Data were collected regarding the problem of the
effects of the Human Development Program procedures on the generation
of linguistic tools for the written expression of feelings. Two
classes of elementary students participated in the experiment, one a
sixth grade of denied children and the other a fifth grade identified
as gifted on an intelligence test. Each group of children
participated in two sessions per week over an 8-week period of
sequenced task-directed conversations about their feelings regarding
specifically stated situations. The treatment was conducted by the
investigator. An instrument was designed which caused narrative
reaction in written form to visual and auditory stimuli. The
instrument was administered prior to and following the treatment
period. Scoring was based upon teacher and investigator word counts
from each subject's written narratives. Interjudge reliability
exceeded .96 for all four administrations of the instrument. A "t" of
4.42 and 3.24 was found in the sixth and gifted fifth groups,
respectively, exceeding significance at .01 in both cases. It was
concluded that the Human Development Program procedures constitute a
measurable effective treatment for the generation of effective
linguistic tools. (Author)
GENERATING VOCABULARY APPROPRIATE TO THE AFFECTIVE WRITING TASK

ABSTRACT

Data were collected regarding the problem of the effects of the Human Development Program procedures on the generation of linguistic tools for the written expression of feelings. Two classes of elementary students were selected for the experiment, one a sixth grade of denied children and the other a fifth grade identified as gifted by a criterion of 10132 on an individually administered test of 10. Each group of children participated in two sessions per week over an 8 week period of sequenced task-directed conversations about their feelings regarding specifically stated situations.

The treatment was conducted by the investigator. An instrument was designed which caused narrative reaction in written form to visual and auditory stimuli. The instrument was administered prior to and following the eight week treatment period. Scoring was based upon teacher and investigator word
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counts from each subject's written narratives. Interjudge reliability exceeded .75 for all four administrations of the instrument. At the .01 level, 3.46 was found in the sixth and gilded fif th respectively, exceeding significance at .01 level. Concluded that the Human Development Program was a measurably effective treatment for the group of fearful linguistic tools.
Composition involves several elements, two of which deal with that about which one will compose and the tools for generating a composition. A great quantity of material is available to help teachers cause children to write about various events, thoughts, experiences, etc., and considerable teaching material is readily accessible to teachers which purport to help children develop composing skills. There is a growing advocacy regarding student involvement in affective or feeling matters in their education and one sphere of the advocacy relates to children's writings. Teachers are asked to involve children in writing about their affective reaction to stimuli and general statements are made concerning the procedures for doing so. There is very little attention paid, however, to the systematic establishment of climate for affective writing as well as the development of tools for affective written production. In this research particular attention was paid to the generation of vocabulary appropriate to the affective writing task.

Research in vocabulary development is abundant. Gray and Holmes (1938) studied two approaches to vocabulary development,
one direct wherein the teacher was responsible for overt instruction of specific vocabulary identified by the teacher and the other incidental, characterized by pupil selection of vocabulary content and time for instruction. They reported a measurable value in the utilization of an incidental strategy in vocabulary development.

Eicholz and Barbe (1961) noted the need to develop vocabulary within a contextual framework, cooperating with Bradley, Cahill, and Tate (1941) who also reported the necessity of vocabulary development in context for the purpose of meaning clarification. A caution regarding context was offered by Deighton (1959). The caution is in regard to expecting children to infer meaning from context since experiential characteristics place boundaries upon one's reactions to grammatical and lexical cues.

Kessel (1970) noted that people who deal in the sphere of language development need to take care regarding the line drawn between that which is semantic and that which is syntactic. Kessel's caution regarding a distinction between semantic and syntactic characteristics of language draws attention to the ways in which the two relate to each other and suggest a recognition of that relationship.

An unpublished study dealing with teacher behaviors (Kawamura, 1970) establishes that teachers who behave in an accepting and attentive fashion toward pupils find that their
pupils are more interested, spontaneous, and responsive. Although Kawamura's research was not directly in the area of vocabulary development, it relates to this research to the extent that such characteristics in pupils are helpful, if not critical, in the development of vocabulary according to the format used here.

In order to measure the development of written affective vocabulary the following problem was identified: What is the effect of a specific treatment applied to a whole class setting upon the generation of linguistic tools for the written expression of feelings? The problem was investigated in terms of the following statistical hypothesis: The experience of a specific treatment applied to a whole class setting will not make a measurable difference in the ability of selected children to express feelings in written form.
PROCEDURES

The objective of the study was to collect data in the form of written linguistic tools. The term "linguistic tools" refers to words and/or word forms which name, explain, or express the feeling or affective state of the writer. The form "feeling" is used in reference to any form of emotional tone or state of affective being. It was within the context of these definitions which the study was conducted.

Two groups of elementary school children were identified as subjects in the study. One group was a sixth grade in an inner city and the other was a fifth grade in a relatively affluent section of a large city. The latter group was identified as gifted by a score criterion of 132 on an individually administered test of IQ. The sixth grade group was heterogeneously grouped.

Treatment consisted of the use of Human Development Program tasks applied to each group of children. The Human Development Program is a classroom system designed to facilitate healthy social and emotional development in children. The program operates in three spheres of social and emotional development as follows:

1) AWARENESS - a response to the question,
"Who am I?", the development of a consciousness of self, an awareness of one's own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and the reasons for their manifestation,

2) MASTERY - the notion of "I can", the development of a consciousness regarding one's competence, awareness of one's ability to do things, one's identification of self as an effective and active participant in the environment, and

3) SOCIAL INTERACTION - the notion of "we", you and I, the group, the development of competence in social relations and communication with others, an awareness of one's power in the establishment of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in others and a respect for that power, the notion that I am an agent who can establish a feeling tone in you.

The Human Development Program employs a carefully programmed system of daily activities which are planned according to a sequence of social and emotional growth and which develop
in a determined fashion from one relative point to another through teacher conducted classroom sessions called Magic Circles. The Magic Circle is a safe place to which children come in groups of 10-12, optionally, for the purpose of experiencing the daily program.

One adjustment in the format of the Human Development Program was made for the purpose of the Treatment. Rather than conducting the program according to the Magic Circle format, the investigator conducted the sessions in the classroom at large with the 35* children in each room. The Treatment consisted of two half hour to forty-five minute investigator conducted sessions per week in each of the two classrooms. Each session began with a task with which the class was to deal. Most often the conversation generated by the task moved into allied areas which tended to fit the specific needs of the children in the room. The following kinds of tasks are representative of those used:

1) There is something in this room that makes me feel good. (Awareness),

2) There is something which I do that makes me feel good. (Awareness),

3) This is something which I do well. (Mastery),

* The discrepancy between the stated N and the classroom size of 35 was due to pupils being absent on testing days.
4) I did something which someone liked.
   (Social Interaction), and
5) I can select and define a word which I like. (Mastery).

As the Treatment developed, children began to feel more and more comfortable with the sessions and different, perhaps more risky tasks were used:

1) There is something in this room which gives me unpleasant feelings. (Awareness),
2) I did something which made someone feel badly. (Social Interaction), and
3) Something happened to me that made me feel badly. (Awareness).

The sessions were conducted in a relatively nondirective fashion. The task was presented to the children and they took the conversation wherever they thought it should go. On several occasions the pupils rejected a planned task and chose to continue with another which had been discussed at a previous time. The investigator accepted whatever was offered in terms of responses and contributions and was directive only to the extent of keeping the conversation safe for the pupils and school bound. It had been decided with the teachers that the introduction of the home into the conversations might needlessly create points of friction with the home. None of these sessions involved any
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A pretest was administered prior to the initiation of the treatment and immediately following its termination eight weeks later. The test consisted of nine items, five of which were visual and four of which were auditory. The following stimuli were presented to the pupils as items to which they were to respond:

1) A reading of the poem, "The Snare" by James Stephens
2) A completely blank, lighted 2 x 2 slide screen
3) A completely yellow 2 x 2 slide screen
4) A reading of the poem, "Hi" by Walter De LaMare
5) An opaque projection of a Black boy daydreaming over a book
6) A 2 x 2 slide of a four year old Navajo boy playing on a dirt pile
7) A pink screen with a red dot in the upper right hand corner
8) A story started involving a prospective confrontation with a snake.

The pupils were given five minutes to make written responses to each stimulation according to the question, "How does that
make you feel?". The ninth and final item was a five minute period in which to respond to the question, "How do you feel right now?". Identical tests in the same order of stimuli presentation were administered as pre and post test measures.

This informal instrument was assumed to be useful on the basis of two criteria. First, it was designed specifically to collect a certain kind of data. It was designed as a measure of the treatment. On this basis it was assumed to be valid. Second, reliability in the context of this kind of instrumentation is not a critical factor. It is most important that the investigator know exactly what he is looking for and whether or not he got it. Reliability is a matter of specificity of goal and accuracy of measurement.

Scoring the responses of the pupils was the task of the teacher and the investigator working independently of one another. The direction was to give one point for each occurrence of a feeling word, word form, or use of words which indicated feelings. The teacher-scorer was not in contact with any of the data until the research was completed. Data on interjudge reliability were collected in order to insure that the judges were counting the same pupil products.

The inferential statistic utilized in this study was the t-test, an appropriate statistic for determining the significance of differences between the means of dependent data. In addition,
A type-token analysis of the novel was conducted in order to show the relationship between actual vocabulary, form, and total word use. The type-token analysis refers to a discrimination between the total number of words used in the novel and the number of times each word was used in the sentence. "The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog" involves two instances (token) of the word, "the" (type).
RESULTS

A review of Table 1 reveals that the statistical hypothesis was rejected in the case of both groups.

TABLE 1. T-TESTS APPLIED TO THE PRE AND POST TEST MEANS OF EACH GROUP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PRETEST MEAN</th>
<th>POSTTEST MEAN</th>
<th>“t”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th (N=26)</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th (N=27)</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .01 level of confidence
Table II reflects the type-token analysis of the data. It is apparent from the levels of significance achieved that the treatment provided in these groups had an effect on the written production of affective vocabulary in terms of both unique and frequency criteria. Not only did the pupils generate affective words in greater volume, they also generated a statistically significant number of different words.

Table II. T-TESTS OF THE TYPE AND TOKEN MEANS OF EACH GROUP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TYPE (Uniqueness)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST X</td>
<td>POSTTEST X</td>
<td>X DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>&quot;t&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOKEN (Frequency) |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 5th   | 14.07       | 18.82       | 4.75          | 3.21* |
| 6th   | 8.52        | 12.78       | 4.26          | 4.13* |

* .01 Level of Confidence
The interjudge reliability data shown on Table II indicates that there was considerable agreement between the two independent judges regarding the meaning of the words "affective" and "feeling" and that the decisions of each judge were directly related to the stated task.

Table III. INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY FOR ALL ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE INSTRUMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIFTH GRADE GROUP</th>
<th>SIXTH GRADE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest several important points to ponder. First, there has been, over the past several years, a renewed interest in what has been popularly labeled affective education or an educational direction which places greater emphasis upon the emotional characteristics and realities of the learner. Many companies have come into existence for the expressed purpose of providing affective materials for teacher and learner use. Publishing companies are writing affective education into their subject matter materials. However, the primary emphasis remains on those traditional school subjects which teachers are to teach and pupils are to learn. This research suggests that within the framework of a traditional academic sphere, i.e. Language Development, the affect of the learner can be dealt with openly and productively to the ultimate measurable gain of the learner in at least one linguistic criterion, that of vocabulary.

The research also suggests that when pupils get as far into their school career as the fifth and sixth grades, their facility for expression of feeling as measured by vocabulary is severely limited. In the fifth grade group the mean production of feeling vocabulary during a 45 minute writing session and in response to
9 stimulations was 14 words. The sixth grade group produced approximately 8 words under the same conditions. By contrast, the incidence of function words on the test papers and the incidence of descriptive cognitive words in other writing situations exceeds affective production by many fold. This is not to suggest that the production of descriptive cognitive vocabulary is not desirable; rather, it is to suggest that attention to the emotional sphere of school children is apparently avoided in school as indicated by their production of affective vocabulary.

Affective vocabulary can, however, be generated with relative ease and speed. The difference between the pre and posttest means in the fifth grade group was 31%. The difference in the sixth grade group was 52%. These gains were achieved through open classroom conversation directed loosely at an affective task. For those who are supportive of attention to the affect of school pupils, this study shows that great gain can be achieved quickly and within the confines of traditional subject matter.

The analysis of data in terms of specific and isolated vocabulary development (type) and total vocabulary output (token) offers a more comprehensive opportunity to deal with the effects of the treatment. Although vocabulary development is the generation of words to be available for use by the user of language, an argument can be offered which calls vocabulary development, at least in part, a process by which an individual learns to use
known words with progressively greater effectiveness. The former is essentially a type criterion; the latter essentially a token criterion.

Ideally, the instructional program in vocabulary should result in increased numbers of words available to the user as well as a progressively more effective use of words. This research has uncovered one of two things or, perhaps, some combination of the two. Greater numbers of words were generated, but at the same time like words were used in various stimuli situations.

It is not the purpose of this research to measure the relative merits of vocabulary (type) in comparison to vocabulary development (token) in preparation for the affective writing task. Obviously a greater reservoir of words can be an asset to a communicator, however, it is not the number of words but the use of words which distinguishes the effective communicator from the ineffective communicator. In the affective task whether written or spoken, the communication of feeling is most enhanced by the ways in which words are used to convey feeling, not necessarily by the numbers of descriptors used.

The treatment in this investigation had two apparent effects. It was a measureable variable in the development of vocabulary (type). It also affected an instructional environment which facilitated the use of words. Both effects are important.
This research supports again the data showing the value of incidental vocabulary instruction. It goes further by showing the value of such an instructional tool in effective education and cognitive education.

Also, this research opens one door to an additional area of children's writing, i.e., how they feel about various aspects of their life space. It points, however, that there needs to be attention directed at the generation and linguistics before children are asked to write about their feelings.

The investigator would like to acknowledge the insight suggestion of one reviewer who urged that the study should include a control group and by having the teacher note which productions not knowing which production was from the pretest and which was from the posttest. Such a replication being planned and while the investigator acknowledges the rigor of the replication design, he submits this research as sufficiently rigorous to generalize to the extent reflected in the discussion.
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SANDIEGO—"Our educational system is a fundamentally wrong, unworkable collapsing institution. Like the Titanic, it was badly designed. The hull is springing open and you are patching and pumping until the rescue boats arrive."

This opinion, voiced by teacher-author John Holt, was one of many divergent theories on modern education voiced by some of the top educators in the country during the Second Annual Conference on Affective Education here, Feb. 17-21.

More than 100 top-level professional educators heard Holt, Haim Ginott, William Glasser, Harold Bessell, Uvaldo Palomares and others discuss ways of increasing emotional and social development, as well as intellectual growth, in the schools.

The conference was sponsored by the Institute for Personal Effectiveness in Children (IPEC), a non-profit professional education organization based in San Diego.

Holt labeled schools "the most common counter-revolutionary agent I know. They are a mechanism that society uses to label a large number of people as 'losers,' and convince them it is their fault."

Holt said he considers learning a fundamental human need and emphasized his own love for education. "However," he noted, "the problem is that schools have been given almost a complete monopoly on learning."

Holt was asked by the audience, which included many school superintendents, education professors, and specialists from national educational agencies, whether he would ever return to teaching.

"Six months ago I would have answered 'yes,'" he replied. "Now I can't locate myself in that situation anymore."
Holt, a gentle, conservatively-dressed Bostonian, whose words belied his appearance, continued:

"Aside from methods, there is absolutely no difference between John Dewey and Max Rafferty (former California superintendent of schools). They are both concerned with preparing the parts for a smoothly running machine."

"In the same manner, there is no difference between education in the USA and Russia; in both places it is a device to serve the state rather than to empower people to think and do for themselves."

Commenting on alternatives to the present education system, Holt was optimistic. "As a citizen, I hold the highest office in the land," he said, explaining that the fundamental goal of education should be to enable people to act for themselves.

Holt said the classroom should be a learning place for all ages, suggesting toy libraries and "reading guides" which would identify and spell words over the telephone. He envisioned tiny storefronts where teaching machines, cassette tapes, and film loops would be available to adults and children.

His concept of education included teachers for skill activities such as swimming and driving, but he emphasized that teaching is not passing a body of knowledge from one person to another. To Holt, the teacher's task is to create an environment for learning.

"What we ought to make available are learning experiences free from coercion—self-motivated, joyous learning experiences," he concluded.

The five-day conference might also have been entitled "best-selling educators" since several participants, including Holt, Ginott, and Glasser, are well recognized as authors. Best known are Ginott's Between Parent and Child, and Between Parent and Teenager, Holt's Why Children Fail, How Children Learn, and What Do I Do on Monday? and Glasser's Reality Therapy, and Schools Without Failure.

The conference included presentations by Headstart researcher Martin Deutsch, inquiry training specialist Richard Suchman, university educators Madeline Hunter (UCLA) and Sidney Simon (University of Massachusetts), and Harold Bessell and Uvaldo Palomares, co-authors of the Human Development Program on which the Institute for Personal Effectiveness in Children is based.

Challenged by Holt's words, the conference educators heard more optimistic views from other speakers who described themselves as "patchers" and offered new techniques to be used by the schools.

Dr. Glasser stressed increasing the child's sense of worth by relevant learning in a friendly atmosphere. He amused his fellow educators by saying, "Although the recent earthquake was a great tragedy, I'm
The audience also previewed a research program presented by Gil Boyer and Anita Simon of the Humanizing Learning Program, based in Philadelphia, Pa. The audio-visual presentation detailed a government-supported curriculum research project which is developing "Achievement Instructional Materials."

The program creates student workbooks and audio-visual aids to increase skills necessary for intellectual, social and emotional growth. Games such as "robot and controller" are used so that two children can practice and understand skills of social interaction.

Dr. Boyer explained that program materials are still in testing stages and that the curriculum would not be available for several years. "We don't want to package something that looks just great, and doesn't work," Boyer said.

Perhaps the most warmly received of all the speakers were Dr. Sidney Simon and his wife, Mary Ann. Mrs. Simon had composed several songs which informally described the importance of human feelings and values. Accompanying herself on the guitar, she sang them to the delighted audience and a demonstration group of children from San Diego.

Dr. Simon challenged the audience to consider Ralph Nader's model for change. He indicated that education must be changed but said, "We're staying within the system. We're not going into the desert to watch the sunset and discuss what's wrong."

Author of the book, Values and Teaching, Simon stressed the necessity for teaching children the process of inquiry and search. "Teaching should be presenting a series of alternatives to be freely chosen," he said.

To demonstrate his theory, Dr. Simon asked the group of school children to applaud, turn thumbs down, or "stand pat" on such widely diverse activities as eating fried chicken, using deodorants, and riding mini-bikes. Without imposing judgment on the children, he wanted children to begin to focus on what they valued, Simon explained to the audience.

The audience was asked to form triads and consider which of the conference activities on a particular evening they had valued most highly, and why. Then Simon detailed many other strategies that could be used to focus on values such as "rank ordering" several values, considering whether preferred activities were more pleasing alone or in company, and determining whether a now highly-valued activity was valued five years ago.

He said if a teacher helps children to clarify their values in a non-judgmental way, then the children will learn to be able to function more positively. "Fuzzy values are at the root of conformity and at the base of non-discriminating revolution," Simon concluded.
Ginott illustrated the unintentional way teachers assert adult superiority when they say, "That's a fine thought, young lady!" He observed that teachers would be shocked if a child said, "You're doing a good job, teach!"

He discussed "appreciative" praise which describes the child's act and tells how the act makes the adult feel. He contrasted this with "evaluative" praise which tends to force a child into a rigid conception of himself. He illustrated this concept by comparing "You're a wonderful artist, Johnny," with "Your picture has red and blue and yellow. All the bright colors make me feel happy."

Ginott also suggested that classrooms could be improved by having a parent in daily attendance. The parent would ease the teacher load by handling much of the clerical work, and would provide a "community check" upon educational activities.

A panel discussion on "Innovative Education-1971" with Madeline Hunter, Richard Suchman, Martin Deutsch, and Jim Carnevale provided additional dialogue between contrasting educational positions for the conference delegates.

Dr. Hunter described a system "for looking at all the possible variables affecting learning." We have lost patience with the idea that teaching is an art--sort of a laying-on of hands. Teaching is now a high-powered, decision-making and-implementing profession."

She proposed a system which "custom-tailors" the teaching to the child, optimizing the learning environment. Referring to her teacher training program at UCLA's University Elementary School, Mrs. Hunter said, "In six months we can take a motivated, warm body and turn him into a teacher."

Dr. Suchman disagreed with Mrs. Hunter's description of education, differentiating between a "dissemination model" and a "growth model." He said the "dissemination model" implies the teacher is a transmitter of a body of knowledge which exists separately out in space. "In that system we ought to be able to weigh people before and after class and discover how much they have learned," he said.

He said the "growth model" implies that within each person there is a potential for growth. He emphasized, like Holt, that the teacher's role is to create the best possible supporting conditions in which this growth can be realized, describing "inquiry training" as a process, not a product.

Dr. Deutsch concurred with Suchman's emphasis on process. He said, "Postman (Neil, an educational psychologist and author of 'Teaching as a Subversive Activity') has said that one day intelligence may be defined as the ability to create an idea rather than to identify and remember other's ideas. I think we must be concerned with making rather than matching and memorizing."
delighted that the San Gabriel Mountains have been raised four feet. Now perhaps you'll understand the irrelevance of making a child memorize the heights of mountains."

Glasser listed four conditions to effect social change within the schools: a change agent, a friendly atmosphere, relevant learning that permits a child to develop a sense of power or mastery, and the development of a process which was the capacity to be ongoing when the change agent is not present.

Glasser described the process as a daily classroom group discussion which, he stressed, should be "as sacred as lunch."

Comparing the structure of buildings and social change, Glasser said social change was built on sand. "It must be constantly reinforced by permitting the children and the teacher to freely express their ideas in a non-judgmental situation." He said these class discussions, which are widely used in many school systems, are unlike sensitivity sessions since they focus on positive topics.

Drs. Bessell and Palomares detailed their Human Development Program, which also involves classroom discussion, to conference, where half of the class participates in the discussion group or "Magic Circle" at one time. Topics are also suggested in a sequential manner, utilizing a series of teachers' guides for different grade levels.

Palomares addressed his remarks to the "down-trodden," in which he included racial minorities, women, and children, describing the Human Development Program as "reveutic education for mental health."

"Within the daily 'Magic Circle' the child practices new modes of responding until they become second nature." The object of the discussions is to give the child a series of success experiences and tools that he can use, through self-awareness, social interaction and mastery," Palomares said.

Consultants from HDP offered demonstrations of the "Magic Circle" with San Diego school children. They also involved the audience in a series of small group discussions.

Dr. Ginott added another dimension to the conference with his presentation, Between Teacher and Child, inviting conference, to visit and observe his psychotherapy sessions in New York. "The same principles we use in psychotherapy can be used in everyday life. There is no place for 'secret knowledge,'" he said.

Expressing his opinion on the harmful effects of evaluative praise, Ginott said, "To be himself, a child must be free from the pressures of praise. Only praise that doesn't evaluate allows a child to err or to recover without anxiety." He then emphasized, "Praise consists of two parts -- what I say to a child, and what he says to himself."
QUESTIONs AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

An Interview with Dr. J. K. Southard, President of
the Human Development Training Institute
1081 E. Main Street
El Cajon, California 92021
(714) 442-9243

DR. SOUTHARD, JUST WHAT IS THE HUMAN
DEVELOPMENT TRAINING INSTITUTE?

First, call me Jerry, please.
The best way to describe HDTI is to say it is people
concerned about people. We sell a few materials but
even those are guides for educators in how to work
more effectively with children in the affective domain.
More importantly HDTI is a group of people who are
dedicated, energetic, and expert in promoting the ideas
of HDP. A few of us, Therese Livingston, Uvaldo
Pulomares, Mike Trujillo and myself work at it full time.
Many others work in other positions full time then do
consulting work on their own or with us as we get jobs.
Some of these are John Jensen, Andy Woldt, Loren
Benson, Clayton Swartzentruber, Edwina Meyers,
Weldon Elbert, Bob Canady, Gale Smith, Lu Anne and
Jerry Lynch, Warren Timmermann, Leif Fearn, Jim
Firth, Jackie Stuchin, Hal Bessell, Geraldine Ball,
Camille McRae, Jacque Lalanne, Jim and Jo Carnevale-
“Sticks” Rowland, Bob McCabe, Sra. Blanca M. de
Alvarez, Susannah Tudor, and Jim Ballard— to name a
few. All have experience in education and have ad-
vanced degrees— most have doctorates or nearly so.
These few mentioned live in nine different states and
three foreign countries.

Founded in 1967 by Drs. Harold Bessell and Uvaldo
Palomares, HDTI has really been a “hip pocket”
operation until now. But I think we are
finally going to make it. It’s tough when you try to set up an
organization like HDTI without government funds or
any large investments backing you.

YES, I IMAGINE SO.

AS YOU KNOW, I AM A TEACHER AND HAVE READ
SOME OF YOUR MATERIALS AND BROCHURE. TELL
ME, CAN I OBTAIN EXAMINATION COPIES OR
SAMPLES OF HDP MATERIALS FROM HDTI?

The multitude of requests for free sample copies has
been overwhelming and our financial status just won’t
permit us to give out all the free copies we would like. If
you have or plan to request a free examination copy, one
will be sent to you provided we have a damaged
book in stock which we would not sell. If none is
available, we will send you the copies you request and a
bill. You may elect either to pay for the materials or
return them with the bill within 30 days in salable
condition and not be charged.

We send a complimentary copy to college professors
upon request when their students use the HDP materials
as texts or source materials in their classes.

WHAT LEVEL OF HDP MATERIALS SHOULD I USE IF
I’M JUST STARTING IT AT, SAY, THE THIRD GRADE
LEVEL?

The HDP lesson guides (preschool through level 4)
have been designed for implementation at any level
through grade four. For instance, a third grade teacher
using HDP for the first time with students who have had
no previous experiences would begin with the Level III
lesson guide. At the same time, if both teacher and
children had enjoyed circle experiences the previous
year they would also use the Level III lesson guide in the
third grade—the initial circle topics for each level are
developmental and are useful for review.

WHAT ABOUT LEVELS V AND VI?

Levels V and VI are presently being developed for the
fifth and sixth grades but will not be available for sale
until mid or late 1973. Until then it is recommended
that Level IV be used with fifth and sixth graders. It
works well. I have used many of the Level IV topics
successfully with college students and adults.

WHAT ABOUT JUNIOR HIGH OR HIGH SCHOOL
MATERIALS?

No specific program has been developed for imple-
mentation at the secondary school level as yet. How-
ever, many teachers are successfully utilizing infor-
mation from the HD manual for Institutionalized
Teenagers in their classes. We have heard of teachers
using the method in literature, foreign language, family
life, homemaking, social studies, and psychology/
sociology classes. As has been stated, “the process is the
content of HDP.”

WHAT ABOUT HDP TO MEET SPECIAL NEEDS OF
CHILDREN SUCH AS VISUALLY HANDICAPPED OR
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED?

HDP is almost entirely verbal so that has to be
considered. However, it does not “force” responses
among children and the response of a child is made by
him at his level and is accepted. The criteria for an
appropriate response is the child himself. Yes, HDP
works with children who have special needs.

WHAT DOES RESEARCH SAY ABOUT HDP?

No formal research studies have been sponsored by
HDTI which would give you the facts you may want.
Some evaluation reports and dissertations have been
written or are presently being written regarding HDP but nothing has been done of such broad significance that generalizations can be defended. I wish we could underwrite such but we can't. It must be remembered that the theories of HDP came out of a search by Dr. Bessell on how to develop productive personalities among children. He worked with children in groups for years before HDP emerged. Then Dr. Palomares began working with him to try to find the best way to transfer the methods to teachers and students. Trial and error has led us to the present. That's research that's basic—time proven.

Basically, the studies which have been made show, in general, that in classes where HDP has been implemented:

1. the level of academic achievement among students is not reduced, there may be some improvement, but cause and effect are not proven.
2. the incidence of behavior problems is reduced, in some cases, markedly so.
3. in the few studies conducted among our children, there is improvement in the self concept of children. The evidence tends to indicate that the benefits of HDP in this area are significant.
4. there is an improved climate of cooperation (helpfulness) among the children.

As for the TEACHERS who use or attempt to use HDP, our experience in training (I don't like that word) over 12,000 teachers and a few studies suggest that

1. very few will reject the idea outright.
2. some will think it is great and would use it every day if— a) their classes weren't so large, b) they had a teacher aide, c) they could schedule in 20 minutes a day, d) etc., etc.
3. others will think it is great and try it only to find that it takes more energy and expertise than they had originally thought and they “drop out” after a while.
4. a few try it, like it, and stay with it. I received a letter from one teacher last month who has been having circle sessions in her fifth grade class for thirty students every day for four years now. She swears by HDP. She is Mrs. Lea Welborn, Mesilla Elementary School, Las Cruces, New Mexico, Public Schools. There are many others like her in California, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Texas, Illinois, Massachusetts, Florida, and other states.

If you would like to contact others who have completed studies or are currently engaged in research, or have just had experience with HDP, you might ask (to name a few)


Kay McGee. Doctoral study in progress. 504½ N.W. 17th, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103.


To sum up the research question, I'm not much of a paper-and-pencil test man myself. At best, they are only indicators. Whether or not something will work rests upon the teacher. All we can do is give them a variety of approaches and experiences. Let them choose which is best for them and their students. Then help them as much as we can do what they do better, so long as it is in the best interest of children and is consistent with the philosophy the community has or wants to develop.

HDP is an approach, not the approach. It is not a cure-all or panacea but it can help teachers do what they entered teaching to do—relate to children as human beings worthy to be heard. If HDP does nothing else, it sets up a situation in which children are listened to by the adult teacher and other students. I have been in many classrooms where it seemed no one listened. Establishing a program in which children and teachers learn how to communicate (speak and listen) more effectively need not be defended.
WHERE ELSE CAN I READ ABOUT HDP?

Probably the best and latest work is Chapter 22, "Human Development in the Elementary School Classroom," by Dr. Bessell, in the book, New Perspectives on Encounter Groups, edited by Larry Solomon and Betty Berzon, and published in 1972 by Jossey-Bass, Inc. Another book written by Ellen Davies-Rodgers describes our attempts to introduce HDP in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1969 but we were thwarted by the far-right conservatives and the KKK. Reading Education—Then, Now and Yon: Human Development published in 1971 by Plantation Press, Memphis, Tennessee, might give you an idea of the opposition we have had in some sectors. Sometimes, I find myself laughing and crying at the same time when I recall some of the experiences we have had. I don't like to use cliches, but sometimes we are misunderstood.

HDP is mentioned or discussed in numerous other books and periodicals. Probably the five best articles are: "The Content is the Medium: The Confidence is the Message" by Hal Bessell in the January, 1968 issue of Psychology Today; "Desegregating People's Minds" by Valo Palomares in the summer 1969 Civil Rights Digest; "Teach Children to Love Themselves—or God Help their Neighbors" by Dolores Lachapelle in the September, 1970 issue of The Catechist; Communication Grows in a Magic Circle" by William Lefkowitz in the Teacher's Edition of My Weekly Reader, the April 5, 1972, issue; and "An Introduction to the Human Development Program" by Warren Timmermann in the March, 1972 issue of the Humanistic Education Quarterly.

HOW CAN I GET AN HDP WORKSHOP SET UP IN MY SCHOOL DISTRICT?

For that, I refer you to the Institute for Personal Effectiveness in Children at 4455 Twain Avenue, Suite H, San Diego, California, 92120. You should talk to Judy Clemmons, phone (714) 283-7141, there who coordinates all the workshops sponsored by IPEC or IPEC associates all over the country. HDTI has given IPEC exclusive rights to carry out this function. Dr. Uvaldo Palomares is the President of IPEC which does all kinds of research and other work under contract in addition to running HDP workshops.

DOES HDTI DO TRAINING OR OFFER ANY SERVICES?

Yes, Most of our training programs have been in juvenile corrections institutions and related agencies thus far. We have held workshops in correctional institutions in North Carolina, Virginia, D.C., New York and Connecticut in the last two years. I suppose we have trained over 3000 people in methods of human development in over 20 institutions—that's hard work.

In addition we have consulted with various agencies in planning projects, evaluation designs, program audits, testing programs, and other areas. When contacted for a special job we will handle it in-house or put you in touch with someone who has expertise in your area of need. In that way we act as a clearinghouse.

Also, we like to help people who have some materials they would like published. We will either publish and market them ourselves—like Bob Canady's Macho and Mimi Supplementary Reading Program—or put you in touch with some firm which might want your work.

HOW DO I GET TO BE AN HDP CONSULTANT? OR, CAN I CONDUCT WORKSHOPS?

That is a question asked many times. For the answer you must contact Judy over at IPEC. As for HDTI, we have all the consultants we need right now. Sorry.

WELL, WHAT CAN I DO TO HELP HDP GROW?

Simple. Use the program with children diligently, evaluate your methods, revise, improve yourself by reading and going to workshops, then tell others. Also, tell us how you are doing. We like to hear from you—while we need support too, you know.

I ALMOST FORGOT. CAN I GET A DISCOUNT ON HDP MATERIALS IF I BUY A LARGE QUANTITY?

No—with two exceptions. If you represent a bookstore, that is, you are going to resale the materials, we will give a 10% discount. Secondly, we are establishing distributorships around the country with whom we make special arrangements. If you are interested in a distributorship for materials, I would rather you contact me directly about that. Ok?

IS THERE ANYTHING I HAVE LEFT OUT WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD ABOUT HDTI MATERIALS OR OPERATIONS?

I might mention two things. First, we have a new publication out entitled, Having Good Feelings in the Magic Circle in School. Authored by Geraldine Bail, the booklet can be used by teachers with primary grade children in the classroom. Also, it is a fine vehicle to describe what HDP is all about to parents or educators. They are well worth the 10 for $2.95 price. Second, the Macho and Mimi books by Bob Canady are excellent high interest—low vocabulary supplementary reading materials for the fourth, fifth and sixth grade levels. As a special introductory offer to Macho and Mimi the sale price will be $2.00 for each packet of 40 stories or almost half the $3.95 price listed in the brochure. But this price will be good only for our first printing—which won't last long.

FINE. WELL, THANK YOU, DOCTOR JERRY. YOU HAVE ANSWERED MANY OF THE QUESTIONS I HAD.

Happy to help, Toni. Ask anytime.
CORONADO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, Albuquerque, N.M. During the 1969-1970 school year, Coronado was federally funded for a bi-lingual, bi-cultural program comprising the hiring of teachers' aides, a three-track system (English, Spanish and bi-lingual), and the Human Development Program in all three tracks. Coronado is located in one of the largest low-income, high Spanish-speaking areas in Albuquerque. Of its 819 children, 350 were given the Magic Circle. Tests were run at the beginning and end of the year in both Coronado and a control school, and videotapes were made throughout the year. Teachers translated HDP materials into Spanish where needed; children responded in either language.

Carlos Savedra, Director of Albuquerque's Bi-Lingual Education Program, gave principal credit for the success of the overall project to HDP: "HDP has made a terrific impact on my children. They participated with very little inhibition. They are happy, they are aware of others, and they are self-aware. The children in the experimental rooms were far ahead of the control groups. Here is a child with something to say, and he says it. He is not fearful. You can see the attitudinal changes happen right before you. We're very satisfied." Freedom of expression seemed most important to Savedra. "They could speak their mind. Once teachers shook loose of their own hangups, it was very easy for them to help the children do it. Each child feels he is worth something. We utilized it exactly as we were trained by HDP, and in the language the child speaks." Best evidence for the program was that this year the control school also adopted the Human Development Program.

According to Savedra's summary of the research data, at the end of the year Coronado scores were significantly higher than the control school's. In Kindergarten (control first, then Coronado), mean score for oral competency, 45.7-69.0; Spanish performance 7.0-21.9; English performance 20.1-25.8; affective performance 14.0-21.2; awareness .455-.490; mastery .170-.241; social interaction .472-.575; peer relations .422-.570; teacher relations .126-.208; enjoyment of school .172-.271; general happiness in school .349-.412; self-esteem .195-.225. Possibly the single most significant finding was the difference in absentee rate: at the control school, kindergarten children were absent one day in five; at Coronado, one day in 12.2.

Using the Goodnough Draw-a-man test, Coronado's children gained 10.37 IQ points (79.26 to 107.63) in the year, and a mental age gain of 17.53 (60.15 to 77.68). In first grade classes, comparative statistics closely paralleled those of the kindergarten. Some outstanding differences, however, were: Inter-American Reading Test in English and Spanish vocabulary and comprehension (control-Coronado) 21-32; in Spanish performance, 15-22; in awareness, .295-.547. Absenteeism among first graders in the control school ran to one day in four; at Coronado, one day in 17.2. First grade IQ gained 11.95 and mental age 18.68 in the experimental group.

DISCOVERY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER. Miss Kay McGee, director of Discovery Child Development Center, 520-26 Southwest 10th St., Oklahoma City, Okla., reports some preliminary findings from her doctoral dissertation in which she matched 80 four and five year old children attending classes in the center. One group did the Magic Circle for a year and one did not.

IQ gain in the Magic Circle children, she said, was twice that in the control group children. Further, the Metropolitan Readiness Test also showed twice the gain in the experimental group as in the control group. Miss McGee administered several tests to both groups and will report on them in her doctoral paper. She noted that especially in listening parts of the tests were the HDP children far ahead of the others.

SEVERAL other research efforts have been made in different parts of the country which we will report on in subsequent bulletins as the research is made available.

INSTITUTE FOR PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN CHILDREN, P.O. Box 20233, San Diego, Cal. 92120

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO. Y
HEADSTART PROGRAM, Odessa Texas. From January through May, 1970, the Headstart staff of the West Texas Educational Service Center (P.O. Box 6020, Midland, Texas) compared the Human Development Program used by Headstart teachers and the standard Headstart program. Under the direction of Dr. Weldon Elbert, Program Director, eight teachers and teacher aides were trained for three days in the Human Development Program. Four classes of Headstart children were classified as control groups. Of the more than 100 four and five year olds in the program, roughly 40% were black, 40% brown, and 20% white. All children were pre- and post-tested using the social-emotional part of the Brenner pre-school test and the HDP rating scale. Tests were administered by the Headstart director and social workers who knew the children. Teachers used and retained their own rating scales on the children, and used them for inservice discussion.

Throughout the five-month period, a portable videotape, arriving unannounced, was used to tape Magic Circle sessions. Five and ten minute "slices" of the tapings were discussed in the monthly in-service day. Both teachers and teacher aides conducted circles.

Dr. Elbert summarized the results of the project as follows: "I thought it was good. I thought it was wonderful. When the teachers left the training session, they were nervous because they had to go in and do something they had never done before. They all voluntarily participated, though, and they knew they were not being judged for production. We made it quite explicit: if it flopped, it flopped. It was an experiment, and we wanted to know if it flopped."

His principal impression concerned teacher change. "At the end, we gave the teachers a rating scale and questionnaire, and asked them if they would be interested in doing it again. Well, one of the most significant things we found was that they felt they learned as much as the kids did. They also felt it did something for teacher to teacher-aide relationships. This was the first time the teacher was forced to function as an equal with the teacher aide."

"One of my hangups," Dr. Elbert said, "is that I don't believe we have nearly the problem with kids that we have with teachers. For HDP to be effective, it has to produce teacher change. If she doesn't get with it, she can have all the circles in the world and she'll turn them right back into another classroom. But for us, this seemed to work out quite well. The teachers seem to have changed quite a bit as far as attitude, feelings, and their relationship to the kids. One teacher said 'I end up doing the circle all day long in one shape, form, or fashion.' She was doing the basic activities that go on in the circle, doing them all day. I asked her 'When did you start this?' She said 'I don't know. I just happened to notice.'"

Concerning a statistical evaluation of the project, Dr. Elbert said "When the average of pre and post tests for both experimental and control groups were compared for significant differences, the t test indicated significant differences for the experimental group at the .05 and .01 levels. There was no significant differences between pre and post test averages for the control group at either the .05 or .01 levels of significance. Roughly speaking, it looks like the experimental group ended up about 50 percent ahead of the control group children. From these preliminary examinations of our results, we could see that the difference was great enough to warrant a closer look. Right now we are trying to get a 360 computer analysis on it."

This year, he said, the Midland district is beginning all its Headstart children with HDP, and will continue advancing it with them as long as it proves successful.

INSTITUTE FOR PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN CHILDREN, P.O. Box 20233, San Diego, Cal. 92120
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, San Diego, California. "THE GENERATION OF AFFECTIVE VOCABULARY" by Leif Fearn.

NULL HYPOTHESIS: The experience of the Human Development Program model applied to the whole class setting will not make a measurable difference in the written expression of feelings among children of diverse educational environments.

SAMPLE: Two groups of children were selected for the study of affective vocabulary growth, one a sixth grade in the inner city and the second a fifth grade in a relatively affluent section of the same city. The total number of subjects involved for the purpose of statistical analysis was 56.

INSTRUMENT: The instrument used to generate written products from the subjects for analysis consisted of nine items, five of which were visual and four of which were auditory. In response to each stimulation the children were directed to write their responses to the question, "How does that make you feel?". The final item in the instrument was a written response to the question, "How do you feel right now?". Scoring was accomplished by taking the mean of the scores identified by both the teacher and the investigator, both of whom counted the total number of words on each paper which they deemed affective. Interjudge reliability exceeded .96 for all administrations of the instrument and .99 in the classroom for the gifted.

PROCEDURES: Two half hour to forty five minute sessions per week were conducted in each classroom. The sessions were conducted with the class as a whole and featured the tasks in the beginning of each of the three spheres of the Human Development Program. The research duration was nine weeks.

FINDINGS: A total of 4.42 was found in the sixth grade group, exceeding significance at .01. A total of 3.46 was found in the gifted group also exceeding significance at .01. In the first group there was a mean gain in affective vocabulary of 4.84 or a 31% increase over the pretest mean of 14. In the second grade group the mean gain in affective vocabulary was 4.41 or a 52% increase over the pretest mean of 8. The positive change in the sixth grade group ranged from 21 words to 1 word and showed a median word change of 4.5. The sixth grade group a change in affective vocabulary which ranged from 28.5 words to 1.5 words and showed a median change in affective vocabulary of 5.5.

CONCLUSIONS: The null hypothesis was rejected in both groups showing that as defined and measured, the Human Development Program constitutes a variable in the generation of affective vocabulary. The data concerning interjudge reliability showed that the judges in the study were in excellent communication regarding the nature of affective vocabulary in spite of the wide divergence among them. The validity of the instrument was defended on the basis of its having indicated a change in the behaviors of the subjects and on the basis of definition relative to the task of counting word change.
COMPARISON BETWEEN HDP AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

1. Aspires to do good.

2. People sit in a circle.

3. Responsibility lies with the participants, not with the trainer. Hence, with an unskilled trainer, individuals may be free to damage each other.

4. Readiness for exposure to anything is assumed. The goal is to bring everything into the open.

5. Participants are made to answer to others' perceptions of them, to endure criticism.

6. Wide range of competence among trainers; some with only a weekend of experience, others with forty years.

7. An orientation of "We know what is best for you even though we don't know you" is frequently found.

8. Objectives are often ill-defined or vague.

9. Sensitivity training often deliberately precipitates deep and surprising emotional reactions with the general assumption that nature will assimilate and heal.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1. Aspires to do good.

2. Children and teacher sit in a circle.

3. The professional is responsible, and makes constant effort to promote increased responsibility by the participants.

4. Nothing is assumed. Not everything is wanted in the open. Gentle invitation and volunteering is the group style.

5. Participants answer only to their own views of themselves. Each one has a right answer. Criticism of others is stopped.

6. Teachers and experienced youth workers are the group leaders. They have been trained to work with children in preparation for their job, and have received 3-5 days of specifically HDP approach. Any deficiencies in their work can be quickly seen and dealt with.

7. HDP is extensively researched and ordered. Each person has the opportunity to deal with (or refrain from dealing with) the suggested activity in his own way.

8. Objectives are spelled out on daily lesson plans. Rationale is based on respected and proven observations of psychological research or experience.

9. HDP is deliberately a bit-by-bit program of encouraging maturing experiences. It always builds upon already established building blocks in the child, steadily moving in a direction of increasing self-confidence. The HDP leader reacts just as any good teacher would to handle children's unexpected and unasked-for responses.