to Portsmouth. I wish the difficulty they had in getting to the chairman and the Junior High principal in order to make placements could have been avoided. And yet, I think it's important that they make the contacts, and not have everything packaged for them. I see this as part of the growth toward professionalism and independence.

I can't think of anytime I haven't enjoyed teaching in this class. That hasn't always been true in past semesters. I really would like to spend more time with them. I'm not sure this would be the way many of the students would feel. I think a two-hour per week session is not adequate. But I don't see how I could make more demands on their time; they have five hours in the field. Some of them put in more than five hours. I guess there's just not enough time to do the things I'd like to do with them. I think if we had more time I could accomplish more of the goals I have, and help them more with their goals. Actually I like a more intensive involvement than prevails in most college courses.
Student Comments

Reasons for taking course and learning expectations:

I took this course because it was required. I couldn't take any other ed. courses until taking this one. I think it's a good idea to have this course so that you can decide whether teaching is right for you before you waste a lot of time.

I expected the seminars to be more directly related to teaching; what problems you might find in teaching, having guest speakers in certain areas of teaching, and so on. I thought it would be a more substantial type of thing. I just had a completely different idea of what it was going to be.

I was under the impression that we would be assigned to a specific school and transportation would be provided. I don't think it was right to leave it up to us.

When I signed up for the course, I thought the arrangement with the teachers would already have been made.

I took this course because I want to be a teacher, and it's required. In the seminar I thought we'd be talking more about what we do in the schools than what we're doing now.

I took this course because it's required in my major. I thought the seminar would be different from the way it turned out. I expected things on how to cope with discipline and suggestions on how to work with kids.

I thought the assignments with the teachers were going to be all set up for us but they weren't. When we signed up for the course, the lady upstairs said that this was going to be the seminar for Portsmouth High School, but it doesn't have anything to do with the problems in high school.

I took this course because I wanted to work at a school to see if I liked it. I thought the seminars would be more discussions on teaching as a career. So far we haven't done anything like this. I thought we'd have people coming in from different areas of education.

I've always been interested in teaching and thought that teaching might be a career for me. I'm not sure if it will be or not. Also, this course is a requirement in this area.

I only took this course because it was required. I was under the impression that when I got in the course I would already be assigned to a teacher and a school.

I don't mind coming to the course considering I didn't want to take it at first.

I think it was poor of the instructor not to have a better format worked out for us to contact the schools. None of the information
I gave in the spring was used for this course.

I'm taking this course at the insistence of the Education department in spite of the fact that I already have my undergraduate degree. I'm unhappy about having to take this course. We were told that we were going to meet at Wentworth and have guest speakers at least half the time. I arranged my schedule with this in mind and these changes are difficult for me.

I had heard that this was a bullshit course and you don't really learn very much. This could be having an effect on how the course has turned out for me.

The only sad thing about this course is that we had to go out and find teachers to work with. It was a big hassle. I think he could have been a little more cooperative. I thought the assignments would already have been made before we came to class. I felt totally on my own.

The course hasn't turned out the way I expected it to be. I signed up to be in the Portsmouth seminar with people who were supposed to be placed in high schools also.

I took this course because it was required; that's the only reason.

Is the seminar helping with decision of whether or not to become a teacher?

The course has two separate parts, the seminar and the field work. The field work is good, it gives you an idea of what it would be like. The seminar is not helping me decide whether or not to be a teacher, at least not yet. It hasn't done anything, I don't think.

The time I spend in the school is helping me make this decision, but right now I don't feel I'm getting anything out of the seminars at all. They're not helping me decide.

Both the work in the classroom and in the seminar are helping me to decide whether or not to go into teaching. It has really helped me to get the feel of what it would be like to be a teacher.

I don't think what we do in class has that much to do with teaching. It's not helping me decide whether or not to be a teacher.

I think the course on the whole is helping me decide whether or not I want to teach. I think what I gain most from is reading the examples in the book, and other people's conversations about what happened in a class. I think the instructor is trying to deter us from going into teaching. He focuses on the negative aspects of teaching.

I made the decision to go into teaching long ago.
I've already decided to be a teacher. The seminar doesn't have any bearing on how I'm thinking about teaching.

Since I've already decided to go into teaching, the course is not as exciting and inspirational as it might have been if I hadn't already decided.

I've decided not to get my teaching certificate now. Not because of a bad experience in the school, but because I don't want to take all their education courses. I've gotten a bad impression of them all. I really don't like the seminars at all. I don't feel that I'm getting much out of them. I don't think you can train someone to be a teacher and I think that's what they're trying to do. If the seminars had been more stimulating, I may have decided to work toward my teaching certificate now.

I think I've already made the decision to teach; I thought this was just going to help me out more, perhaps improve my teaching.

**Seminar Composition**

I think it would be good to have a seminar with only PE majors in it, because it seems like we're just pushed to the side a lot.

I think the class would be a lot better if all the people in the seminar were in the same school.

I think it's very much of a disadvantage being in a seminar with people who aren't placed in a high school because it's a whole different world. I really feel out of place in the seminar because it's centered around elementary education. Most of the open discussions don't relate to high school.

The seminars should be divided up into groups of people who have placements in the same grade level, this would help group discussions.

It would be an improvement if the seminar were made up of people who were placed in the same grade level. As it is now, there are differences in disciplinary problems, etc.

I like having the opportunity to hear the other people in the seminar talk about their experiences in other grade levels than the one I'm in. I may want to teach at another grade level in the future than the one I'm currently focusing on.

Being in a seminar with people who have placements in different grade levels than myself is kind of good because it gives me insight into older children and helps me decide if I'd like to teach older children.

Most people are in an elementary school and what they talk about doesn't really apply to my situation.
I think the seminar should be composed of people who are placed in the same grade level, because the problems are different in elementary school than they are in high school. I don't think the instructor understands what PE is. I don't think he wants to understand what it is. It might work if all PE majors were put in one seminar.

I thought everyone in the seminar would have placements in the same grade level. It really doesn't bother me that this isn't the case though.

Classtime

The exercises haven't done a thing for me. Maybe I'm just not grasping what he's saying. I haven't seen anything useful so far in the seminars. It might just be me. I feel really comfortable in this class; usually I don't in discussion classes. I don't think a two hour seminar is necessary. I think we could accomplish as much in an hour or hour and a half. The seminar would be better if it were related more to what we do in the schools.

I don't really understand much of what goes on in the seminar. Everything he tries to explain to us goes right over my head. I don't know if I'm the only one. I think some others feel confused also. I don't see the whole purpose of coming to the seminar. Sometimes I get pretty bored. I don't have any ideas of what could help it. I'm not afraid to talk in this class, it's just that I don't have anything to say.

I'm not too thrilled with the seminars. I think it's a waste of time, actually. There are some useful things, but we don't finish them. I really like the field work part of the course. I don't think we've accomplished anything in the seminar yet.

The only useful thing so far was a discussion on discipline. I really think the seminar is a waste of time. As far as the exercises go, I can plug myself into some of them, but the other stuff he doesn't explain too well. Writing up our goals was a good idea. I'm interested about 30% of the time and bored about 70% of the time in the seminar.

It hasn't been very valuable for me so far. I hope it gets better; I don't know if it will. I'm very bored in the seminars. I think he runs them too slowly. I wouldn't mind doing what we're doing if the pace picked up. I just keep waiting for something to happen. The class just drags on; if he could just pick up the pace. It seems like there's just four of us who do the discussing. I think it would be better for the class if the silent members were more open. I'm not sure why they're not. He does try to get us to discuss things, but it's not working for some reason.

I don't find speaking out in class that difficult. Sometimes I feel that I should catch myself because there are a lot of silent
students in the class who may be reticent to speak out. I think that if the shy ones really want to talk badly enough, they will. I think he does give everyone ample opportunity to speak. The exercises he has for us have been very useful. What we do in the seminar is very much related to what goes on in the classroom. You get from the course whatever you want to put into it.

I dislike going to the seminar. We do some interesting things, but the instructor makes me really nervous. He takes a lot of long pauses. The way he talks makes it hard for me to concentrate on what he's saying. I don't know what we're supposed to be talking about in the seminar. Some people talk about their experiences in the schools, and some people don't say anything. I think the exercises he has us do are good. It helps people in the class get to know one another. The learning styles inventory was pretty useful for me, as was the goal exercise. Considering my criterion for a good college instructor, I think he's doing a pretty good job. He does a good job of making the class interesting because we do all those group things.

Sometimes it gets kind of dragged out for the two hours. The first hour really goes along smoothly. I wish the length of class could vary depending on what we have to accomplish instead of staying the whole two hours regardless of what's going on. I think a lot of students feel very blase about this course. I think everyone feels sort of lost because there is less direction than in other courses. I feel there should be more continuity with the schools that are involved.

Except for last week, all I keep hearing are echoes to my questions. Or, they are shuffled off to another student for an answer. I don't want that. I paid to hear the professor talk. I want the course led, controlled, directed, and taught by the professor. I want the benefit of the experience he has. That's what I paid for, that's what I thought I was going to get, but I'm not getting it. My questions have been very specific; the answers have been very vague.

I don't get anything out of the course, and it's more or less a waste of time. I think the book and the time spent in the school are sufficient to make you aware of what teaching is about. I don't really see the purpose of many of the exercises and assignments. I wish we wouldn't get in small groups for those exercises, they haven't been useful for me. It would be helpful if he talked on topics like obedience, writing lesson plans, etc.

I'd like the format of the classes to change, perhaps have individual conferences every other week.

It may be a good idea to increase the time we spend in the schools. A field trip would be a good idea. Perhaps a movie to change the format.

I'm getting a lot out of the place I'm teaching. As far as the seminar goes, I tend to get very bored. The seminars are very long and tend to get boring.
We spend a lot of time in one-on-one discussions in the class. Maybe it would be better to have short individual sessions.

The material he brings in is good and interesting, but it seems that we're always on the same track.

There are many people in the class who don't say very much. How can you control a class when you don't say very much.

We possess the position to control the course but very few people take advantage of it. He does want us to talk.

I think the seminar is too long; an hour and a half is more than enough time. The last half hour is basically wasted; people are tired. Half the people don't participate anyway. It would benefit me more if people participated. The instructor doesn't seem overly enthralled with it lasting two hours either. I think he spends about a half an hour just sitting there.

One of the biggest pluses of the course is the exercises in which we have to talk with someone in the class we don't know. We should do a lot more of these. They have value in two ways: meeting people and gaining insights.

I like the things we've done in class so far. I think they've been interesting and helpful. I think the seminar is too large. We get off the track too often. I think some kids in the class don't feel comfortable about talking. I'm sure everyone has ideas. I think you get more out of it if you talk. Two hours is a long time for a class, there are too many long silences and I get bored. I wish we would talk more about the actual school situations we're in.

I get bored sometimes, especially when he and one other person get going on some topic and no one else is into it. I think everybody is afraid to say something, except for a few people who like to talk, because he really doesn't give you any answers.

"Assumption" Exercise

I don't think the assumption exercise really helped me that much with the observation assignment.

I would have liked to hear him respond to some of the statements.

The assumption exercise was helpful to me in doing the observation assignment.

I think that what came out of the assumption exercise was really rather cruel. Some of the inferences were wrong and deserved correcting. I don't believe he is treating any student unfairly.

I was hoping that he would discuss the statements in the assumption exercise. All he did was read them off. He didn't say how he felt about them. I don't know what the whole point of the thing was.
Reactions to the Instructor

My first impression of the instructor was that he didn't care about us. Everything was left up to us to do. He didn't seem to care whether we found a placement or not. I didn't like that about him.

I think he knows a lot about the education field. He's pretty interesting to listen to. He always has different kinds of exercises to keep the interest up.

I think he knows what he's talking about. He's good at understanding our problems. He's postponed assignments several times because we didn't understand and I think that's good.

He starts things and never finishes them. For examples, the goals assignment and the case study exercise. There is a purpose for these exercises but he hasn't shown us what it is.

I don't think the instructor makes things interesting. I can hardly stay awake the whole time. I realize I never say anything to help things out.

It would help if he would finish projects. A lot of times it seems we just sit there and don't say anything and I don't know what he wants us to do while we're sitting there. I think he should know more what's going on. He has no idea of what we do in the schools.

I don't think he should have made such a big thing out of it when one of the students left class before it was over. He makes it seem like his course is the most important thing on campus.

I think it would help if he came around to the schools and observed us, and then sat down with us and told us what we need to improve. I think the instructor should be able to communicate with students better and help them out. He just leaves everything up in the air and doesn't explain things.

He's a nice person. I wish he had more enthusiasm! I think if he had more the class would, too. There's only a couple of people who talk during those seminars. It gets very boring. I don't think the instructor is aware that people are bored in the seminar and aren't getting anything out of it. If he knew that, maybe something could be done. He talks about how college courses are so abstract, but that's what his is!

I've gained a wealth of information from him. It's refreshing to sit in his classroom and hear his views. He never hesitates to go into most subjects we have brought up. He's a fascinating man.

The instructor is a slow talker. I don't know if he's talking slowly to give us a chance to speak up or he really doesn't want to say what he's thinking so that we will open up. I think he portrays one side of himself and he's thinking entirely differently. For example, I felt he got quite annoyed last week when one of the other students left during class. He was trying to appear very
undisturbed, but I thought he was really quite annoyed.

The instructor is very pleasant, but less directive than what I'm used to. I think he comes to class not really prepared to do something; I don't know if he is supposed to. It makes things go slowly.

The instructor seems to be trying to help the students identify things about themselves. It's almost a psychology course rather than an education course. He doesn't solve anything for you, he keeps feeding it back to the students. This last session was very different from the others and much more useful. We got direct responses from him; some feelings, some emotions. Coming from him this is unusual so far. I'm looking for the class to become much more dynamic. He's a great instructor and capable of more dynamic instruction.

I wish the instructor followed through more. We drop exercises without finishing them. I wish he'd help us understand what he wants us to get out of the exercises. I need him to explain more what the purpose is of what he's having us do.

I think it really bothered him when that student left class. I don't think he handled it right. I didn't catch what he meant by what he said after she left. He seemed to be saying that it didn't bother him if people didn't come because it was they who were losing, but I thought he was upset.

The instructor is easy going and humorous, but little things will irritate him.

I think he's a really neat guy. He's got one of those not easy to figure out personalities, and I like that.

The instructor is okay. He's not great. He's better than some I've had.

I have respect for him and I think he respects each of us also.

The way he presents himself may prevent people from talking. His image is very inhibiting. You don't want to speak up because he might contradict you, or you might say something wrong, or someone might laugh. It makes me uncomfortable when he just watches us.

The long silences really bug me. I wonder what's going on in his head when he does this. I get the impression he's very intelligent and he's studying us.

I have a very hard time understanding what he says. He seems to be in a world of his own sometimes. I really do not get anything out of what he says.

I don't like it that the instructor comes in, sits down, and smiles at us for fifteen minutes. It drives me crazy.
He encourages everybody. I think he goes out of his way to make people feel free to talk.

I don't think he has too many of the qualities he is telling us a good teacher should have. He rambles on. He's not specific. He doesn't seem to have any enthusiasm about the course. I think he's preaching one thing and doing another. I don't think that makes him a bad teacher. I just think it's kind of funny.

I wish the instructor would answer questions which are directed at him. Sometimes it's good to let someone else answer, but sometimes you just want his opinion on the subject.

When one of the students left class a couple of weeks ago, I think it really made him mad. I don't see why he'd be like that though. I could see it if what we did in the seminars was really important.

I don't understand him. Sometimes he confuses me. I follow what he's saying, then he goes off and never really finishes or ties it off. I'd like him to be more straightforward; he beats around the bush.

He raises good questions but before you have time to think about them, he raises two more.

I think he should deal with individual problems rather than trying to treat everyone the same. I wish he would come to the school and see what was going on. He'd have a lot better idea of what our situation is like.

**Selected Questionnaire Data** N=15

Response Choices: 1. No improvement needed (very good or excellent performance)
2. Little improvement needed (generally good performance)
3. Improvement needed (generally mediocre performance)
4. Considerable improvement needed (generally poor performance)
5. Not a necessary skill or behavior for this course.

Explanation of class and activity objectives: (1) 13.2 (2) 13.3 (3) 60.0 (4) 13.3

Introduce inst. activity which arouses my interest: (1) 13.3 (2) 20.0 (3) 26.7 (4) 33.3 (5) 6.7

Clear relationship course content and objectives: (1) 13.3 (2) 20.0 (3) 53.3 (4) 13.3

Clarify material needing elaboration: (1) 13.3 (2) 33.3 (3) 26.7 (4) 26.7
Instructor's speaking skills: (1) 33.3 (2) 40.0 (3) 20.0 (4) 6.7
Ability to ask easily understood questions: (1) 6.7 (2) 33.3 (3) 40.0 (4) 20.0
Ability to ask thought provoking questions: (1) 46.7 (2) 26.7 (3) 20.0 (4) 6.7
Ability to answer questions clearly: (1) 6.7 (2) 33.3 (3) 26.7 (4) 20.0
Ability to get student participation: (1) 20.0 (2) 20.0 (3) 33.3 (4) 26.7
Summarize before moving to a new topic: (1) 13.3 (2) 6.7 (3) 53.3 (4) 26.7
Summarize at the end of a class: (1) 6.7 (2) 13.3 (3) 53.3 (4) 26.7
Explanation of performance evaluation: (1) 0.0 (2) 46.7 (3) 26.7 (4) 26.7
Appropriate action when students appear bored: (1) 13.3 (2) 26.7 (3) 26.7 (4) 33.3
Availability for personal consultation: (1) 33.3 (2) 33.3 (3) 13.3 (4) 6.7 (5) 6.7
Promotes mutual respect: (1) 40.0 (2) 40.0 (3) 13.3 (4) 6.7
Inspires excitement or interest in course: (1) 6.7 (2) 33.3 (3) 40.0 (4) 20.0
Relates content to real world situations: (1) 26.7 (2) 60.0 (3) 0.0 (4) 13.3
Willingness to explore other viewpoints: (1) 53.3 (2) 33.3 (3) 6.7 (4) 6.7
Gets students to challenge course views: (1) 33.3 (2) 40.0 (3) 20.0 (4) 6.7
Helps me relate my values and course content: (1) 26.7 (2) 33.3 (3) 33.3 (4) 6.7
Makes me aware of value issues in course: (1) 13.3 (2) 53.3 (3) 26.7 (4) 6.7

In terms of the directions my life is taking, this course is:
relevant: 66.7%
somewhat relevant: 20.0
irrelevant: 13.3

In this course I am learning:
a great deal: 26.7
a fair amount: 33.3
very little: 33.3
I am unsure: 6.7
As a result of this course, my attitude toward the instructor is:
becoming more positive: 20.0
becoming more negative: 33.3
unchanged: 46.7

As a consequence of participating in this course, my attitude toward the subject matter is:
becoming more positive: 26.7
becoming more negative: 13.3
unchanged: 60.0

I would prefer that this course be:
more structured: 66.7
present level: 33.3

Overall I would rate this course as:
excellent: 13.3
good: 33.3
mediocre: 26.7
poor: 26.7
Transcript of Final Interview With The Instructor

Terry: Tell me what differences you think there were in the class when you compare the portion before the feedback session with the portion after the feedback session.

Instr: With some people there seemed to be an easier and more open communication. For some this was true during the class sessions, but it was certainly true privately. They felt they could be more open about how the course was going.

I felt that during the class, some things had been said publicly, admitted to, and spoken about. Because of this I felt more comfortable. I was still a little frustrated with some people who would just sit there. They were this way even when you as the facilitator reminded them of their commitment to express their reactions.

Terry: Any other differences?

Instr: We did do some planning about topics as a result. I'm not sure how people reacted to that. I haven't seen the TABS yet.

Terry: I want to ask you about our relationship during the semester. Did you feel that you could trust me? Did you feel supported by me? Was I sensitive to your needs in this process?

Instr: I think you were very sensitive to me, and the possibility that what you were doing could be anxiety producing and threatening to me. I think extraordinarily sensitive to that. It was reassuring. You did a good job of not intruding, even when you did intervene with the students after the midpoint I never felt that you were in any way a threat, or an unwanted person. I really felt you were helpful.

Terry: To the extent that it's possible, can you separate the differences, between the two halves of the semester, which occurred because of my work and which would have occurred anyway?

Instr: I would have gotten to the planning of those topics anyway. But as a result of your feedback I now know that I should have done that kind of thing much earlier.

I think I would have asked them now and then for some feedback but I don't think I would have gotten from them what you did. They were reluctant, even after the feedback session, to let me know what they were feeling. I think most of them didn't realize the difference between a seminar and a regular course. I was blithely assuming that they knew this. This semester I've made it a point to make sure they know what a seminar is. Maybe we can come back to this question. I'm having trouble connecting with that.
Terry: Are there ways in which I could have been more effective with you and the class? Could I have been more active in the latter part of the course?

Instr: I hadn't thought about that. Without taking more time out from the course it would have been hard.

I think the feedback session might have come a little earlier. It might have been useful to have it one-quarter to one-third of the way through. You get to a point half way through and the "sails are set". You can make adjustments, but I might have been able to make bigger adjustments earlier. I might have been able to have done more with some of those people.

It may have been useful to have the first feedback session earlier and then have another one later on, perhaps half way through. Perhaps even two more would have been appropriate.

Terry: Are you doing some things differently this semester as a result of my work with you last semester?

Instr: Yes. I talked more about what the nature of a seminar is in the beginning of the course. I built into it from the beginning, breaking earlier from the seminar and meeting individually with them. That's kind of illuminating, you get a much different perspective of students that way. I think a lot of them like it too; I'm not sure.

I'm also giving them a writing assignment each week, a page or two. I read it at the conference and make comments, as well as talking about other things that they want to talk about. You'll remember that halfway through it was decided that we would have conferences, and also to talk more about problems in the field. So, this semester, in the seminar we set aside a time where we do this. And to get at this lack of active involvement, I ask each person who has identified an issue they are concerned with to question every other person in the class as a resource. I tell them that this is a way to develop listening skill, and that as teachers they need to respond in some way. It also, I think, gives them the feeling that what they ask has a lot to do with the quality of the response they get. So, there's a responsibility on their part to ask good questions. Which they're not used to doing.

I'm also making far fewer assumptions that they know what I'm trying to do. I talk more about why I'm doing things. I thought that last semester I had a much more positive attitude about the students than I did the semester before. And this semester it's even more positive. One of the reasons I think this is so, is that one of the things that came out in your feedback session is that how they view the course depends an awful lot on how positively I feel about them. Actually, this was a rediscovery for me.

Last semester, one of the things that seemed to be coming through to me was some confusion about goals. So I've been very careful not to take things for granted this semester. I'm more careful about my assumptions. I take more time in explaining assignments.
I think I'm more in touch with the way the course is going this semester than I was last semester. I've been wrong before so I'm uneasy about making a more definite statement.

I decided to set up the field placements instead of having them seek it. This was so they could get started into it more smoothly. Not because the other way didn't have any value, but because of the fact that last semester some of them didn't start out smoothly, didn't contribute to having a positive kind of seminar. I've also limited the seminar to those who have placements in elementary and junior high school. I announced that there were no high school placements in this seminar and that if they wanted high school they would have to be in another section. And this was accepted without any great difficulties.

So that's another change. Sometimes I think there is too much of a choice, and this may have been the case last semester when they had to set up their own field placements.

Another change is that they were in the schools the second week of classes and that's never happened before. They feel good about this. I feel that there is a more positive attitude among them. I think it's been going better than last semester.

Terry: Do you think that the approach I used in your class is a useful way of developing a theory about the functioning of a college class as a group, and an effective way of improving the quality of that experience for them?

Instr: My immediate reaction to the second part is yes. In terms of developing a useful theory, I think if you were to do this in a number of classrooms, patterns would begin to emerge. It's kind of an anthropological approach.

Another change, which the instructor made in the course the following semester as a result of my work with the class, was the addition of the following remarks to the syllabus informing students of their responsibilities in the seminar.

To: Prospective Ed. 500 Students

Goals: Exploring teaching as a career.

Helping you to improve your process for career decision making.

Making sense of present and past schooling experiences in the context of your ideas, feelings, assumptions
and values about teaching and learning in order to:

a) make a better career decision

b) establish a way of thinking which good teachers also use to make sense of their own experience.

Expectations: Students and instructor will engage in a variety of class activities which will press the participants to become aware of personal values, assumptions and personality characteristics which affect the work of teachers at any level of education. Students who have already made up their minds regarding teaching will be especially pressed to examine contrary or "negative" evidence regarding their choice in relation to themselves and the field of education.

Seminars are different from typical college classes. Students and instructor engage in discussions based on thinking about, examining and clarifying personal and professional issues related to the choice of teaching as a career.

You need to think carefully about enrolling in this section if:

a. you typically avoid discussions in class

b. you are unable to withstand the discomfort that comes from taking on the responsibility for your own growth and development or learning

c. you expect the instructor to provide you with gems of wisdom and insight for you to memorize and return to him in exams and papers

d. you do not wish to engage seriously in clarifying your own thinking through

1) a series of weekly writing assignments
2) engaging in seminar discussions with your peers and instructor
3) reading and reflecting about that reading

e. your extracurricular schedule does not permit you to participate in the seminar on a weekly basis.

Additionally, think carefully about enrolling in this section if:

f. you do not want to take responsibility for transportation to Portsmouth or for establishing your final placement as an aide by contacting appropriate school people in Portsmouth
g. your schedule does not permit you to keep all your commitments to the school in which you are an aide

h. you believe you cannot clarify your thinking about teaching as a career unless your field experience is at the level you prefer (e.g., high school) or in a subject area resembling your major (e.g., music, PE, history)

i. you really want to student teach (student teaching is definitely not a goal of ED 500)
Transcript Of Peter Fernald's Discussion
With Ed. 500 Class

PSF: Do you have any general reactions to Terry's role in this course?

Karen: I think that because it was so important to him, he really cared about the results, it made all of us care a lot more about what we got out of the course. It made me stop and think about whether or not I'm getting what I want out of the course. I would have just sat back and not done anything about the problems we were having if he hadn't been here. I certainly wouldn't have said anything to the instructor.

Kathe: It made a really big difference to have him help with the class. We thought it was going one way and the instructor thought it was going another and they didn't coincide at all. When we talked with Terry (feedback session) he persuaded us that it wouldn't do any good unless we told the instructor how we felt about the course. Since then I think it's gone a lot better. I've gotten a lot more out of it. I think it was a really big help to have him here.

PSF: Raise your hand if you agree with what Karen and Kathe said. (All raise hands except one) Are there any minority viewpoints? (Ed raises hand).

Ed: Because it was Ed. 500, an entry level course, I felt that it did a disservice both to the instructor and to the students by having Terry intervene. This was so in the respect that the students were not forced into a position at all in this class to come to an accommodation with the teacher. The teacher was going along blithely thinking everything was going good. Sooner or later it had to come crashing down on him. And it would have been possibly better for him as well, to start looking around his class and get a feel for what was going on. I'm not quite sure that he didn't have a better feel than that which was reflected in the notes.

PSF: You think that without Terry's intervention the instructor would have come to this discovery on his own and that would have been a better learning for him?

Ed: Yes, it would have been a better learning for him. The students would also have had to learn to accommodate the teacher. It would have been a better growing system for the students, I think, if they were forced into a position where they had to deal with the teacher rather than a surrogate.

Mary: I agree with that to a certain extent, but with the semester being as short as it was, I don't think it would have ever happened in that short a period of time. I think as far as this course goes, it was extremely necessary that he (the instructor) did come to see how the students were feeling about his class. I think it was very important that Terry was here.
Karen: I just have one comment on what Ed was saying. I don't think we would have come to that point on our own. I think, just through Terry telling us that in order for things to change you've got to say something to the instructor that I learned. In another class without a person like Terry I would probably do that now just because of him.

PSF: Something happened in the course after the feedback. What was different?

Kathe: I think we were more ready to talk to the instructor about what we think needed change in the class.

PSF: How many feel that they were more ready to talk to the instructor about what to do with the class? Raise your hand. How many felt that this was definitely the case for them?

How many felt that this was perhaps the case? (9)

Ed: There is one thing I'd like to clarify about my own particular situation. I never was hesitant on telling him what I felt. So with Terry's services it didn't change my position.

PSF: Would you mind if I got the class' perception on that for you, Ed?

Ed: Sure, go ahead.

Class: Agrees enthusiastically.

Ed: You believe me now?

PSF: I gather that for Karen and Kathe there was a distinct change and for some of the rest of you there was the possibility for change but that you didn't take an active part?

Nancy: I think there was a definite change in the class. It might have been a slight one but there was a change. I don't think I made suggestions to the instructor about what to do to change the course but I think he changed from the feedback.

PSF: (to Nancy) What I see is that Kathe and Karen were willing to give the instructor some feedback thereafter, and that what you're saying is that there was a change but that you didn't really offer too much in terms of changing the course.

Nancy: Yes. I was happy about how the course changed, though, and how the instructor's behavior changed.

Martha: There was a definite change in the way he acted and the way he ran the class. I didn't really suggest anything to him, but I felt that I could because other people were going to be doing the same thing.
Frances: I also felt that I could have suggested changes if I wanted to.

Kathy S: I felt the same way. I was being a little hesitant.

Beverly: I always had kind of spoken up, but I didn't really say, "We don't like this", or anything like that. I don't know if anyone said that, after the feedback. We might have said, "Gee, I don't understand", or, "Could you explain that more?" But I think there still is a barrier between student and teacher. I just feel that there is. We were made more aware of that through Terry.

Frances: There have also been more things that we've done since then (feedback session). We've gone to Wentworth and talked to the teachers, the superintendent has come in, we've had a movie. We've done more things since then so there really hasn't been that much time to say there is anything wrong.

Phil: Before the feedback session the classes were more on a discussion level between us, whereas afterwards we had a movie, or people coming in. It was like a different type of class altogether.

PSF: So it wasn't the kind of situation where you might want to give that feedback?

Student: Even now, it might be the same as before if we did what we did before.

Kathe: As far as I'm concerned I don't think it would be. One thing that directly affected me, was that before the feedback session the instructor was not answering directly. We'd asked him something and he's thrown it back at us and ask someone else. And there were times that we just wanted a question answered then by him. We told him this at the feedback session and since then he's answered questions directly.

PSF: Raise your hand if you agree with Kathe. Okay, so there was a definite change.

Nancy: He also now usually asks the person if his answer was sufficient.

Kathe: Another change that came about, I think because of the feedback, he sort of tries to tie it up a little more so that we can relate it to what we're thinking about.

PSF: Has this happened for anyone else... that is, the idea that the instructor seems to be relating what's going on here to the purpose of this course? Raise your hands (about half the class members raise their hands).

Ed: I don't think there was any difference on that issue. He was doing that from the beginning in a very different way.
Martha: I think the things we were doing after the feedback session were really related to what we would have had to do before anyway. I mean, the people coming in to talk to us that relates more than getting into a group and talking about Maslow's hierarchy of needs or something.

Karen: We wouldn't have done any of that without the feedback session. We wouldn't have had the movie or very few of the guest speakers.

Phil: I disagree, because we were going to have a planning session anyway. In the feedback session a lot of kids said how they didn't like it because we didn't have anything planned, and we just sat there and it didn't seem to relate to the course. But he (the instructor) planned on a planning session where we would be able to plan our activities and things like that. And that's why I think after the feedback session it was just a totally different class. It was no longer discussion oriented.

PSF: If I hear you correctly, you're saying that even if the feedback session hadn't occurred, a lot that happened at the feedback session might have happened at the planning session.

COMMENT: At this point a number of students were confused about whether or not a planning session occurred and if so when it occurred in relation to the feedback session. In fact, the planning session took place one week prior to the feedback session.

PSF: Let's see if I can get some more systematic feedback on that. How many agree with Phil that many of these changes would have happened with the planning session without Terry's intervention? Raise your hands.

Martha: Which changes are you talking about?

Phil: Going to Wentworth, meeting with those teachers, having the movie, and the different speakers we've had in since the feedback session.

PSF: Okay, let's just take those. How many think those would have happened as a result of the planning session?

Class: Confusion.

Ed: He (the instructor) said we were going to do all of those things the very first day of class.

Class: But we never did.

Ed: Yes, I know. But it was his intent.

Student: Maybe it wouldn't have gotten done if Terry hadn't intervened.

Phil: The thing is I think he (the instructor) set aside the last half hour or 45 minutes of the class before that for a planning session,
which is what we had after the feedback session. It came after the feedback session, but if we didn't have the feedback session, the planning session would still have taken place. So, we would have been able to give our same views about going to Wentworth, etc. whether we had the feedback session or not.

Christine: A lot of it was on the syllabus.

Nancy: I agree with Phil but I think the planning session was more open because of the feedback session.

PSF: Would it be fair to say that the instructor's behavior with regard to answering questions probably would not have changed by the planning session? I see a lot of nods on that.

We're running out of time here, I'd like to focus on a couple of other items. Terry was participating in the course, I gather, after the intervention. Occasionally making comments about the way the course was going. I would like to know what your perception was of Terry during that period, and of his interventions particularly.

Phil: I just think he lent a positive attitude toward the whole class. I think his being here was good; it gave us more of an awareness of what the teacher thought and what we thought was going on. So I just think his intervention was a good thing.

PSF: It made you more aware of the teaching/learning process here?

Phil: I was more thinking of what the teacher thought he was getting across compared to what we actually perceived he was getting across.

PSF: Terry had some very definite views about what might have been going on during the last half after the intervention. I'd like to get some more feedback from you on what you thought was going on.

Christine: I may have been in the minority in this view. I thought that Terry's approach and what he was doing for his project was fine, a good idea, but I didn't find that much wrong with the instructor's methods in promoting all of the students to think on their own. I felt that the instructor, by not answering questions directed at him, was promoting the students' thoughts to go ahead and think on their own. Helping them to find answers on their own without getting an immediate answer from him. I found that in my case to be a more challenging way to learn.

PSF: Any other comments with regard to Terry's participation in the last half of this course?

Mary: During the feedback session Terry kept saying that you have to let the instructor know if he is not answering your questions directly and so on. You have to let him know because he doesn't realize it's happening. When the classes resumed, without Terry being here, at least I know I wouldn't have, and I think a lot of people here wouldn't have kept up their promise to let the instructor know if he wasn't
answering a question directly. And I don't think the instructor would have been so direct in answering questions if it had not been for Terry saying now and then, 'Did he answer your question?' or something like that.

PSF: So you feel like that was kind of like an incentive or some sort of impetus to keep it going from the feedback session?

Mary: Yes, it was like a reminder of your promise.

Martha: I agree with that and I also think that because he was there, like if you're dissatisfied with something you kind of show it by the expression on your face. The fact that if we had been unsatisfied, Terry would have sensed that, so we would have to do something so that he would know that we would be keeping up our promise by telling him (the instructor).

PSF: Terry was a little disappointed in what he felt was his impact during the last half of the course. What he would like is feedback on how he could have greater impact.

Kathe: I think he did have some impact and maybe the reason he didn't have more or as much as he wanted was because after the feedback session, as we told you, we had something planned out for just about the entire session the whole time. There wasn't really that much time when we were just discussing things with the instructor, or in small groups. So, the time that was left after we had let's say speakers was just barely enough time to cover what was going on, and it went fast and it went well. I think if we had more meetings per week and had just more time as a class, maybe he would have had more impact.

PSF: How many would agree with that? That Terry's impact was minimized due to the change in structure after the intervention measures. Virtually everybody says that; okay.

Beverly: I would agree because he couldn't say... Well, in the beginning we were learning a lot of what the instructor wanted us to read, but we were doing something entirely different the second half. So, we didn't have discussions of things. And it's hard to compare the two. He (Terry) was probably looking for more of us to open up. He perhaps didn't see that or find that.

PSF: I feel pretty good about the feedback you have given me.

Ed: I have written some suggested things for Terry and it amounts to the possibility that he might have spent some time in conference with individuals to help them articulate their questions or their comments to the instructor.

PSF: That's a very interesting notion. Because what I pick up here is that there was almost a large portion of the class that felt very good about Terry's intervention, but that the intervention was the kind in which there was not a whole lot of carry-over in terms of people changing their behavior in the classroom and monitoring the instructor
on a day-to-day basis, class-to-class basis. Is that correct?

Ed: True, but the single biggest cause for that is the change in the curriculum. We went from the teacher at the top, talking and using the board, to group sessions with outsiders, or a movie. It didn't lend itself to the same situation.

PSF: But that's very interesting, Ed, in other words you're saying that if the structure had been the same, and you had the seminar sort of thing, and if Terry had worked individually to help people articulate and monitor the instructor's behavior, you feel there might have been a greater effect. Is this correct?

Several students: Yes, this is the case.

Martha: It was just the circumstances of the classes, but I think he would have even helped us more saying what we would want to say if the circumstances had been right.

Ed: Behavior is a strange word, though. I think we're talking more about the instructor's teaching technique. Is that behavior?

Class: Confusion.

Ed: I'm not so sure that the instructor wasn't using a technique on us of feedback that I hated so much, never answering a question. It's a valid teaching procedure.

Kathe: Alright, it wasn't working with us and he needed to know this. And I don't think he would have known that if it hadn't been for Terry.

PSF: It did work for Christine.

Kathe: She did let us know at the feedback session that she was getting something out of it. That's fine if she can, but if the majority of the class can't, what good is it?

PSF: I am inclined to agree with you, Ed, that there was a technique operating here and the instructor knew exactly what he was about, but apparently it wasn't going over as well as he had hoped and he wasn't getting any feedback about it.

Nancy: We were just bored by it; we were just lost. I think that's because most courses we've had are these lecture courses where you come and sit down and open your notebook, you listen to what the professor has to say and then you leave.

Beverly: We're used to that kind of thing.

PSF: I'm finding this, as usual right at the end, very valuable feedback. I'm clear on the notion that the change in the structure of the course limited the degrees of freedom in terms of what you could do and what Terry could do. But what I hear as a second priority, after this change in structure in the course, is Ed's suggestion that
there are a number of you who could have used some help from Terry in terms of helping you articulate and get across your concerns for changing the course. Is that correct? Raise your hand if that is correct (most raise their hands).

Martha: Often I was about to say something but someone said it before me.

Beverly: It's hard for some people to know what to say. We become so passive.

PSF: Maybe we have to learn not to have other people run our errands for us. Well, I appreciate getting this feedback from you, I feel it was very helpful and I expect Terry will think so too. I'm glad you were all willing to be 'guinea pigs'.

Before their discussion with Peter, I asked the students to respond to several questions in writing regarding my work with the class. The following are their responses grouped according to question.

#1. Has the quality of the course improved since the feedback session? If so, in what ways?

S1: Yes, the instructor became aware through Terry of our problems. If it hadn't been for Terry, the instructor wouldn't have found out until the end of the semester. I still feel people could have opened up more to the instructor.

S2: I would have to say, yes, it has improved. The class is more responsive to the instructor and the instructor has communicated on a higher level than was previously the case.

S3: Yes, the instructor seems to take a greater interest in answering students' questions and seems to try to answer them completely. He usually makes sure that the question or problem has been taken care of before moving on to something new.

S4: It has improved immensely since the feedback session. The course itself has become much more relevant to what I had impressions of it to be, such as guest speakers, etc.

S5: No.

S6: It definitely has. I think the instructor has become much more conscious of the class's feelings as a whole. This is because Terry encouraged us to tell the instructor what we were thinking (like, "I don't understand what you said". "Could you answer the question directly?!") as opposed to keeping silent, which was the case before the feedback session.
S7: Definitely. I think the instructor has been more direct and clear in what he says, and the classes themselves have dealt with more relevant material than before.

S8: Yes. We have had guest speakers which were very interesting and had acquired a great deal of information from them.

S9: Yes, we have some more interesting things in our seminars like speakers coming in and talking.

S10: Yes, we have done a variety of things, seen a movie, gone to Wentworth, talked to teachers, had a superintendent in, career and placement person, and more constructive and useful things.

S11: Yes, because since the feedback session I have known what to expect as far as what we'll be covering in our class. As far as having our class time spent on more meaningful subjects to me.

S12: I felt the quality of the course was good to begin with. I don't therefore see a great deal of improvement, but I don't see that there was a lot wrong with the course anyway. The feedback sessions were good just the same, for those who had comments, etc. to vent.

S13: Yes, not so many tensions. The students seem a little less bored, and not so afraid to say what's on their minds.

S14: Very much so, after the feedback we had several guest lecturers who were of great interest to me.

#2. Has the instructor responded to questions directed at him more frequently than before the feedback session?

S1: Yes.

S2: Yes, he has, and has been more direct in answering questions and helpful, too.

S3: Yes.

S4: Yes.

S5: No.

S6: Yes, definitely. I think he really makes an effort to do this now, because he knows we want him to.

S7: Yes.

S8: Yes.

S9: Yes.
S10: Yes, when he doesn't sometimes he asks whether the question was answered now or not.

S11: Yes.

S12: Perhaps so.

S13: Yes.

S14: Yes, noticeably so!

#3. Has the instructor explained the connection between class discussions and exercises more clearly than before the feedback session? That is, are the seminars more relevant to your field experience than they were previously?

S1: Yes, he made sure everyone understood the assignments and he did answer our questions more directly.

S2: Yes, we have talked about responsibilities of the teacher, both in class and out of class, by meetings with school personnel who know what to expect in teaching.

S3: I would say that the seminars have been more relevant to me in exploring the career itself, that is, we have been having really good discussions about the career. The guest lectures have been helpful also.

S4: Yes, having people come in to give us more concrete facts has helped greatly.

S5: I felt there was no problem here even before the feedback session.

S6: Most of the seminars since the feedback session have been much more interesting and pertinent than before. He has also tied things together better.

S7: The classes were more relevant, but he failed to point out the relevancy or discuss it.

S8: No, they haven't been relevant to our field experience but as far as the guest speakers are concerned, they have been relevant.

S9: We have had speakers that are more relevant to our experiences.

S10: The observational instruments were unclear by four of us, that I know because I thought I did what he said; I have to redone.

S11: Yes.

S12: Somewhat.
S13: Yes!!! Having speakers has really been great.

S14: Yes--at times we discussed personal "field work" experiences.

#4. Have the small group conferences been beneficial? If so, how?

S1: I would assume so, but I really can't say because I wasn't in any.

S2: I participated in only one and really only wanted to ask a question. After it was answered, I had little to talk about but found the discussion stimulating.

S3: Yes. In the small conference I was able to ask the instructor many questions I had had but for which there had been no time to ask during the seminar.

S4: (No response).

S5: No.

S6: I never had one.

S7: Yes, in that they helped me to open up more.

S8: Yes and no.

S9: Yes, because you feel more free to talk about problems you might have.

S10: Not really, the only thing it helped was finding out what he wanted on the final assessment paper.

S11: Not really.

S12: They were good. Other students got a chance to relate personally to the seminar leader.

S13: I didn't get one.

S14: Yes. They gave you a chance to ask specific personal type questions but the conferences weren't structured or frequent enough.

#5. Has Terry's work with the class helped it to become more valuable to you? If so, in what way?

S1: Yes, as I explained in question #1, Terry was sort of a go-between, between teacher and student. If he had not done his research, the course would have just dragged on without probably any changes.
S2: He told us how we react to questions from the instructor, how many of us are shy and if we wish to make the discussion more involved we must ask questions to both the seminar leader and our fellow students.

S3: Terry opened up communication between the students and the professor in which there had been a great void. The professor is now more attuned to our need, questions and problems, and I believe the students are more aware of the teacher's expectations of us.

S4: Yes, by helping to change the instructor's views, teaching techniques, etc.

S5: No.

S6: I think that Terry's work really made the class better because of the decided improvement in the class after the feedback session. We all, I think, became more interested in the class and more understanding of the instructor. In addition, the instructor became more in tune with us.

S7: Yes, I was glad to see the results he obtained from the conferences, for I was beginning to think I was the only one who felt that way about the course. He also showed me where I could help make things better.

S8: Yes, I think it has, because other things have been brought up and put in front of the instructor and he sort of seemed to improve on these matters.

S9: Yes, because if he hadn't been working with us we would never have had the feedback session and our seminars would have continued the whole semester like they were at the beginning.

S10: Yes, because if it wasn't for Terry, then the classes would have remained boring.

S11: Yes, because through his interviews and feedback session our class became more aware of the problems within the class. Such as student-teacher conflicts. It made us realize our problems and grievances and therefore allowed us to look for possible solutions.

S12: Yes, he brought out many areas worth discussing.

S13: Yes, it has. 1) By getting the instructor to answer our questions. 2) By getting us to air our feelings in the class.

S14: Yes, it made us all care about getting as much as possible out of the course.
#6. How could Terry have been more effective? What knowledge and skills does he need to learn?

S1: I don't know myself, with us meeting only once a week.

S2: By making us respond better in discussions. Stopping the class to raise questions that would help the instructor and us.

S3: His skill in getting me to discuss my feelings about the course (during the individual conference) was very good. He was effective in persuading us to voice our assumptions, and seemed to have a good ability to sense our feelings. It would have been helpful if we had had more time for discussion after the feedback. [It] would have been helpful to have another conference.

S4: (No response).

S5: I think a part of the problem in this class was a lack of oral participation by the students. Terry could possibly have helped this situation by having conferences with the students and help them to articulate their thoughts.

S6: I'm not sure exactly what Terry's purpose here was--if he planned to improve the conditions of the class and instigate more group reaction, I don't think he could have done much more than he did. It was very successful. I don't know if his hypothesis was confirmed by his work with us, but if it wasn't, then perhaps he did not consider all the possible angles. If it was confirmed, then I cannot think of any way he could have been more effective--the private interviews with him were especially helpful to both the course and to getting me thinking about my exact feelings of the course.

S7: I think he did a great job in precision, as to what was said, how he interpreted it, and in giving us feedback.

S8: (Misread question).

S9: (No response).

S10: No, I think he did what he was trying to do and if he wasn't trying to solve a problem for this class, he surely did.

S11: He could have been more effective if he had started working with us earlier in the year. As far as what knowledge and skills he needs to learn, I'm not a good judge of that, but I do think he has an excellent understanding of what can make for a better learning atmosphere.

S12: I have no criticisms of his effectiveness.

S13: I really don't know. Maybe having the feedback session earlier than he did would have made what he did more effective.
S14: I'm not sure? This is my first experience with anything like this. Perhaps if he was more active in class discussions, it would be helpful.

#7. Do you think Terry's research is an effective way for improving the quality of a course? Please comment.

S1: Yes, very much. I had never really thought of it as an improvement but it did help in this class. He made us more aware of our place in the class and the instructor's awareness of happenings.

S2: Yes, it helped this course and probably could help other courses too.

S3: Yes, because in my opinion the quality of the course has improved since the feedback session. The self-disclosure that was given us was difficult to give, but helpful in the long run.

S4: Yes, by getting the views of the participants (as he did in the interviews) pro and con qualities of the course became known. Otherwise, many qualities existing within a course may remain hidden while a professor may not realize that they exist.

S5: No, I don't think so. His position and interest in the class allowed the students to escape from their responsibilities by bringing their comments to him rather than being forced into an accommodation with the instructor. By "paying" Terry with their words they owed nothing to the instructor.

S6: With a course of this type, where interaction between both members of the group themselves and between the members and the instructor, it is an effective way. It worked especially well in this situation, I believe, because there were definite problems, which, through Terry's help only, were defined, analyzed, and to a large extent, solved.

S7: Definitely. I honestly feel the class improved due to his work. Our professor had no idea how we felt and we had no idea how he felt. Unless there was an impartial person in the middle to collect this data, these feelings wouldn't have ever come out, and the class would have remained the same.

S8: (Misread the question).

S9: Yes, it can reduce or eliminate problems people have when dealing with others.

S10: Yes. See #6.

S11: Yes. If nothing else, at least by having him present and talking over our problems with him and our teacher during the feedback session, we became aware of our problems and an awareness of how to solve them.
S12: Yes, his approach is excellent if improvement is needed in a course.

S13: Well, it seems to have made some improvement in this class, hopefully it could do the same for others. One way for improvement might be more personal interactions with us as individuals, not just observing in class.

S14: Yes, I would like to hear how it all worked out. Terry's work added just a little something that isn't easily explainable but definitely positive.
Teaching Analysis By Students (TABS)

Section I: Teaching Skills and Behaviors

In this questionnaire there are some statements concerning a variety of specific teaching skills and behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and then indicate the extent to which you feel your instructor needs improvement. Respond to each statement by selecting one of the following:

1. No improvement is needed (very good or excellent performance)
2. Little improvement is needed (generally good performance)
3. Improvement is needed (generally mediocre performance)
4. Considerable improvement is needed (generally poor performance)
5. Not a necessary skill or behavior for this course

Please make your decisions about the degree of improvement needed on the basis of what you think would be best for this particular course and your learning style. Try to consider each statement separately, rather than let your overall feelings about the instructor determine all the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Student Responses</th>
<th>1st TABS</th>
<th>2nd TABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor's explanation of course objectives.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor's explanation of the objectives for each class session and learning activity.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor's ability to arouse my interest when introducing an instructional activity.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor's explanation of the work expected from each student.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor's ability to maintain a clear relationship between the course content and the course objectives.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TABS</td>
<td>2nd TABS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The instructor's skill in clarifying the relationships among the various topics treated in the course.

7. The instructor's skill in making clear the distinction between major and minor topics.

8. The instructor's skill in adjusting the rate at which new ideas are covered so that the material can be followed and understood.

9. The instructor's ability to clarify material which needs elaboration.

10. The instructor's speaking skills.

11. The instructor's ability to ask easily understood questions.

12. The instructor's ability to ask thought-provoking questions.

13. The instructor's ability to answer questions clearly and concisely.

14. The instructor's overall effectiveness as discussion leader.

15. The instructor's ability to get students to participate in class discussions.

16. The instructor's skill in facilitating discussions among students as opposed to discussions only between the instructor and students.

17. The instructor's ability to wrap things up before moving on to a new topic.

18. The instructor's ability to tie things together at the end of a class.

19. The instructor's explanation of precisely how my performance is to be evaluated.

20. The instructor's ability to design evaluation procedures which are consistent with course objectives.

21. The instructor's performance in periodically informing me of my progress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st TABS</th>
<th>2nd TABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. The instructor's ability to select materials and activities which are not too difficult.
24. The instructor's provision of variety in materials and activities.
25. The instructor's ability to use a variety of teaching techniques.
26. The instructor's demonstration of creativity in teaching methods.
27. The instructor's management of day-to-day administrative details.
28. The instructor's flexibility in offering options for individual students.
29. The instructor's ability to take appropriate action when students appear to be bored.
30. The instructor's availability for personal consultation.
31. The instructor's ability to relate to people in ways which promote mutual respect.
32. The instructor's maintenance of an atmosphere which actively encourages learning.
33. The instructor's ability to inspire excitement or interest in the content of the course.
34. The instructor's ability to relate the subject matter to other academic disciplines and real world situations.
35. The instructor's willingness to explore a variety of points of view.
36. The instructor's ability to get students to challenge points of view raised in the course.
37. The instructor's performance in helping me to explore the relationship between my personal values and the course content.
38. The instructor's performance in making me aware of value issues within the subject matter.
Section II: Other Information

Please mark the appropriate response for each of the following items beside the correct statement number on the answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st TABS</th>
<th>2nd TABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. Class:
   (1) freshman
   (2) sophomore
   (3) junior
   (4) senior
   (5) graduate student

40. Sex:
   (1) male
   (2) female

41. Grade point average:
   (1) less than 1.50 (lowest)
   (2) 1.50-2.49
   (3) 2.50-2.99
   (4) 3.00-3.49
   (5) 3.50-4.00 (highest)

42. In terms of directions my life is taking, this course is:
   (1) relevant
   (2) somewhat relevant
   (3) irrelevant
   (4) I am unsure

43. In this course I am learning:
   (1) a great deal
   (2) a fair amount
   (3) very little
   (4) I am unsure

44. As a result of this course my attitude toward the instructor is:
   (1) becoming more positive
   (2) becoming more negative
   (3) unchanged

45. As a consequence of participating in this course, my attitude toward the subject matter is:
   (1) becoming more positive
   (2) becoming more negative
   (3) unchanged
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st TABS</th>
<th>2nd TABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. I would prefer that this course:
   (1) become more structured and organized
   (2) become less structured or organized
   (3) maintain about the present level of structure.

47. Which of the following descriptions of student learning styles most nearly approximates your own? (Choose only one.)
   (1) I like to think for myself, work alone, and focus on learning personally relevant content.
   (2) I prefer highly structured courses and will focus on learning what is required.
   (3) I try to "get the most out of classes" and like sharing my ideas with others and getting involved in class activities.
   (4) I am competitive, concerned about getting good grades, and try to learn material so that I can perform better than others.
   (5) I am generally turned off as a student, uninterested in class activities, and don't care to work with teachers or other students.

48. About how much time and effort have you put into this course compared to other courses of equal credit?
   (1) much more
   (2) somewhat more
   (3) about the same amount
   (4) somewhat less
   (5) much less

49. Generally, how valuable have you found the assigned readings in terms of their contributions to your learning in this course?
   (1) very valuable
   (2) fairly valuable
   (3) not very valuable
   (4) there have been no assigned readings

50. Overall, I would rate this course as:
   (1) excellent
   (2) good
   (3) mediocre
   (4) poor