DOCUMENT RESUME

FD 035 463   PS 002 830

AUTHOR   Rashid, Martha; And Others
TITLE   The Teacher, Teacher Style, and Classroom
              Management. Proceedings of the Head Start Research
              Seminars: Seminar No. 2, The Teacher and Classroom
              Management (1st, Washington, D.C., July 22, 1968).
INSTITUTION   Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO   OEO-4098-Seminar-2
PUB DATE   22 Jul 68
NOTE   70p.; This seminar is part of a larger work (ED 034
              088) entitled "Critical Issues in Research Related
              to Disadvantaged Children," edited by Edith Grotberg

EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS   Behavior, *Class Management, Classroom Environment,
              Cognitive Development, Data Collection, Preschool
              Programs, *Preschool Teachers, *Research Needs,
              *Seminars, Social Development, *Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS   *Head Start

ABSTRACT
          One of a series of seminars on Head Start research,
this paper deals with the potential contribution of teacher style to
classroom management. It is suggested that studies be designed to (1)
compare and describe preschool and primary programs, (2) develop a
standard system of notation for recording behavior in classrooms, (3)
determine the effect of the classroom setting on teacher behavior,
and (4) provide in-service education for preschool teachers to teach
them practical procedures for getting systematic feedback about their
own behavior. Further studies are needed to examine both teacher and
pupil style, as well as the development of sex role and motivation in
young children. The effect of the teacher's style on children's
cognitive and social development deserves further attention.
Responses to this paper are made by Ira Gordon, Martin Haberman, and
Helen Richards. A bibliography on the teacher and classroom
management is included. (Document ED 034 088 has the full text of the
proceedings of all six Head Start seminars in this series.) (DR)

Proceedings of Head Start Research

Seminar #2:

THE TEACHER AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Washington, D.C.
July 22, 1968

THE TEACHER, TEACHER STYLE, AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

by Dr. Martha Rashid
George Washington University

THE PROBLEM

Newspaper headlines proclaim that student achievement scores are above or below national norms. The success of one program or another, however success is defined, leads to the instant creation of a new hero; the educator who has "something going". The failure of a program, however failure is defined, results in the instant ouster of former heroes. So the controversy rages over the process and output of education.

The forms it takes are protean. The basic issues are fewer. They are often expressed in questions such as these: Is income level the cause or consequent of poor education? What is the contribution of schools to the education of children? How much of the variability in children's performance is accounted for by inputs from the school program? Which input from the school program has the most positive or negative effect upon children's achievement?

A course for school teachers? No! These are some questions representative of those appearing in recent newspaper editorials. They are also somewhat representative of those in the professional literature on what some call "compensatory" education. Throughout many current discussions about education there is a questionning of the long held assumption that educational programs do contribute substantially to variability in performance, that educational programs can contribute enough to account for a substantial portion of variability in performance, and that teachers are the agents who most significantly affect the performance of children in the school setting.

When what used to be known as pedagogical issues are emblazoned in newspaper headlines, the boldness of the printer's type may lure the reader into assuming an unwarranted simplicity. "Does income level cause success in school?" is cast in deceptively simple cause-effect phraseology which makes the issues it signifies nonetheless important. These happen to be only some of the issues in the current politics of "compensatory" education or "intervention" programs. They are of great interest to the public as well as to members of the professions related to the welfare and education of children. It seems obvious to many that professionals must intensify their efforts to seek better understanding of the many facets of the problem in respect to theory, research and practice. But avoiding simplistic statements of the issues is not enough. Seeking to dimensionalize the major variables is not enough. More effective programs must be developed! What cues can be taken from available research data in order to plan more effective programs?

The problem of the role of the teacher has been of interest to the research community over quite a long period of time. To say that the teacher's role is being currently reappraised is to vastly understate what has become almost a national preoccupation with educational issues. This paper is limited to examining the potential contribution of teacher style to classroom management. The first part of the paper presents some general considerations in respect to classroom management per se. The second part speculates a bit about teacher style or the teacher in the role of manager of classroom situations. Several suggestions are made for future research efforts directed toward improving educational programs for young children. The intent has been to

select several areas of promise for future work rather than to provide an exhaustive review of the literature. When the terms "early childhood" or "young children" are used they refer to children of the age range typically included in nursery schools and in the primary grades (kindergarten through third grade) of the elementary school.

THE TEACHER AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

"The Teacher and Classroom Management" is prosaic enough.
It leads easily to images of a teacher "managing" a reading
period with the ubiquitous three groups of children programmed
into various patterns of reading circle, seatwork and indepen-
dent activity. It leads to images of the teacher monitoring
lines of children waiting...waiting at the water fountain,
waiting to go to the bathroom or waiting to go out in orderly
fashion to the playground. Jackson's book Life in Classrooms (47)
gives an excellent description of the importance of waiting and
the almost infinite variety of the kinds of waiting which
teachers manage and children undergo. "The Teacher and Classroom
Management" conjures images of a teacher managing an instruc-
tional situation by carefully observing children as they
manipulate counting blocks, for example, before they go on to
learn the formal symbolic notation for sets. As it is used here,
the teacher and classroom management refers to the teacher's
arrangement of time, space, materials, pupils and herself into
various constellations of a learning environment. This descrip-
tion is borrowed from Paul Gump and is, of course, broad enough
to permit discussion of almost anything that has to do with life
in classrooms. If one accepts the notion that researchers
ought to concern themselves with natural settings as well as
with laboratory settings, then an important corollary is accep-
tance of the tough job of identifying and abstracting from the
natural setting the relationships among variables which are
powerful enough to extend our understanding of the intricate
social systems which teachers set up and manage as part of their
daily work. The daily work of any teacher is the juggling of
time, space, materials, children and herself into patterns which
go beyond the situation of the moment to eventuate in the attain-
ment of prescribed and emerging goals.

Some images of classroom life are prosaic because we may,
for example, recognize them as rituals engaged in by teachers
as they organize and direct the activities of children in the
primary grades. Somehow, for me at least, the teacher's role as
a manager of the classroom is more intrusive at the primary
grade level than at the preschool level. It seems to me, too,
that there is a sharp break between the professional literature
describing practices in preschool programs and that describing
practices in the primary grades. The dimension where the differ-
ence is the most dramatic is that of dependence upon elaborate
social systems set up for maintenance of orderly group activ-
ities. The research literature concerned with teacher behavior
at the preschool level also varies in emphasis from the research
literature concerned with teacher behavior in the primary grades.

Here the gap between the two levels is not so great as it
seems to be in the discussions of practices. The bulk of the
research at the preschool level, at least that which was
reported prior to 1960, was concerned with the teacher's influ-
ence upon the dependent or independent behavior of children and
upon other behaviors in the general domain of personal and
social development. (Sears and Dowley, 74) Much of the
research on teacher behavior at the elementary school level
seemed to be predominately aimed at teacher competence or
teacher effectiveness. A useful review of this genre of
research can be found in the 1964 review edited by Biddle and
Ellena (10). Part of the body of literature dealing with teacher
effectiveness has taken the approach of describing the creation
of social systems within learning environments which systemati-
cally affect the individual, small group and total group
behavior of children. Anderson, Bales, Flanders, Medley and

Mitzel, Gump and others have taken this approach. Most of the
other research on teacher effectiveness, however, has been
fragmented and lacking in theoretical underpinnings of any
kind. The simple paradigms used in much of the research on
teacher effectiveness have schematized measurement and/or pre-
diction according to a variety of narrowly defined criterion
variables (30). This brief look at the difference between
research on teacher behavior at the preschool and the primary
school levels is not meant to disparage the importance of
teacher effectiveness. It is meant primarily to highlight
important differences in research emphases and in description
of recommended programs. Almost any textbook on early childhood
describes this as an epoch of development where, in theoretical
terms at least, more similarity than dissimilarity in educa-
tional programs might be supposed to exist. Many institutions
of higher education prepare teachers especially for work with
young children. In some states a special teaching certificate
is issued for this level. Historically, however, the goals of
preschool education have differed from those of education in the
primary grades. Even programs such as Follow Through seem to
focus on continuing to provide the special services of Head Start
as an addition to the regular primary program.

        Do such differences in program actually hold over large
numbers of preschool and primary grade programs? Or are they
fleeting impressions which arise from the mythology of our pro-
fession? Do preschool teachers today perceive their role
differently than do teachers of the primary grades? What are the
major areas of difference in role perception? One direction for
research on the teacher and classroom management that I see is
description and analysis of a wide variety of "natural settings"

or classrooms at these two levels to see where they are similar and where they differ. Another is to study differences in perception of role on the part of preschool teachers and primary grade teachers. With the advent of Head Start and with the advent of Titles I and III of E.S.E.A. it may well be that events are underway which have significantly changed both preschool and primary grade programs. It may also be that a sharp difference between programs at these levels still exists. Perhaps special recent "intervention" efforts have not had a substantial impact upon either the middle class preschool proto-type or the traditional primary grade classroom. At this point, we don't know. We need to find ways to describe what actually exists.

Part of the difficulty researchers have faced in their quest for workable measures to appraise the impact of the teacher's management of the classroom upon children has been the confounding factor of a priori judgements of the nature of effectiveness. Such judgements do not free the observer to see and to record what is actually going on. Most professionals who are deeply committed to the welfare of children observe within the limits of their educational predilections. For example...It is good to plan activities which enhance the self concept. It is bad to reprimand a child in front of other children. It is good to ask questions which encourage the child to think his own way through the cognitive mazeway of a difficult problem. It is bad to require young children to sit and listen to a story if they prefer to play with blocks. Each of us has a filing system of the "goods" and the "bads" which predisposes us to judge rather than to see. The "goods" and the "bads" which we retrieve from our filing system at any

given point of time may be excellent from the viewpoint either
of theory, of research, or of practice. But they also can be
powerful deterrents to objective description of what actually
is happening in the situation being observed. Instead of
observing in order to appraise, we need first to find ways to
observe in order to describe. When description comes before
appraisal, and is a procedure distinct from appraisal, it per-
mits a common and relatively more objective basis from which
appraisal, or any other research objective, may proceed. Some
very early attempts along this line were made in 1928 by Puckett.
As reported by Medley and Mitzel (60), he devised a series of
symbols to represent various teacher and pupil behaviors.
Several illustrations of his symbols are given below.

- Pupil raised hand.

⊙ Pupil raised hand and was called upon by
  teacher.

⊡ Pupil called on when he did not have hand
  raised.

⏁ Pupil called on when he did not have hand
  raised; made a single word response.

Apparently Puckett worked out other symbols; those given
here are illustrative only. A system where each symbol repre-
sents a particular behavior would be quite easy to use in
recording behavior once one learned the notation. Such a system
is particularly elegant because modifications of each basic
symbol form can differentiate either the situation in which the
behavior occurred or the nature of the behavior. At this point
one might very well state that while few would object to the
need for objective descriptions of classroom life many would
question the feasibility of the development of a notational
system for recording the myriad actions and transactions which
normally occur in any time-slice of classroom behavior. Such

objection has merit. Undoubtedly it is impossible to get an
absolute isomorphism between any notational system and any
given "live" classroom situation. But it is very likely that
an adequate sampling of behaviors can be selected for inclusion
in a notational system such as that being suggested here. It
should be possible to develop a system representing the basic
elements of teacher behavior, children's behavior, time, space,
and materials as they are manifested in various patterns or
combinations of interaction. Many observation checklists have
been used. Pooling these items and selecting those considered
the most basic behaviors, or classes of behavior, would be an
important first step. At first thought the job seems horren-
dous. But there are some data at hand which are the result of
sporadic research efforts throughout the past fifty years or
so. What is needed now is a workable and objective way to
record what actually goes on in classrooms. Once these data
were available, researchers could use them for whatever
specific research goals they had in mind. Dancers use the
system of Labanotation to record the elements of a dance in
sequence so the dance can be replicated and also, as I under-
stand, so that it may be copyrighted. We may not wish to
record all teaching-learning sequences for copyright purposes
but it would advance research greatly if some professional
group could be funded to develop a standard system of notation
which would be available for use by the entire research
community.

A recurring theme throughout the literature on teachers
as managers of the institutional settings for learning which
our society provides is the theme of the adaptability or
flexibility of teacher behavior. Flexibility seems to be used

to indicate the ease and skill with which the teacher can shift
managerial gears from one activity or situation to another. It
also refers to the actual change in the teacher's behavior as
the context for behavior changes in the rather fluid patterns
of interaction which ordinarily exist within the limits of the
prescribed rules and routines of classroom life. At times it
is used also to indicate the teacher's capability for dealing
with the unexpected, the unusual events which somehow erupt
through the surface of daily classroom life to demand an imme-
diate response. Flexibility may also be used to refer to other
aspects of teacher behavior not identified here. It is diffi-
cult often to determine which meaning of flexibility, or aspect
of it, is intended. Much of the literature on this particular
dimension of teacher behavior contains more discursive
discussion of teaching methods which purportedly contribute to
flexibility than reports of research projects designed to
examine systematically the nature of flexibility and its
contribution to general patterns of teacher behavior.

Going from the abstract to real classroom situations, one
may ask: How does a given teacher behave when she is guiding an
activity where several young children are playing a card sorting
game where the objective, at least that of the teacher, is the
children's discovery of the principles involved in "winning".
Let's say that if one guesses or selects "blue, blue, red"--
"blue, blue, red" wins. If one is able to state the principle
"blue, blue, red always wins" one is rewarded by the teacher's
approval.

In this situation both the teacher's verbal and nonverbal
behavior may be important. Considering only verbal behavior, at
this point, is the teacher directive (restrictive of pupil

response) or is she relatively indirect permitting, indeed encouraging, the children to respond freely in order to discover and to state the principle of the game? Flanders and his associates have studied the impact of the teacher's verbal behavior upon the student's behavior by extensive use of interaction analysis. Flanders' achievement to date in refining this method of studying verbal behavior and in using it to train teachers to evaluate their own behavior is compelling. In analyzing the data on any given teacher's behavior, Flanders (25) has defined the flexibility of a teacher's verbal behavior by using the ratio of indirect to direct influence in any one activity and comparing it with the corresponding ratio in other activities. This definition of flexibility is related, and correctly so, to the conceptual framework which Flanders and his associates used to derive interaction analysis as a procedure for describing and categorizing only the verbal behavior of teachers. However, one may define flexibility as a construct, the problem immediately arises of the relationship of flexible behavior to context. To what degree is behavior, flexible or not, dependent upon requirements of the situation, the context, the setting? Gump, among others, points out that activity settings are coercive of interactional patterns. Research carried out on camp settings as well as on the classroom indicated that the context, to use Gump's phrase, "shapes the behavior of adult managers."

Going to the primary level classroom again for illustrative purposes, one certainly expects teachers to behave differently when they give a spelling test, for example, from when they are informally moving about the room chatting with

youngsters who are engaged in "free time" or "independent" or "learning center" activities. The labels for such activities vary but they usually refer to a period of time when children may select from a variety of activities the one in which they wish to engage themselves. At one extreme of this continuum of activity settings is the test situation where all children are required to do the same thing at the same time; where the emphasis is on order, attentiveness and being quiet; where the goal clearly requires an accurate response to specific stimuli; and where diversions from the task at hand are not readily tolerated.

Some interesting questions arise here. Does the teacher feel impelled to keep order, to maintain quiet, and to be on guard against frivolous interruptions because of her perception of the requirements of the situation? To what degree does the activity setting actually coerce both the teacher and the students to respond in certain ways? With the same teachers and children is it possible that as much could be accomplished in learning to spell words in settings which differ from that described above? This comes close to the classic chicken-egg question. But the work of Barker, Gump, Hughes and others does suggest that the activity setting itself imposes requirements which elicit identifiably different patterns of behavior. To go back to classroom illustrations. At the other end of the continuum of settings, during "free time" the children are expected to select what they wish to do; different children are expected to be doing different things; conversation is per- mitted; the teacher intrudes only to keep things going smoothly and to make sure that reasonable care is taken of materials and equipment. The ethic of this situation is not pencils poised

in unison. It is that of exercising options and pursuing one's own interests. Many other classroom situations or activity settings lie between the polarities just described. The issue goes beyond that of determining the role of flexibility in the teacher's management of the classroom to issues concerned with curriculum because so often our goals are those of mastery of content, and at the same time, development of adequate social skills. We need therefore to determine some priorities of action for examining the part which teacher flexibility plays in classroom management. In pursuing this we might wish to take another, and perhaps a longer look, at the activity settings teachers design for young children. Study of these related areas can make important contributions to very practical matters of classroom organization and curriculum. While an extensive discussion of curriculum is not the objective at hand it is impossible to consider the teacher as a manager of the classroom without tracing the effects of teacher management upon curriculum. If the activity setting itself does impose certain behavioral patterns upon both the teacher and the children then the practical curriculum planner must not only consider the substantive material and social skills she wishes to teach directly but also the behavior which emerges from the activity as an indirect or unplanned for result.

If our objectives for children do include the careful nurture of behavior such as that of using language playfully as a conversational art or making wise choices or planning a course of action with another child or examining goals to see their relationship to our own behavior in the classroom... then we must analyze curriculum for young children not only

from the viewpoint of cognitive development, not only from the viewpoint of direct development of social skills, but also from the viewpoint of what kinds of children's behavior are required by the activity settings we use. Some of these requirements may fit in well with stated objectives; some requirements may be undoing our explicit objectives. It would be beneficial to analyze systematically and to compare programs in order to describe the patterns of activity settings used; the explicit or public objectives such settings were designed to reach; the behaviors which result from the requirements of the settings and which have not been planned for or perhaps even recognized by the teacher.

The teacher's recognition that her behavior interacts with that of individual children and with groups to set off delicate yet very strong spider-web patterns of social transaction is a vital part of her personal and professional self-renewal. Flanders (26) comments that as a group teachers are virtually isolated from information about their own behavior. Almost all teacher preparation programs include courses in psychology, educational psychology and sociology. Teachers in the schools attend occasional mass meetings most of which seem to be designed to inspire them to go forthwith and transform themselves into paragons. With the exception of a few exploratory projects, teachers have not been provided with a systematic means for feedback from the systems they create and manage. The Stanford group and others have used micro-teaching; Flanders and his associates have used interaction analysis and Kersch and others have used simulation techniques. While simulation techniques are not as directly related to feedback as micro-teaching and inter-action analysis, each of these approaches and others warrant further study and more widespread systematic use.

Teachers do pause for a moment after a hectic day to
reflect upon a mental ledger of that day's successes and
failures. Teachers do watch for the overt behavioral signs
children use when they are fatigued, bored, excited or
uncertain. Teachers do get evaluated formally by supervisors
and informally by parents. All of these result in fleeting,
incidental cues which may serve a variety of useful purposes.
They cannot take the place of an organized set of procedures
for getting constant feedback, information which is processed
by the teacher and then acted upon in planning next steps.
The Educational Professions Development Act and many other
programs testify to the concern throughout the teaching pro-
fession that we find better ways both to prepare teachers and
to sustain professional growth after they are employed.
Increasing the professional skill of huge numbers of teachers
is a task of awesome magnitude and complexity. Considering
here only what should be done on the in-service level, we
ought to test the hypothesis that sustained and systematic use
of procedures designed to yield feedback will result in more
effective teacher performance which will in turn improve the
cognitive and social performance of youngsters.

An investment in setting up systematic feedback mechanisms
in the classroom may very well result in the elusive pay-off
all "intervention" programs have been designed to achieve.

These general comments about various aspects of classroom
management can be drawn together in the following suggestions:

a) Some comparative descriptive studies are needed
to determine areas of similarity and difference
between preschool and primary grade programs and
the role perceptions of teachers at these levels.

16

Continuity from one level to another is not the only issue here. Sharply different goals may result in different activity settings which impact upon children in various ways. Where teachers of both levels plan together, desirable changes in goals and activities may occur at both levels. It is evident, however, that objective data are needed about actual operational differences.

b) A standard system of notation for recording behavior in classrooms would be useful to many different research programs. Perhaps a professional organization might be lured into developing such a system.

c) Intricate relationships among a number of factors seem to underlie the environments which teachers create and the systems within the environments which they manage. We need more information about the degree to which the behavior of the teacher as an adult manager is coerced by activity settings. How does the construct of teacher flexibility relate to the construct of classroom ecology? We may wish to examine not only the behaviors which instructional goals are explicitly meant to achieve but also the behaviors which are not always planned for, those which arise from the requirements of the activity settings teachers provide.

d) The major part of in-service education for teachers of young children should be designed to teach them practical procedures for getting systematic feedback about their own behavior. The particular technique selected is not so important as the general acceptance for its need. Some portion of released time should be given to the systematic self-appraisal of teacher behavior in the classroom. It is suggested that training in using a self-appraisal technique, time in which to use the techniques selected, and the general expectation on the part of everyone concerned that such appraisal will be carried out as a regular part of the teacher's job will result in the pay-off of improved pupil performance.

TEACHER STYLE

Teacher style is used here to refer to the way in which the teacher plays the role of classroom manager. There are identifiable differences among teachers in the behaviors which predominate as they perform in the classroom. The teacher as an actor of a role is not a new concept. Teacher style does not refer only to the skill of the performance but also to the form of acting characteristic of any given teacher. Just as there are differences among teachers in the behaviors they select to shape their playing of the role so are there similarities. Clusters of behaviors can be identified according to various dimensions. There is enough similarity in these more frequently occuring behaviors on the part of any one teacher to permit identification with labels such as the punitive or the accepting teacher, the direct or the indirect teacher, the challenging or the dull teacher, and so on. The labels used vary widely, as one would expect, and so do the dimensions of behavior which have been of particular interest to any given group of researchers. Teacher style is examined below in respect to:

a) its differential impact on individual children and small groups

b) its relationship to the culturally defined sex role of the child

c) possible effects upon cognitive development

d) possible effects upon social development

The large majority of studies concerned with relating teacher style to any type of student performance have used group measures of performance. Before faulting this approach,

one must recall the fact that teachers are not permitted to be
tutors in American public schools. They are given responsibility
for teaching groups rather than individual children. On the
other hand, within the total group situation many teachers do
work with individual children or with small groups of children
whose interests, skills or needs may be similar. In effect, as
many teachers manage the classroom they point their efforts at
times toward individuals or small groups. Most small groups,
however, are formed on the basis of achievement. It is
reasonable to assume on this basis alone, disregarding the
literature which uses learning theory as the rationale for
individualizing instruction, that research which focuses only
on mean achievement may obscure potentially significant changes
in the performance of individuals or small groups. Recent
research efforts which have examined the differential effects
of teacher style upon individuals include a study reported by
Sears (73). Using fifth and sixth grade subjects to study the
effects of classroom conditions upon achievement motivation
and work output, Sears indicated that teacher behavior had
differing effects upon children of different mental abilities
and sex. The way in which the teacher rewarded the subjects
seemed to be related to achievement. Much of the research
literature on creativity also suggests that there may be a
relationship between teacher style and measures of creativity on
the part of individual children within the total group. The
data are not clear, however, as to how teacher styles do relate
to the performance of individuals or as to which combinations
of teacher and child seem most productive.

What has been suggested is not new or startling by any
means. Many have vigorously supported the idea that the day is
long past for comparing the mean performance of one group with

the mean performance of another. Published research still
suffers, however, from the "measure of central tendency syn-
drone." Because it is difficult to find published research
designed to examine more complex interactions, it may be useful
to examine a few of the assumptions underlying much of the
current work on young children. One assumption, it seems to me,
is that an important research goal is the analysis of what are
essentially "leveling" effects. Another assumption is that
groups of disadvantaged youngsters do have such similar learning
styles, life styles if you will, that they all literally fit
neatly the stereotype of "the disadvantaged child" which we have
so conscientiously and laboriously constructed. Another assump-
tion is that the degree of match between teacher style and
individual children does not exist or is not important enough
to justify the use of more sophisticated research designs.
Still another assumption is that we can afford to search for
the elusive "best" method of instruction for all disadvantaged
children; that we can afford to continue to compare pairs of
methods until somehow the "real winner" mercifully emerges
from a somehow definitive statistical analysis. Minuchin's (64)
study of curiosity is a promising effort among recent studies
to examine individual and small group behavior systematically
and to develop instrumentation in an area where large group
tests are inappropriate.

While it is not reasonable to expect all studies of teacher
style to focus upon change in individual children, it is
feasible to suggest that small samples might be studied to find
linkages between teacher style and the performance of individual
young children. It also seems feasible to attempt to link to
teacher style the work output of various subpopulations or
small groups. Cannot such subpopulations be selected according

to combinations of variables such as sex, curiosity, language
ability, creativity, motivation, etc.? Simple "either-or"
research paradigms are clearly inadequate if we perceive our
research goal to be an analysis of complex interactions between
teacher style and individual children or small groups.

The development of sex role as well as the power of sex as
a variable in differentiating both motivation and achievement
on the part of children has been widely discussed in the
psychological literature. There is relatively little <u>direct</u>
evidence to bear, however, upon the question of the nature of
the relationship between teacher style and development of sex
role. Sex as a factor accounting for variability in motivation
and achievement has been studied somewhat more extensively.
In respect to teacher style and sex role, great emphasis has
been placed upon the availability of models and the potency of
such models. Relatively little emphasis has been given,
however, to differences in teacher style as a variable of
importance. Observation of natural settings does support the
well known literature on doll play, for example, in leading one
to question the appropriateness of materials and activities in
classrooms which seem to reinforce aspects of the feminine
rather than the masculine role. Information about the relation-
ship between curriculum and sex role is, however, still largely
speculative at this point. Sears' (73) work which was
mentioned earlier in the section on the fit between teacher
style and individual children suggested that high achievement
in boys seemed to be related to the teacher's modes of expres-
sing reinforcement of desirable, goal-directed behavior.

In the Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, Katz (50)
reported on how Negro children actually administered reinforce-
ments of criticism and praise to themselves while they were
doing simple tasks under what they assumed were private
conditions. He found that low achieving boys were more likely
than relatively high achieving boys to express disapproval of
their own task performance even when the quality of performance
was the same for both groups. Whether such expressed
disapproval reflects systematic internalization of previous
failure or disappointment with oneself and exactly how such
mechanisms are set into operation is unclear. Katz used a
questionnaire which elicited information about parental
reactions to effort, and success and failure from the Negro
boys and girls in his study. Reports of low parental interest,
low acceptance and high punitiveness were related on the part
of boys, but not girls, to low school achievement and expressed
self devaluation in the task setting mentioned earlier. Results
such as these point to the strengths of the parental role, and
as Bronfenbrenner suggested in an earlier paper in this Head
Start Research Seminar series, there is an urgent need for
involving parents in the total school enterprise. This leaves
unanswered, however, in any direct sense the interplay between
teacher style and the low achieving Negro boy's lack of
motivation to achieve. Rosenthal and Jacobsen (71) presented
interesting evidence about the apparent effects of teacher
expectation upon achievement. In what ways do teachers in
inner-city schools act as agents to reinforce the child's
generalized disappointment with self? Would it not be useful
in developing programs for such youngsters to emphasize the
elements of teacher style which relate most directly to
rerouting an ego system which has been under constant assault?
What are the elements of teacher style which would serve in this

rehabilitative cause? These questions signify the dilemma in which teachers find themselves where causation for a propensity toward failure seems to be clear. The instrumentalities for intervening are so very much less clear. If we would identify a number of children who had somehow broken through this cycle at some level during their school careers and analyze their interactions with teachers we may glean some understanding of specific components in teacher style which do and do not appreciably operate in collusion with failure and self disparagement. Another significant issue in this important area of research is that of how differences in teacher style among women teachers are related to different levels of motivation and achievement. Even though the evidence on cross-sex preference in reinforcement agents is fairly clear, especially at the preschool level, it is unlikely that we can readily change the existing situation where the majority of teachers are women. Bringing in male models undoubtedly is very useful but if a female model is the important person in the school situation over a period of time, we must also consider teaching female teachers the means which they can use to rescue children from self assault and battery on the ego.

Teacher style has been posited as the way in which the teacher plays the role of classroom manager. The use of a term such as style indicates that there are enough common elements among teachers as they perform to permit us for the moment to disregard idiosyncratic elements unique to each individual teacher. What is the relationship between teacher style and cognitive development? This is a very broad question, of course, and has been extensively studied. The particular aspect presented here focuses only upon what may be viewed as the contribution of pedagogy to cognitive development. In

a 1965 review of the literature on classroom learning,
Baldwin (6) remarked on the startling lack of research studies
on the content of teacher-child interaction; the way teachers
actually present new material, encourage the search for an
underlying principle, answer questions or summarize material.
The well-known work of Hess and Shipman (45) on the quality
of the verbal instructions given by mothers of middle class
and lower class children is of interest in this context.
Among other things, the middle class mothers were more skillful
as instructors.

What are the elements in teacher style which make for
better instruction in each unit of teacher-child interaction
at various junctures in the learning process? Much of the
research on the teaching of arithmetic which was done prior
to 1950 emphasized the specific content of teacher-child
interaction units in respect to more effective ways to intro-
duce mathematical concepts, ways to provide practice, and ways
to use manipulative materials for the greatest impact on
learning. It is instructive to reread some of this literature
because of the care with which these researchers sought to
relate the practices of teachers to the learning of children
by examining elements of the teacher's teaching behavior upon
children's acquisition of content.

Should teacher style differ during situations where ideas
are first being introduced from situations where mastery of
content may be expected? Is more or less verbal output on the
teacher's part called for in varying situations? What should
the rhythm of instruction be in the use of manipulative and
schematic materials? Are systematic procedures on the part of
the teacher more important than warm accepting behavior at

certain junctures of the learning process? Surely the char-
acteristic response of the teachers to questions such as these
as they actually perform in the classroom are important both
to identifiable differences in teacher style and to impact on
cognitive development. An intriguing question in this regard
is how potent the teacher's teaching behavior is as a model for
children in their cognitive development. The studies of
Bandura (7) and others demonstrate the ease with which young
children imitate entire repertoires of behavior under varying
conditions. Teachers are fond of recounting how children who
play school imitate even the subtlest gestures of the teacher
with finesse and aplomb. Can it be that children also in-
directly learn from their teachers characteristic ways of de-
fining the dimensions of a problem, of asking questions or of
relating one fact to another? The degree of skill with which
teachers themselves deal with subject matter and the clarity
with which they communicate this skill to children may be the
basis for very strong cognitive modeling in classroom situa-
tions. There is a general agreement that the skillful teacher
is less intrusive and talks less thus permitting the children
to engage themselves actively in learning. When teachers are
instructing, however, when they are "thinking out loud," the
potential benefit for eager listeners and imitators may be very
great indeed.

One of the functions which the teacher performs as a
manager is that of control. The style in which this function
is performed has been associated most often with negative and
positive effects upon the social development of children. It
is primarily in the situations where the adult manager exer-
cises control that she may be perceived by children to be
punitive or nonpunitive. Kounin and Gump (54) showed that
there was a higher incidence of aggression and hostility among

children whose teachers were rated as punitive than among
children whose teachers were rated as nonpunitive. Several
theoretical approaches can be used to account adequately for
this relationship between the punitiveness of teachers and that
of the children under their supervision. However this finding
is accounted for theoretically, it does provide an interesting
perspective for viewing discernible trends in the literature
for a need to "get tough" with deprived children because this
is the style of control which they understand, the one to which
they are presumably accustomed, and the style which they re-
spect and value. Another issue extends beyond social develop-
ment to inquire into the differential achievement of children
as the style with which the control function is performed is
varied. Evidence to date from various sources both in social
psychology and in teacher effectiveness research seems to in-
dicate, putting aside personal preferences for humane manage-
ment, that an indirect, nonpunitive and accepting teacher style
is closely related both to similar behavior within social
systems in the classroom and, in general, to improved student
performance. In the recently reported studies by Harvey, et al
(42, 43) a relationship was established between attitudes or
beliefs of teachers, and pupil behavior. Teachers were desig-
nated as concrete or abstract on the basis of their belief
systems. Those who were designated as abstract expressed
greater warmth toward children, were more flexible in meeting
their needs, invoked rules less frequently, and were more in-
genious in using play and teaching materials. They were, in
brief, more resourceful, less dictatorial and less punitive than
those designated as concrete. There were significant negative
relationships between dictatorialness and punitiveness, on the
one hand, and student cooperation, involvement, achievement and
helpfulness on the other. Harvey and his colleagues recognize
that the demonstration of such a relationship does not specify

the nature of causality. Any number of interactions among teacher style, children's behavior and learning climate could be operative in the classroom. A striking finding of the Harvey study was the very small percentage of the teachers involved in the total sample who could be designated as abstract teachers. As more data become available to enable us to "map the territory" of the classroom, we can then sketch in the salient interactions among variables. At present we can suggest that teacher style is important but not necessarily related in a linear fashion to pupil output; we can suggest further that teacher style can consciously be modified and used by teachers to achieve socially desirable ends.

This discussion on teacher style can be summarized briefly in the following series of suggestions.

a) Small samples of young children can be selected for intensive study, over a period of time, of the interacting effects of teacher style and what may be called pupil style. Both teacher style and pupil style deserve further theoretical elaboration but one purpose of such studies would be to yield practical information useful to teachers of young children.

b) We need to intensify examination of the effects of materials and activities upon the development of sex role and motivation in young children. Because research evidence has drawn a picture of self-disparagement as the dynamism in the ego system of deprived Negro boys, it may be useful to try to identify elements in teacher style among women which are most likely to intervene in this process of self-disparagement. This suggestion is made recognizing the fact that the most powerful intervention very well may be the use of successful men and older boys and models. It is nevertheless important to do the best we can now with the existing situation wherein female teachers predominate in programs for young children. Identifying the female teacher styles which are least harmful to deprived Negro boys may be a useful line of inquiry to pursue.

c) In respect to cognitive development, the suggestion
was made that the nature and content of instructional
episodes is likely to have a substantial direct effect
upon the child's cognitive development. In other
words young children may preempt the teacher's style
as an instructor for modeling their own cognitive
behavior.

d) A considerable literature exists in social develop-
ment to suggest that teacher style has some form of
reciprocal effect upon children's behavior. Recurring
emphases on the relationship on nonpunitiveness,
acceptance, and indirect control to improved student
performance suggest that more attention ought to be
given now to enable teachers to develop and use such
styles with skill.

RESPONSES

Ira Gordon
University of Florida

First I should thank Professor Rashid for her paper be-
cause those of us on the panel received it a few days ago and
we are one up on the rest of the participants in this seminar.
The one problem that I had with the paper is that it has so
many ideas. It was quite a stimulating thing to read but I
had trouble figuring out to what should I address my responses.
What you are going to get now is a running "stream of con-
sciousness" response to the paper. Let me first start off
with the comment about the shock-break between preschool and
primary school definitions of teacher role in which Dr. Rashid
said that at the preschool level there has been emphasis upon
research on the modification of social behavior. At the ele-
mentary school level research has been done on teacher
effectiveness. I think this is a very good statement of
things as they were. I hope it is not indicative of things as
they will be. I think that any such split between preschool
and primary is no longer viable. I think, too, that we have
to change our whole notions about even talking about preschool
as though it were pre anything at all. Some very interesting
work is going on in looking at five-year olds in terms of
classroom observation and the role of the teacher. And this
is work at Stanford originating again with Pauline Sears who
has been extremely productive and it is being followed through
to some degree by Dr. Katz who is now at the University of
Illinois. They have done what is called point-time samples of
pupil behavior in kindergarten. A point-time sample simply
means looking at each youngster long enough to categorize his
behavior along a whole set of dimensions: what is he doing at

the moment I look at him and then sampling the next child in
turn. They now have some data which has not yet been released
in the journals about the effects of computer assisted instruc-
tion on the actual social and cognitive behavior of first
grade youngsters. Such data would be very easily adaptable
to younger children than first grade. Let me give you some
of their categories for looking at kindergartners. This was
reported in Childhood Education in February 1968. The article
was written mostly by Lillian Katz called "Observing Behavior
in Kindergarten and Preschool Classes." It relates also very
much to the point we made about looking at kids as well as
teachers. You look at each child to see whether he is strongly
intent on work, intent on individual work, or attentive to the
teacher. You look at social work which is work that is cooper-
ative, attentive to another child. There is a category of
intent on non-teacher prescribed work. I guess the analogy in
the upper grades would be doing the French homework in the
English class. Disinterest and disruption is a category.
Categories of the cognitive domain include seeking information,
offering information, curiosity and experimentation, following
a cognitive plan, and engaging in problem solving. There are
other areas such as inter-personal behavior between teacher and
child. One of the things this does though is to cover both
domains, affective and cognitive. One of the weaknesses in
many other of our systems is that it addresses itself to only
one domain. Now we can begin to use this kind of instrument
across preschool and primary and get some kinds of leads on
Dr. Rashid's question as to whether the division between pre-
school and primary programs is staying with us or disappearing.
And if I can put in a plug for Florida, we are currently, and
Dr. Robert Soar is taking the leadership in this, trying to
develop a variety of systematic approaches one of which we have

called from our World War II antiaircraft days, "flac." We
don't know whether we are going to get flac on it or give
flac, but we're calling it that. "FLAC" stands for Florida
Affective Categories. We are trying to cut across cognitive
and affective behavior but we are applying only a little bit
of theory, which may be dangerous.

In terms of pupil characteristics we have raised the
question: "What might we see in a five-year old's behavior
that would be reflective in this case of a child being, in
terms of Piaget, at an egocentric stage in terms of his lan-
guage and behavior?" So that we have items on this, if he
talks to himself while he is playing rather than talking to
another child, or in terms of the category we've labeled simply
"me too," which is the phenomenon of sharing: the kid gets up
and says "I went on a pony ride Sunday" and everybody says
"Me too" you know. We are trying to get at how personalized
is the child's responses, how self-centered is he. Again we
don't know whether it's going to work. We will be trying it
out in a number of Follow Through places. The point I think
that needs to be made is that we do have to design systems
especially for the age levels of the youngsters with which we
are dealing. Present systems must be reworked, in effect, to
be usable in keeping with pupil characteristics and more ac-
curate descriptions of classrooms as they are in the lower
grades.

I think the point that was made that the measurement
of teacher competence has been basically fragmented and athe-
oretical is essentially true. But not completely true.
Flanders' work is related to a theory of social psychology
and certainly the work of Paul Gump relates clearly to a
school if not a theory which talks about the ecology of

behavior. And I would refer you to the work of Kounin in look-
ing at Detroit classrooms as being very systematic within a
particular theoretical view, an ecological view that says in
effect that setting determines behavior. Such a view holds
that you don't have to worry about the personality of the
teacher, you don't have to worry about the personality of the
individual child, if you can describe the setting, the setting
itself will tell what kind of behavior is allowed and what kind
of behavior will come forth.

In terms of directions for research we do need, as Dr.
Rashid said in our discussion this morning, more "description
and analysis of a wide variety of natural settings of class-
rooms at the preschool and primary level to see whether they
are similar or different." This is absolutely vital. But the
questions I would raise are: For what dimensions will we look?
What will be our criteria for selecting, if you will, what
items to put on the observation sheet and what items to omit?
Because anybody who thinks you can go in and just look at a
classroom and capture everything that is going on in some type
of behavior analysis writeup, is kidding himself. Eventually
you have to dimensionalize. You do have to categorize. You
can do it after the fact or before the fact but you surely
have to do it. Otherwise you would be like the neophyte the
first time he looks through the microscope; he doesn't see
anything there. You've got to come to it with some notions.
And here, the best safeguard is coming to it with a variety of
teams of observers, representing varieties of viewpoints, look-
ing at the same room. And this is one way to handle bias rather
than the single observer with his own biases looking.

But this thing raises the question of what common train-
ing. Dr. Rashid mentioned the need for a common language.
In addition to a common language, what common training are
we going to provide for observers? On the old Oscar the
first item was "teacher yells," the second item was "teacher
uses sarcasm." Well, everybody knows what yelling is, and
most everybody might agree on what sarcasm is. I used this
scale in Florida on elementary and secondary interns in a
variety of schools, urban and rural, etc. The same scale
was used on student teachers in Minneapolis; Donald Medley had
used it in New York City on first-year teachers. And when
you looked at the data, the Florida teachers don't yell or
don't use sarcasm. In New York City there was a high degree
of yelling and sarcasm. The question we have to ask is:
How much of this is a function of the region? In other words,
is it true that more yelling and sarcasm is going on in the
New York classroom or is this a function of the way I trained
my observers and the way others trained their observers.
Unfortunately since this was several years ago, we will never
know. But we heed to develop common training as well as com-
mon language. When an observer in California says this was
an "X" and an observer in New York says this was an "X" we
will have some guarantee of a common meaning of an "X", not
simply in somebody's writeup but in actuality.

If we look at the filing systems notion that Dr. Rashid
gave of "goods" and "bads", I don't think this is necessarily
bad at all. We have our goods and bads; let's be honest
about it. The thing we need in an observation system though
is to list both the goods and bads of the system.

I'm sort of a self-concept theorist, whatever that means
today. I'm very interested in teachers doing things that en-
hance and develop a youngster's self-concept. Don't ask me
to get very specific about what it is that enhances somebody's
self-concept. Let's say then that I think the teachers should
call the child by name. This is a nice good simple device
you know. Here's a kid who comes to school and doesn't know
his name. The way to enhance his self identity is to call him
by name. So I would put "teacher calls the kid by name" on my
observation report. Somebody may think that's a very simple
and stupid kind of thing to put on an observation report. He
says the way to enhance the kid's self-concept is through
praise for specific acts. So, okay, we'll have something on
there that says when kid did "A", teacher said "Good boy" you
know, and stood up and cheered and did whatever came to her
mind for positive reinforcement. The point is that both of
these ought to be on the system. Then we can see which of
these relates to outcomes. Let's not prejudge what relates
to outcomes; this is where I think we can learn heavily from
Medley who makes no prejudgements. Prejudgements can be con-
trolled as long as we list the possible presence or absence
of a number of these kinds of things, so long as the observer
records these; as long as we can relate them to specified
pupil outcomes....Of course the question of how one measures
self-concept comes up which is another problem. Measurement
questions aside we should include items such as self-concept.
We need to pool and select, as Dr. Rashid said, to bring our
biases with us and have them represented in these systems. I
would think that the best way of doing this is not to include
them all on one observation sheet, but to have different
systems of observation. Simultaneous recording by several ob-
servers is preferable to having one observer managing too many
diverse items in one system.

I'd like to get back to the point on Flanders again. I
made it in our earlier discussion this morning. The problem
here is that many of the systems were developed without refer-
ence to subject matter. This seems to me to emphasize the
need to recognize what often has been ignored in classroom
observation systems which, by and large, have been developed
by educational psychologists. And that is the curriculum in
its old meaning of subject matter. If the settings, as Barker,
Kounin, Gump and others point out, govern much behavior, then
the behavior setting must be specified. Let me give you an
example of some of the work we are doing down in St. Peters-
burg, Florida in which we are simply using the point-time
sampling that we borrowed from Sears. We were looking at
different behavior settings to see what the differential re-
sponses of boys and girls were in elementary school. We
found that this was insufficient because to say that it was
a reading class still doesn't tell one enough. So then we
had to say the class was using the Scott Foresman series and
the teacher had it organized into three reading groups in
which "group A" was around her doing thus and so. We had to
get extremely specific because we found that differences in
behavior were a function of these settings. When it was a
formal reading group, then by and large the boys who were not
in the reading group were goofing off and all of their be-
havior was on the nonacademic, wandering, daydreaming, part
of the continuum. On the other hand when the reading class
was structured so that it was independent reading, then the
youngsters who were classified as low-achievers were goofing
off; the kids who were high-achievers were attending and en-
gaged in work-oriented tasks. This points out that one has
to talk about a child rather than a whole class. In the situ-
ation above, a low-achieving boy was doing practically all
the goofing off and the high-achieving girl was paying atten-
tion. I'm not about to say which was causing what. Maybe we
can get out of it by saying it was a correlation.

If we look at flexibility again, we cannot talk about flexibility as an abstract of saying it's always going to be good. Teachers must be flexible. Teachers must be indirect. We need to relate flexibility to goals. Some of the intriguing work that Soar did, looking at a South Carolina classroom, points out that we really ought to have a circumplex model of teacher behavior, in the same way that we need a circumplex model, Schaeffer has pointed out, of maternal behavior. We can talk about the "warm teacher", the "cold teacher" and the "controlling teacher" and the "non-controlling teacher." These are independent dimensions. In interaction analysis they are treated as if they are all one dimension; they're not. In other words it is possible to have a warm controlling teacher; you can have a warm-freeing teacher; a cold-controlling teacher; and a cold-freeing teacher. What Soar found is that learning depends upon what particular mix of these dimensions is taking place. For example, in reading achievement in the elementary school, most growth was associated with indirect control or a non-supportive climate, or direct control and a supportive climate. What is characteristically conceived as a good teacher, that is the warm non-controlling one, was not the best teacher for reading achievement. Effectiveness here seemed to be linked to cold or controlling behavior; one of the aversive ractors, if you will, had to be present to elicit reading achievement. If vocabulary growth is the goal, then the best teacher for vocabulary growth was the supportive non-controlling teacher. In both of these situations the worst teacher is the controlling non-supportive. This is apparently a "mix" to avoid.

The point here is that we can't talk about any dimension as necessarily good in all situations. It must be related to pupil growth, it must be related to goals. One of our problems unfortunately is that we have been stressing, in Head Start and Follow Through programs, only the cognitive domain in terms of measuring the goal. We talk about I.Q. and where a child

improved in cognitive development. It may be that the very
teacher who can do the best on that or the style that brings
that about, is not necessarily the style that brings about
certain kinds of affective growth which we may also be in-
terested in. I hope we're interested in both domains. The
problem then, it is a lot more complex than we used to think
it was.

This leads me back then to Dr. Rashid's point about the
need to describe before we assess. It seems to me that there
is a model that Wright gave in the Manual of Research on
Child Development, in which he talks about an open system
rather than a closed system. Perhaps we need to go in first
and simply try to describe what we see. Then we can move to
hypothesis making, in which we set up some particular cate-
gories in a closed system and observe simply for those. From
this we can begin to trace relationships to pupil behavior.
I think Jack Wirtz's studies of the Israeli child rearing
settings may offer us a clue. This is very specific, very
detailed, very elegant way of describing something. What he
did, in effect, was to look for a period of time at just what
was going on. He didn't look at it from the psychoanalytic
viewpoint or from any other preconceived framework. He looked
first and tried to describe the settings. He listed these
settings which included feeding, diaper changing, sleeping,
etc. Then he identified the agents who were interacting with
the infant during this time. He listed how many minutes the
mother spent in feeding, how many minutes the father spent,
how much time with the boy, how much time with the girl, and
so on. With this tremendous amount of information, they can
begin to relate it to a variety of other kinds of responses.
This approach does give us a way of looking at the questions:

"What is going on?" Out of this welter of activities what is "information" and what becomes "noise"? That is still a basic question and I think this approach is important and useful.

We were talking earlier this morning about the use of videotape which hadn't been mentioned much in our discussion. From my point of view this is a "gimmick" which can be very useful. But if you ask a teacher just to look at her own behavior on the videotape the first kinds of things she is going to address herself to are not necessarily related to pedagogical behaviors or pupil outcomes at all. It could be "I didn't know my skirt was so short." Or "My hair wasn't combed." Or "Gee, I didn't know my voice was so low." But it will be more fundamental personal attributes that will be extremely difficult to relate in kindergarten at least to pupil growth. The point is that one has to have something in mind for looking at what's on the videotape rather than simply "Well, I'm going to go make tapes and everybody will look at them and enjoy them."

If we move then to the notion that Dr. Rashid had, then we need to "describe the patterns of activity settings, the explicit or public objective which such settings are described to reach and the behaviors which result from the requirements of the settings." I think these are very key ideas. And I would simply like to reinforce what she had to say about them. As we turn to evaluation of Head Start or Follow Through, these ideas are critical. We have spent considerable time and effort in describing inputs and outputs. And we also need to describe what's going on in the assembly line. I think this is what Dr. Rashid is suggesting; we need to describe the patterns of activity-settings used.

38

It is fallacious to assume that because two places say
they are doing the same thing, or are using the same model, that
they actually are the same operationally. We need to engage in
a very systematic observation: the kind of monitoring or
quality control, if you will, for taking samples over time of
what is actually transpiring, to see whether or not they are
doing what the model says they ought to be doing, and whether
or not in reality the models they say they hold really differ
when they become operational. We will attempt to do some of
this. Dr. Soar is now attempting to do some of this. Let's
look at the Follow Through models, for example, which are
going to be instituted in a variety of communities. Some places
will use Bereiter and Engelman, others will use the British
Infant School, or the Bank Street approach and so forth. On
what dimensions are they alike and on what dimensions are they
different? Only as we begin to address ourselves carefully to
that kind of question will we have the kind of research and
evaluation that tells us the directions for new programs. Here
are some possible mixes; the degree of cognitive emphasis; the
source of reinforcement; the amount of internal versus external
control; the degree of structure; the provision for explicit
feedback. All of these can be looked at pretty carefully in
terms of classroom systematic observation. If we follow-up
again on the point of the need to train teachers in observation
systems, yes, I heartily subscribe. You know my biases already.
I don't think we should train them in a single system. I
think we need to train them in a variety of systems so I would
like to train them in both Kounin, Flanders, FLAC and so on.
I think this is possible with time. Teachers ought to self-
appraise in relation to sets of goals. But they need training
in defining goals, in what activities to use, etc. If we take
Dr. Rashid's example of the trip to the zoo, the average teacher
will not be able to discuss the rationale for this beyond the

cliché "It's a good experience." I would remind you that
Dewey said that all experiences are not equally educative.
Why is the teacher taking children to the zoo? What does
she expect to come from this trip? How is she going to
measure outcomes? The provision of experience per se ought
not to be the goal. We turn then to the second half on
teacher style.

The match of cognitive style or teacher style with pupil
cognitive style I think is extremely important. There's
good data on the individuality of pupil perception and the
importance of the pupil's perceptions of the teacher's goals.
But let's not kid ourselves on the simplicity of the relation-
ships involved. Let's take a high school situation for kids
who have been labeled failures. One of these students feels
that he can't learn, let's say, and that he has been dumped
into a special class is further demonstration to him that the
school thinks he can't learn. The teacher comes around and
attempts to purvey an attitude of "I think you can." Then
the student thinks either she's crazy or I'm crazy but he sets
out somehow or other to prove that something is wrong. I
think there is some work going on at Stanford matching teacher
and pupil cognitive style. Again I would hesitate about making
prejudgements. In other words, suppose a kid has an analytic
style or a concrete style, or he's impulsive. I don't think
we should make the assumption that the teacher style should
match the pupil style; that we need analytic teachers for
analytic kids, synthetic teachers for synthetic kids, impulsive
teachers for impulsive kids. It may very well be that we need
just the opposite; that the impulsive kid needs the analytic
teacher, and so forth. Again we should not forget putting into
the equation the nature of the task. It may be that the task
operates coercively: the only way you can solve a given task,
for example, is to be analytical. It doesn't much matter at

this point whether the kid is impulsive or the teacher is impulsive--the only "winning" style is analytical on that task and the task coerces both the teacher and kid to be analytical for that period of time. We need to change our equation from "teacher behavior equals pupil behavior" to "teacher behavior modified by task requirements equals pupil behavior modified by pupil characteristics."

If we turn to the problem of self-disparagement I would refer you to two references: one is Rosenthal's very intriguing little book called Pygmalion in the Classroom and the other, Esther Fuch's book about I.S. 201 called Pickets at the Gates, which offer a number of clues about teacher behavior particularly in respect to the ways in which teachers non-verbally communicate expectations to children which convince children that they are worthwhile or not worthwhile. In Fuch's book for example she asked the Harlem kids "How do you know the teacher hates ya?" One of the kinds of responses is "Every time I get near her she backs off." Words are not necessary. It's quite clear what the teacher is conveying.

In terms of this business again of cognitive growth and how the teacher might influence this, Taba's work is extremely interesting. And Earl Seager's work he made at Merrill Palmer and the report he made of it and some of the work they were doing in the English schools of teaching for multiple attributes offers a great deal for us both in preschool and primary grades and I think it's reported in the new book by Seigal and Hooper on cognitive development. There is a book that Wiley will be bringing out by Sara Smilansky. I don't know the exact title but it's got all the right words in the title: deprivation, disadvantage, socio-dramatic play and research. The problem of the concept of the teacher as active rather

than passive may be one of the delineations between the pre-
school role and the primary role. Smilansky reports on the
very interesting finding that the kindergarten teacher in
Israel, who is a good middle-class lady, would think nothing
of playing the direct teacher role at home with her own
children but would be afraid of direct teaching in the class-
room because she might hurt the children's psyches. Such a
teacher saw her teacher role, and more as a parent than as a
teacher, in terms of the provision of direct instruction. On
the other hand the disadvantaged parent, which means in Israel
those who had origins in the Arab lands, are equally warm and
loving. There is no difference in the affectional climate in
these homes but these mothers didn't see themselves as teachers.
They would say for example "Go put your shoes on." The middle-
class mother would say "Come sit next to me, darling, and I'll
show you how to put your shoe on. First you do this and then
you tie them..." you know, the whole bit. The point is that
the disadvantaged child was getting indirect teaching at home,
going to school where he got this nice middle-class woman as
a teacher, who didn't believe in teaching him in school either
and so he was getting indirect teaching from both ends of the
line. I wonder how many of our primary and preschool teachers
are like the Israeli kindergarten teachers who think it is
anathema to tell the kid anything directly or show him some-
thing or break learning down into small steps.

I've talked more than my time so I'm going to stop.
Though I do have more to say. Perhaps we'll have time during
the discussion period to get more specific about some of the
issues presented thus far.

42

Martin Haberman
Rutgers University

This is a good paper. I had three criteria for deciding it was a good paper. I learned something from reading it; secondly I felt compelled to deal with the ideas in the paper rather than my own ideas; thirdly, I was motivated to rethink some of the things I believe as a result of reading the paper. The second reason I'm grateful for being invited is that most people today are considered experts in teacher education. It's like politics, religion, sports; the fellow who cleaned the suit I'm wearing probably feels that he's an expert in teacher education. And the funny thing is that to some degree he's right. He has lived through the system and maybe this gives him the right to be, if not an expert, at least a critic. It seems that a professional teacher educator or someone who spends his time just in this field is usually sloughed off. He seems to be a member of a vanishing breed. I'm grateful to be invited someplace as a teacher educator and I appreciate the opportunity to speak in that context. I would like to deal with each of the issues that Dr. Rashid has raised. I know you don't have the paper. There were eight points, four in the first section and four in the second section where she summarized and made some suggestions. I would like to repeat what those suggestions are to emphasize her paper and to make some comments about them in respect to their implications for teacher education.

After the first section which dealt with classroom management, Dr. Rashid suggested that we need more descriptive studies to determine areas of similarity and difference between preschool and primary grade programs. My experience with this issue has been this. At a place like Rutgers, the Douglass men and the Douglass girls self-select themselves into secondary education because of their strong liberal arts backgrounds. So that we

have to contend with the issue that, from a teacher-education
point of view, whoever prepares for teaching in this country
is doing so largely by a self-selection process. Whereas
people actually working in the field are faced with pressing
needs that require both commitment and professional skill.
The analogy with medicine might be preparing dermatologists
when the basic need may be cancer research or finding cures
for fatal diseases. Now I'm in the process of placing two
hundred student teachers. Most of the girls at Douglass
want to teach French in Jersey City or in Newark. They want
it arranged to have a cab bring them back and forth or for
the school to be within walking distance. Now the fact that
in the entire state of New Jersey we need only eleven teachers
of language and they are in the area of Latin and Spanish
doesn't mitigate the fact that most of the Douglass girls are
going to wish to teach French or possibly French-English. What
I'm getting at is that from a teacher education point of view
there is probably a basic difference in who prepares to teach.
Let's look at colleges and universities which prepare people
to staff Head Start programs, or to staff the needs of American
education, let alone Head Start and other "new" programs. The
total output of teachers in early childhood, among some twenty
two hundred universities and colleges in this country was
twelve hundred last year. Now if the colleges and universities
in this country are preparing twelve hundred teachers in early
childhood and we continue to look only to colleges and univer-
sities--the best thing that can be said about us is that we are
unrealistic. That's the best thing that can be said about us.
Another statistic: five-sixths of the people who are certified
by their states, get "A's" and "B's" in student teaching. Still
another statistic: five-sixths either don't teach or quit in
their first year. Now that's very interesting. Suppose five-
sixths of the kids in the Head Start program were dropped. Do
you think the public would be concerned about it? I think they
might. Well, anyway, this first issue about the similarities

and differences between preschool and primary programs. There
is a difference for one major reason. The people who self-select
themselves to become teachers in those areas and on that level,
and here I'll make a global generalization, teachers of early
childhood are concerned with activities. They are "activity-
oriented cats." People in the primary grades are concerned with
skills-they are skill-oriented people. People who work with
older children are content-oriented people. It seems to me this
is the one area where Dr. Rashid deserved to be and was faulted
by Dr. Gordon. The content to be taught has to be emphasized
in research and that is the first major point I want to make.

The second point of Dr. Rashid's summary, which I think
is a good one also, concerns a standard system of notation.
I wrote in "GREAT". But as Dr. Gordon pointed out, and as
others besides Dr. Gordon pointed out, a way of seeing is also
a way of not seeing. One needs categories to describe but as
soon as you have categories you've put blinders on and preclude
the opportunity to have a complete intake. I think his sugges-
tion about some kind of initial open point of view, one of
recognizing biases, is the way to proceed. A way of seeing is
a way of not seeing. One needs the categories but as soon as
they are developed other things are precluded.

The third point which Dr. Rashid made is the need for more
information about the degree to which the behavior of the teacher
as an adult manager is coerced by activity settings. How does
the construct of teacher flexibility relate to classroom ecology?
This is I think the most important point of her paper and there-
fore, the most important reaction that I can give. Institutional
role and the press of social systems in which we participate is
the greatest lack in the research area. The reason this is true
is because education is basically based on psychological deter-
minants of human behavior rather than on economic models or
political science models. Let me give you examples of what I

mean. Teacher education for fifty years at least and perhaps
longer than that has tried to improve individual teachers on
the assumption that if individual teachers improve, the whole
system will be improved and changed. This would be equivalent
to going to Viet Nam, saying to a private "What do you do?"
"Well, I give out overalls." "How many did you give out last
month?" "Fifty." "This month give out two hundred. We'll
make a two hundred percent increase---four hundred percent
increase in efficiency." We would ask another private "What
do you do?" "I bury the dead." "How many did you bury last
month?" "Oh, I buried ten." "Alright, this month bury twenty."
Not only do we ask these questions of the soldiers in Viet Nam
but we help each of those men see the purpose and _el fully
committed to what he is doing. Let's assume all those things
are possible. That we get them to improve their productivity
and we get them to really believe in what they are doing. We
help the medical corpsman see that his job is the most important,
we help the supply guy see that his job is the most important,
and so on. Everybody is now fully actualized and four hundred
percent more productive. My hypothesis is we would still have
the same problem in Viet Nam that we have now, because the
problems deal with institutional-social system relationships
related to goal orientations and purposes. And it is completely
simple-minded to conceive of the problem in terms of improving
each product. And this is the basic model we have in teacher
education. So we help a teacher to get a Master's degree some-
place so she'll be a better teacher. And that somehow will
"rub off" on the total system. It has not worked, it does not work
now, it will not work in the future. But that's the model we
currently use. Let's carry this further in terms of Dr. Rashid's
point. If you tell me I'm an airline stewardess I will engage
in certain behaviors. I will first give out magazines, I will
then insist that people's belts are buckled, I will then say
"coffee, tea, or milk?," I will then go around and find out

who wants dinner, then serve the dinner; I will then collect
the empty trays; and I will make an announcement when we take
off and land and I will also introduce a colleague who will
show you how to breathe in and out. There are eight be-
haviors. But that has nothing to do with personality. There
are eight behaviors within a very limited role. The same is
true of an usher. He has four purposes in his role. He
needs to show people to their seats, show people to the fire
exits in case of an emergency, stand outside to announce
"standing room only" and hand out programs. The point is
that you may "self-actualize" me and then put me into my role.
What difference does it make? You make me very creative and
put me into the role and then tell me I need thirty credits
in how to improve my limited role. Let's stay with this
third recommendation: effective teachers, effective man-
agers, can distinguish between managing and organizing the
environment and managing ideas. There is a real difference.
A teacher who cannot distinguish between the two would do
something like this: "Well, where do you think we ought to
keep the art paper? Let's vote. How many think we ought to
keep it on this side of the room? Seven. How many think we
ought to keep it on that side of the room? Fourteen. Okay,
that side of the room. How many colors should we use? How
many colors should we use when we make our Father's Day
cards? How many people want red? I'll write that on the
board. How many people want black?" Et cetera, et cetera.
Then suddenly it is time to make the Father's Day cards. I
roll up the screen and say "Here's the one I want you to
make." Period. Now suddenly when it comes to the work, I'm
directing! In the management and organization of the room
I'm Miss Thomas Jefferson of 1912. When it comes to the
actual practice of the sharing of ideas I roll up the screen

and say: "Here's the Father's Day card. Make it; I will walk around the room to tell people how well they're doing....That's a good one....That's a bad one!....That's a bad one!"

I'm drawing this in broad strokes because I think that's the way we remember things. The teacher who is effective does the opposite. She says: "We're not going to talk for the next half hour. The art paper is going to be on that side of the room. Don't get out of your chair unless you're going for art paper. When you are through do something else." Bing, bing, bing, right down the line; but when it comes to the Father's Day card she will say, "Gee, that looks interesting. Who are you going to sent it to? Your uncle? That's nice." Because maybe he doesn't have a father. But the content of the ideas is open ended. What is "managed" ought not be the ideas but the organization of the materials. The equipment, the time schedule, etc. And these ought to be managed to permit the students to handle ideas without excessive restriction and premature evaluation.

Now the fourth recommendation has to do with getting systematic feedback about teaching behavior. What teachers need is not simply feedback but guided feedback. That's point one. Secondly, teachers must be reassured that the feedback about themselves as individuals is important. There is a low self-concept among most teachers, who in the adult population are disadvantaged in the same way that inner-city children are the disadvantaged in early childhood groups. I think teachers are disadvantaged and maybe feedback has to start with the teacher's self-concept. Maybe this has to be the very first step of a teacher education program. That's what youngsters in school are very concerned about and also those who are preparing to teach. The third stage would be to recognize the results of

48

the feedback on the child's behavior. Remember Dickens' Christmas Carol? It wasn't only Marley's ghost who frightened Scrooge as the angel of death took Scrooge around. Scrooge actually had the opportunity to see the effects of his behavior. Scrooge had the opportunity to see into the future--to see if Tiny Tim would die. He had the opportunity to see that he himself would be unmourned. The opportunity to see the effects of one's behavior is a compelling situation.

The fourth level is the role hang-up. You know the effect: and this is the point I made earlier, you know the effect you have on a youngster but you are caught in the role anyhow. Now not only is there feedback on the first level of self-concept but there is feedback on the second level of working on your behavior; on the third level of the effects on the child; the fourth level is the institutional level. Teachers are caught in the role. Remember Melville's great novel, Billy Budd? The illustration is a dramatic one. The Captain didn't want to hang Billy. And the only one who knew it was Billy. When they put the noose around his neck he looked at the Captain as if to say "Don't feel bad, Captain. I know you gotta do this." Billy was the only one who really understood. The Captain begged Billy to forgive him. He was saying as long as I wear the Queen's epaulets there's only one thing I can do. The roles were reversed. Poor Billy was reassuring the Captain: He was saying "I understand Captain, I understand you have to hang me, Sir." We need to look at more than feedback and the result of the teacher's behavior. We need to examine the system. Teachers must decide on participating in the institution because there are still changes they think you can make or opting out. But as teachers do participate in the system they need to be inside critics. As long as one is willing to wear the Queen's

epaulets, one must realize that he too is a murderer. Last
week I was faced with a young man at Rutgers who had had an
"F" in a course. We both admitted the course was poor. But
all I could say to him was "You have to take the course
again. There are two thousand other people on eight campuses
for whom that course is required. We can try to improve
courses, make them more relevant, and so on; but while that's
happening you have to take the course again." The point I'm
trying to make is that there is an institutional hang-up. If
I were a first-grade teacher in a public school in New York
City, I would make my major goal the teaching of reading. As
limited as I think this is, I think that's the nature of the
system and that's the way in which I would be evaluated. Un-
less you're going to change the way in which you evaluate me,
and unless you're going to change the way in which you evaluate
the children, that's what I'm going to teach. I'm going to
teach reading and I'm going to teach it well. And so we come
back to the institutional role. And the point which Dr.
Rashid made triggered all that off.

I think we ought to look now at her points dealing with
teacher style. This is so important. The first point is
teacher style. Louie Hyle studied it at Brooklyn College a
few years ago. Teachers were grouped into certain categories
of personality and students were grouped as waiverers, oppos-
ers, conformers, strivers. Then there was a match of who
learned the most with which. Now here is the point on which
I would disagree with Dr. Gordon. It isn't a question of
matching them up alike or matching them up differently. It's
a question of matching them up in teams as it is done in good
early childhood settings. One youngster may have four teachers;
a broad range of human personality instead of one individual

is involved. The child has a person concerned about neat organization, planning, time schedules; a somebody to see that everything works well. A good part of anyone's life requires that. I want a person like that to land planes at the airport. There are jobs in our society which require compulsively neat people. Building a bridge is an example of a situation where such people are to be valued and honored and used. The great motivator, the great person who can motivate people to do anything, but who doesn't know how to teach them is useful. After he's got the students interested and they are all looking at him he says "What do I do now?" It isn't a question of personality labeling, it's a question of using people of different personalities in team efforts. It's a question of dropping the simple model of "one teacher-one child". Let's use the model which Head Start uses so well in its centers. There are bus drivers, parents, assistant teachers, and so on. The model is based on personality, not on credentials. It is a team model not a model using a one-to-one correspondence between licensed teachers and children.

I think Dr. Rashid's points about sex roles are well taken particularly in respect to the disadvantaged. But I do want to add something. I think that children learn their sex roles from other people besides their parents. We have a little girl who reached the age of four; we decided it would be good to teach her that she has to wear clothes. So we started buying her pretty clothes and so on; you know. We started giving her walking lessons. This is true. We told her how pretty she was. She became very clothes conscious, very feminine. But she still goes around naked. Now she did not learn this from her parents. We had a conscious program to teach her to love and value clothes. We still work on it. But she's naked every chance she can get. Children learn

from their peers. They learn from other adults, they learn from their total culture. They learn from television. A second example. In vocabulary and language we usually look at the parental model. I remember taking my four year old son into a store in Milwaukee and saying to myself, "Holy mackerel, look at all the hats." And he said "Dad, notice the large variety." Four years old! I said in my heart, I didn't have to say it out loud, "Geez, look at all the hats." He says and enunciates clearly, "Dad, notice the large variety." Now when you consider sex roles in specific terms, it's not simply sex, it's power. One thing that can be done is this: when you select a group of people for young children, the one variable to look at is people who think they have power over what happens to them. That is not only a masculine trait it is a very pervasive influence on personality development. All the disadvantaged groups need the feeling that they have power and are not just being misused by others. One way to develop this feeling of power is to learn it by having models who do have some power. It's not just that I'm a man and I'm wearing a suit. It's this dimension of being the kind of person who perceives the field and himself largely in control over what happens instead of perceiving himself as a leaf in a stream.

The next to the last point Dr. Rashid made was in relation to cognitive development. I think teachers need to be prepared to deal with the kinds of knowledge rather than the subject of knowledge. Are we interested in teaching generalization? It doesn't matter whether it's in chemistry or physical education. Do we want to teach appreciation, do we want to teach a skill, do we want to teach a principle, a theory? There are pedagogical procedures for teaching lots of different kinds of knowledge. In the real world, though, we usually group teachers in teams by subject matter fields.

He's an English teacher and she's a social studies teacher so we'll group them. I'm suggesting that we have to group teachers more in terms of their instructional skills for teaching various kinds of content. We talked about the kinds of personality earlier as a basis for developing teams of teachers for young children.

How shall we select critical teacher behaviors? Are they teacher behaviors which lead to student learnings in a truly causal way? Can we afford the time such research would take?

I'm willing to assume that certain kinds of things are worth knowing by teachers. I'm willing to assume that how to make a response to a stupid or inappropriate child response is a skill worth developing. I'm not going to wait for researchers to connect that skill with learning. I'm going to assume that differentiating assignments on the basis of interest is a skill worth learning. Even though researchers have not yet connected this with high reading scores. I'm going to begin where they leave off. My concern is changing the behavior of adults preparing to teach. I don't see how we can waste our time while a few people develop some esoteric kinds of designs to identify causal relationships. I'm going to try to do it by convincing you on two bases. There are at least three ways to convince people: on the basis of research evidence and on two other bases. One is on the basis of experiential evidence, face value. The other is in relation to some theory which supports the experiential evidence. A search for causal relationships can become a will o' the wisp. Using experience and theory as the basis for making decisions may be necessary expedients in terribly complex situations.

I want to say something in regard to personality change.
Most of the research so far deals with characteristics, per-
sonality attributes, belief systems and perceptions. Research
hasn't dealt with the structures of personality. Teacher ed-
ucators deal with adults with little opportunity to change them
except in very superficial ways. Personality ought to be a
major criterion in the selection into teacher education. But
the reason we have so little data on personality is the diffi-
culty of collecting it on college students. One can't get
permission to get personality profiles on adults for a very good
reason. There are large numbers of teachers and a large number
of people preparing to teach them. They represent a normal
distribution of the population. Because of the sheer numbers
of people involved, the best that one can do is to select out
potentially harmful cases. To pretend we can deal with person-
ality, on any level but the superficial is to be hopelessly
romantic given the large numbers of people involved.

This brings me to the final point that Dr. Rashid made.
If we do away with courses and workshops we can develop either
mini-courses or some form of feedback systems. There must be
some specified goal so that, for example, teachers know they
are going to learn some specific listening skills. Teachers
need to know they're expected to improve by "X" amount how
much they remember of what another person said. They know
they're going to become "X" amount more successful at guessing
the underlying feelings. They know they're going to become
"X" amount more successful at remembering the questions asked
to get someone to talk more. Teachers are aware that they are
expected to become "X" amount more successful at discerning
generalizations and sifting facts from fancy. First there is
a one-day workshop in listening; two months from now there

54

will be a one-day observation in the practice of implementing
these same four listening skills in the classroom. We need
a whole sequence of very specific behaviors that we want
teachers to be able to perform. But these behaviors come
from our assumptions. They are assumptions justified by
some theoretical commitment and some experience. If we wait
for hard data about effective behaviors we may have to wait
and wait and wait and never get into the ball game.

These are some of my reactions to Dr. Rashid's points.
I'll stop now so you can discuss some of these issues.

Helen Richards
Grambling State College

It is important that we seek to find out whether it is
feasible, on the basis of current research and practices, to
define and evaluate what might be acceptable as a "model"
role of the teacher, her teaching style, and classroom manage-
ment. For years, we have been trying to find ways of measur-
ing a teacher's effectiveness. It appears that no one has
been successful in setting forth highly defensible tech-
niques.

Professor Rashid has done a scholarly job in putting
before us the concern that, to date, research appears not to
give clear or specific directions in regard to teacher style
and classroom management. Her question is focused: What,
if any, yardsticks can be determined through present research
to justify teacher style and classroom management? - -

- - In an address at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education in New Orleans, then commissioner Harold Howe, II, said, "If we cannot measure teaching. . . . weigh it, take its temperature, or otherwise appraise it." He questioned whether we should consider that teaching is headed downhill. As I respond to Dr. Rashid's paper, in a similar vein, I wonder from what base does research attempt to measure the teacher's "contribution to the educational enterprise or teacher style and classroom management." To what extent has it been possible for researchers to isolate teacher style and classroom management of teachers who guide the educational experiences for a specific group of learners -- preschool children?

The global coverage of classroom management as portrayed by Paul Gump and described by Jackson in his book LIFE IN THE CLASSROOM provides a broad base for research designs on class-room management. I agree with Dr. Rashid that more specific identification of variables and their relationship within the natural setting of the classroom would do much to extend un-derstanding and interpretation of the specific classroom system being managed. The soul and substance of the art of classroom management, if designed for educational purposes, is to stimu-late, encourage, and direct learning of children. It appears that what is being sought here is for evidence of managerial classroom situations that define for us or demonstrate for us effective ways that this has or may be done.

Dr. Rashid inferred a belief or feeling that, at the pri-mary grade level, the teacher's role as a manager of the class-room is more intrusive than at the preschool level. O'Brien suggested that the teacher makes the difference in the class-room. He stated that the teacher who is characterized by

56

stimulating, intellectual development; the teacher who is
warm and supportive; and the teacher who "actively inter-
venes" in the educational process is the one who makes the
difference. He does recommend, however, that the need is
greater for teacher intervention in the ongoing learning
process in the preschool for poor or economically and cul-
turally deprived children. According to O'Brien, these
children are simply unable to initiate the type of inter-
action with their environment that will result in desired
intellectual growth.[1]

It is vitally important that consideration be given to
Dr. Rashid's request that research designs take a serious
look at "differences in perception of roles on the part of
preschool teachers and primary grade teachers." How the
teacher perceives her role is a fundamental basis for de-
termining classroom management. The teacher needs to be
clear enough about her role and responsibility so that she
can strike a balance between "setting limits" and permissive-
ness.

Preschool teachers, and primary teachers for that matter,
need to be assured that they are responsible for establishing
a balance of controls, allowing children fluidity and ease,
which work toward the development of self-control. On the
other hand, they need assurance that too much permissiveness
frequently implies to the child a lack of adult concern. How
and when will guidelines be set that will give a reasonable
measure of security or assurance for preschool teachers?

---

[1]O'Brien and Lopate, "Pre-School Programs and Intellectual
Development," (pamphlet) (Urbana, Ill.: University of
Illinois, College of Education).

I wish I could prescribe for teachers the type of class-
room management that would establish a balance of controls.
- - Unlike a doctor's prescription, the dosage cannot be
handed out in neat bottles of pink, green, or yellow pills.
It is to research that we must run -- and this appears to be
what Dr. Rashid is asking that research do for the sake of
"improved classroom management."

Noting the problem with which teachers are constantly
faced -- what is good and what is bad in terms of the total
welfare and development of young children as they attempt to
create the proper environment for learning -- I endorse Dr.
Rashid's view that there is urgent need to first find ways to
observe in order to describe the desired behavioral patterns
sought in children rather than observing to appraise behavior.
It appears that a basis for description of basic behavioral
patterns was what Clark Moustakas and Minnie P. Berson had in
mind in their statement of the aims of preelementary education.
Also, Nolan C. Kearney's summary of objectives in the ele-
mentary school was toward this end.[2]

Further in this regard, a look at the characteristics
and needs of five-year-olds and how the kindergarten tries to
meet them as outlined by Salot and Leavitt in THE BEGINNING
KINDERGARTEN TEACHER may serve as a means for more sober think-
ing and planning for research designs which will describe be-
havior as a basis for more effective classroom management.

---

[2]De-Young, et al., American Education (New York: McGraw-Hill,
1964), pp. 134, 154-55.

With respect to adaptability or flexibility of the teach-
er as a manager of the instructional setting for learning,
there seems to be not only a need for clarification of flexi-
bility, but a need to understand the preschool child as the
central factor in the classroom that gives cause for the need
of flexibility. Teachers need some type of measuring rod
from which they may judge or assess their reactions or re-
sponses to the different personalities they attempt to guide
and shape -- for the sensitive, perceptive teacher recognizes
that there is nothing so _unequal_ as equal treatment of un-
equals.

It might be well for those of us who seek for possible
answers to perplexing questions about classroom management
and for those of us who administer the programs in which the
managerial classroom officers (the teachers) hold forth to
reread Kozol's book DEATH AT AN EARLY AGE. I am not sug-
gesting that the type of classroom management or teaching
style illustrated in this book is widespread. However, the
fact that this could happen in 20th century America "in the
60's" cannot be dismissed lightly. It is at this point that
I may be projecting beyond the intent of this analytical
paper, but I believe I am keeping within the bounds in saying
that we need more specific descriptions from research --
descriptions that are practical to the point that they can be
interpreted and used by preschool and primary teachers. As-
suming that this can be done, the question arises: "What is
beyond the completed research; who will help the teacher to
effect, in her classroom management and teaching style, the
needed changes when research gives more specific directions?"

Since the teacher is the individual through whom the planned (not formal) program of education reaches the young child, it is extremely important that Dr. Rashid has devoted a portion of her paper to "the way in which the teacher plays the role of classroom manager." She has termed it "teacher style."

A teacher is a sculptor who molds the child's mind. - - A teacher is an architect who blueprints the child's career. - -- A teacher is a pioneer who explores the child's character. - - A teacher is a diplomat who negotiates with the child for the future. The world seldom notices who good teachers are, but civilization depends upon what they do.

As I see it, teacher style results from a combination of strengths and weaknesses in both personality and procedure, or approach, in and out of the classroom -- playground, trips, etc. Research has pointed out and classroom practices have confirmed the fact that rich and varied educational experiences at an early age enhance a child's intellectual activity, self-assurance, and social skill -- and, thus, the potential for his continuous academic achievement. In this regard, one important factor that must not be overlooked is tutelage from a wise, warm, resourceful, flexible teacher. The kind of teacher in the classroom makes the differnnce. "Kind of teacher" is what I assume that Dr. Rashid is speaking of when she refers to teaching style. What is the teaching style of the teacher who makes the difference?

It is in reference to the "kind of teacher in the classroom" that Dr. Rashid is in quest of clarification. She says -- and I concur -- that research needs to isolate or state in

more specific terms the styles of teaching and their influence on individual children. Earlier reference was made to O'Brien's findings in regard to teacher intervention and its influence on the economically and culturally deprived child. This research does not go far enough to indicate the "how" of intervention. Thus, the problem, as referred to in this paper, looms large in regard to styles of teaching and their relevancy for:

- individual differences
- culturally defined sex roles
- cognitive development
- social development

As factors that form the cluster for teaching style are identified or isolated, it appears imminent that the definition of perceptual skill as a basic factor will play a major role in determining the nature of the teaching style or the way the teacher handles the instructional settings for learning. A teacher who possesses perceptual skill does not only impart knowledge to children, but awakens their interest in it and makes it easier for them to perceive for themselves. Such a teacher is a spark plug -- not a fuel pipe. She helps the child to clarify ideas and enlarge concepts by knowing what to "pull out" or what to emphasize for each child as he works to understand. Her knowledge of the importance of role models for certain groups of children can be noted in the efforts she puts forth to enhance the child's self-image and strengthen his emerging personality.

It is evident that the quality of the scholarly, provoca-
tive paper and its presentation by Dr. Rashid make it incumbent
upon us to go forth from this day of deliberation determined
to do our bit to make possible the realization, in theory and
in practice, of the two important educational issues projected
at this conference. Teacher style and classroom management <u>can</u>
and <u>should have</u> a reasonably common meaning for preschool (and
primary) teachers so that their teaching skill and perceptive
powers will make them the type of teachers who "do not blow
out the light within the brain" of the child, but who foster
understandings that "will make it glow."

THE TEACHER AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Amidon, Edmund and Simon, A. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction."
    Review of Educational Research, 35, April, 1965, 130-9.

2. Amidon, Edmund. "Interaction Analysis-Recent Developments."
    ERIC Research in Education, 3, #3, March, 1968, 93. ED 013
    776; SP 000 989.

3. Amidon, Edmund and Hugh, John, Eds. Interaction Analysis:
    Theory, Research and Application. Reading, Massachusetts:
    Addison-Wesley, 1968.

4. Allen, Dwight W. and Clark, Richard F., Jr. Micro-teaching:
    Its Rationale." High School Journal, November, 1967, 74-78.

5. Antes, John, Aderson, Dan, and DeValut, M. Vere. "Elemen-
    tary Pupils' Perceptions of the Social-Emotional Environment
    of the Classroom" Psychology of the Schools, 2, 1965, 41-46.

6. Baldwin, Clara P. "Naturalistic Studies of Classroom Learn-
    ing." Review of Educational Research, 35 (2), 107-113.

7. Bandura, Albert. "The Role of Imitation in Personality De-
    velopment." Journal of Nursery Education, 18, 1963, 207-16.

8. Barr, A. L., Issue Editor. "Wisconsin Studies of the Measure-
    ment and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness: A Summary of
    Investigations." Journal of Experimental Education, 30, Sept.,
    1961, 5-156.

9. Biddle, Bruce J. and Ellena, William J., Eds. Comtemporary
    Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart
    & Winston, 1964.

10. Biddle, Bruce, J. "Methods and Concepts in Classroom Re-
    search." Review of Educational Research, 37, #3, June, 1967,
    337-57.

11. Biddle, Bruce J. and Adams, Raymond S. "Teacher Behavior in
    the Classroom Context." Instruction: Some Contemporary View-
    points. Edited by Laurence Siegel. San Francisco: Chandler,
    1966./

12. Bloom, Richard D. and Wilensky, Harold. "Four Observational
    Categories for Describing Teaching Behavior." ERIC Research
    in Education, 3, #2, Feb., 1968, 95. ED 013 238; SP 001
    261.

13. Bowers, N. D. and Soar, R. L. "The Influence of Teacher Personality on Classroom Interaction." Journal of Experimental Education, 30, June, 1962, 309-11.

14. Brown, Bob Burton. "Observer-Judge Ratings of Teacher Competence." Childhood Education, November, 1967.

15. Brown, Bob Burton, et al. "The Reliability of Observations of Teachers' Classroom Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, 36, #3, Spring, 1968, 1-10.

16. Clausen, John A. "Perspectives on Childhood Socialization." Socialization and Society. Edited by John A. Clausen. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1968.

17. Cogan, Morris L. "Theory and Design of a Study of Teacher-Pupil Interaction." Harvard Education Review, 26, 1956, 315-42.

18. Connors, Keith C. and Eisenberg, Leon. "The Effect of Teacher Behavior on Verbal Intelligence in Head Start Children." Final Report. Edited by L. Eisenberg, et al. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Hospital, October, 1966.

19. Cooper, James G. and Bemis, Katherine. "Teacher Personality, Teacher Behavior and Their Effects Upon Pupil Achievement." Final Report. ERIC Reseach in Education, 3, #1, Jan., 1968, 77. ED 012 707.

20. Davis, O. L. and Slobodian, June J. "Teacher Behavior Toward Boys and Girls During First Grade Reading Instruction." American Educational Research Journal, 4:3, 1967, 261-70.

21. Downey, Loren W. "The Relationship of Teaching Patterns to Organizational Climate and Teacher Belief Systems." Dissertation Abstracts, 27, 4-A, 1966, 898.

22. Fanning, J. F. "Implication of Overt Manifestations of Expectancy Bias." Educational Leadership, 25, April, 1968, 683-.

23. Fantini, Mario D. "Discussion of Policy Issues on Equality in Education." Harvard Educational Review, 38, Winter, 1968, 160-175.

24. Flanagan, John C. "Needed Research in Teacher Selection." ERIC Research in Education, 3:5, May, 1968, 116. ED 015 150. SP 001-365.

25. Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement. Cooperative Research Monograph No 12, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

26. Flanders, Ned A. "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement." Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. Edited by Bruce J. Biddle and William Ellena. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, 196-231.

27. Formanek, Ruth and Morina, Gretta. "Categorizing in Young Children: Two Views." The Record, 69, Feb.,1968, 409-420.

28. Fox, R., Luszki, Margaret B., and Schmuck, R. "Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environment." Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1966.

29. Freeman, Roger A. "Schools and the Elusive 'Average Child' Concept." Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1968, 10.

30. Gage, N. L. "Paradigms for Research on Teaching." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. 94-141.

31. Gage, N. L. "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instructional Methods." ERIC Research in Education, #12, December, 1967, 1. ED 011 936.

32. Galloway, Charles M. "Teacher Nonverbal Communication." Educational Leadership, 24, #1, October, 1966, 55-66.

33. Gerhard, M. "Behavioral Outcomes: What the Child is Able to Do and Does as a Result of the Teaching-Learning Experience." Grade Teacher, 84, April,1967, 92-95.

34. Getzels, Jacob and Thelen, Herbert. "The Classroom Group as a Unique Social System." The Dynamics of Instructional Groups. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. (The Fifty-Ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960, 53-82.

35. Gideonse, Hendrik D. "The Relative Impact of Instructional Variables: The Policy Implications of Research." The Record. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 69, April 1968, 625-40.

36. Giebink, J. W. "A Failure of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory to Relate to Teacher Behavior." Journal of Teacher Education. 18:2, Summer,1967, 233-39.

4

37. Gray Susan W. and Miller, James O. "Early Experience in Relation to Cognitive Development." _Review of Educational Research_, 37, December,1967, 475-93.

38. Hallam, Kenneth J. "The Effects of Teaching Styles and Pupils' Needs on Learning, Retention, and Preference." _Dissertation Abstracts_, 26:12, Part I, 1966, 7439.

39. Hamachek, Don E. "What Research Tells Us About the Characteristics of 'Good' and 'Bad' Teachers." _Human Dynamics in Psychology and Education_. Edited by Don Hamachek. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

40. Hartup, Willard W. "Social Behavior of Children." _Review of Educational Research._ 35, April,1965, 122-29.

41. Harvey, O. J. et al. "Teachers' Beliefs, Classroom Atmosphere, and Student Behavior." _American Educational Research Journal_, 5, March,1968, 151-66.

42. Harvey, O. J. et al. "Teachers' Belief Systems and Preschool Atmospheres." _Journal of Educational Psychology_. 57:6, 1966, 373-81.

43. Hess, Robert D. Ed. _Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Practice._ Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

44. Hess, Robert and Shipman, Virginia. "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children." _Child Development._ 36, December,1965, 869-86.

45. Ishler, Richard Eves. "An Experimental Study Using Withalls' Social-Emotional Climate Index to Determine the Effectiveness of Feedback as a Means of Changing Student Teachers' Verbal Behavior." _Journal of Educational Research_, 61, November,1967.

46. Jackson, Philip W. _Life in Classrooms._ New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

47. Jensen, Arthur. "Learning in Preschool Years." _Journal of Nursery Education._ 18, January,1963, 133-39.

48. Jenson, Gail E. "Social Structure of the Classroom Group: An Observational Framework." _Journal of Educational Psychology_, 46 (1955) 362-74.

49. Katz, I. "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children." _Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967_, Edited by D. Levin. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967, 133-91.

50. Kliebard, Herbert M. "The Observation of Classroom Behavior."
The Way Teaching Is. Washington, D. C.: Association of Super-
vision and Curriculum Development and The Center for the Study
of Instruction, NEA, 1966, 45-76.

51. Kleinman, Gladys S. "Assessing Teaching Effectiveness: The
State of the Art." Science Education, 50, April,1966, 234-
38.

52. Kooi, Beverly Y. "An Analysis of the Effects of Teacher-
Pupil Interaction Cues Upon Learning." Dissertation Abstracts,
26, 5-A, 1966, 1265-1266.

53. Kounin, J. and Gump, P. "The Comparative Influence of Puni-
tive and Nonpunitive Teachers Upon Children's Concepts of
School Misconduct." Journal of Educational Psychology, 62,
October,1961, 247-65.

54. Kounin, Jacob S. "An Analysis of Teachers' Managerial Tech-
niques." Psychology in the Schools, 4, 1967, 221-27.

55. Lippitt, R., Fox, R., and Schmuck, R. "Innovating Classroom
Practice to Support Achievement Motivation and Ego-Development."
Behavioral Science Frontiers in Education. Edited by E. Bower
and W. Hollister, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967. 317-
34.

56. McClelland, David C. "The Importance of Early Learning in the
Formation of Motives." Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society.
Edited by J. W. Atkinson. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.

57. McNeil, John D. "Concomitants of Using Behavioral Objectives
in the Assessment of Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of Ex-
perimental Education, 36:1, Fall,1967.

58. Maccoby, Eleanor, et al. "Activity Level and Intellectual
Functioning in Normal Preschool Children." Child Development,
36, 1965, 761-70.

59. Medley, Donald M. and Mitzel, Harold E. "Measuring Classroom
Behavior by Systematic Observation." Handbook of Research on
Teaching, Edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963,
247-328.

60. Medley, Donald M. and Mitzel, Harold E. "Some Behavior Cor-
relates of Teacher Effectiveness." Journal of Educational
Psychology, 50, December,1959, 239-46.

61. Meux, Milton. "A Model of Evaluative Operations in the Class-
room." The High School Journal, October,1967, 39-45.

62. Miller, George L. "Collaborative Teaching and Pupil Think-ing." The Journal of Teacher Education, 17, Fall,1966, 335-43.

63. Minuchin, Patricia. "Processes of Curiosity and Exploration in Preschool Disadvantaged Children." (Mimeographed) Office of Economic Opportunity: Contract #OEO-2403 Final Report, June,1967.

64. Mitzel, Harold E. "Teacher Effectiveness." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Chester W. Harris. Third Ed. New York: Macmillan, 1960. 1481-1486.

65. Morrison, Virginia B. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction in Elemen-tary Urban Schools." ERIC Research in Education: 1956-65. CRP 2780; ED 003 385.

66. Nelson, Lois N. "Teacher Leadership-An Empirical Approach to Analyzing Teacher Behavior in the Classroom." Journal of Teacher Education, 17:4, Winter,1966, 417-425.

67. "On Compensatory Education," Editorial. Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1968, 101.

68. Page, E. B. "Teacher Comments and Student Performance: A Seventy-four Classroom Experiment in School Motivation," Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, 1958, 173-81.

69. Pierce-Jones, John, et al. "Outcomes of Individual and Pro-grammatic Variations Among Project Head Start Centers, Sum-mer, 1965." Final Report. ERIC Research on Education, 3:4, April,1968, 80. ED 014 325.

70. Rosenthal, Robert and Jacobson, Lenore. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

71. Ryans, David G. "Assessment of Teacher Behavior and Instruc-tions." Review of Educational Research, 33:4, October,1963, 415-41.

72. Sears, Pauline S. "The Effect of Classroom Conditions on the Strength of Achievement Motive and Work Output of Elementary School Children." U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 873, Stanford, Calif: Stanford University, 1963, 311 pp.

73. Sears, Pauline S. and Dowley, Edith M. "Research on Teaching in the Nursery School." Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, 814-864.

74. Shure, Myrna B. "Psychological Ecology of a Nursery School." Child Development, 34, December,1963, 979-92.

75. Simon, Anita et al. "Programming Teacher-Pupil Interaction Patterns." ERIC Research in Education, 3:2, February,1968, 94. ED 013 231; SP 001 095.

76. Smith, B. Othanel. "Recent Research on Teaching: An Interpretation." Education Digest, February,1968, 51-54.

77. Soar, Robert S. "Multivariate Statistical Procedures in Predicting Teacher-Pupil Classroom Behavior." ERIC Research in Education: 1956-65. CRP 1170; ED 003 051.

78. Solomon, Daniel. "Birth Order, Family Composition, and Teaching Style." Psychological Reports, 17:3, 1965, 871-874.

79. Spaulding, Robert L. "Personality and Social Development: Peer and School Influence." Review of Educational Research, 34, December,1964, 588-98.

80. Spencer, Thomas D. "Sex-Role Learning in Early Childhood." Journal of Nursery Education, 19, April,1964.

81. Symposium on Conceptual Frameworks for Analysis of Classroom Social Interaction. Introductory Comment by John Withall. American Psychological Association's Annual Convention, New York City: September,1961.

82. "Teacher-Student Relationships: A Symposium." NEA Journal, 57, April,1968, 14-24.

83. Vincent, William S. "Indicators of Quality." Research Bulletin, 7, May,1967, 1-4

84. Waetjen, W. B. "Recent Analyses of Teaching." NASSP Bulletin, 50, December,1966, 17-29.

85. Walberg, Herbert J. "Structural and Affective Aspects of Classroom Climate." ERIC Research in Education, 3:5, May, 1968, 117. ED 015 154.

86. Wallen, Norman E. "Relationships Between Teacher Characteristics and Student Behavior." Part III. ERIC Research in Education, 5,May,1967, 7. ED 010 390.

87. Wallen N. E., et al. "Relationship Between Teacher Needs and Teacher Behavior in the Classroom." Journal of Educational Psychology, 54, February,1963, 23-32.

88. Weick, Karl E. "Systematic Observational Methods." Hand-
    book of Social Psychology, edited by Gardner Lindzey and
    Eliot Aronson. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley
    Press, 1967.

89. Wright, John and Kagan, Jerome. "Basic Cognitive Processes
    in Children." Monographs of the Society for Research in
    Child Development, 28:2, 1963.

90. Wyett, Jerry Lane. "A Pilot Study to Analyze Cognitive
    Style and Teaching Style with Reference to Selected Strata
    of the Defined Educational Sciences." Dissertation Ab-
    stracts, 28, March,1968, 3579A.