

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



8522803

Arroe, Beatrice

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

The University of Arizona

Ph.D. 1985

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985
by
Arroe, Beatrice
All Rights Reserved



CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

by

Beatrice Arroe

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 8 5

Copyright 1985 Beatrice Arroe

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read
the dissertation prepared by Beatrice Arroee

entitled Conceptual Framework of Alternative Programs

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement
for the Degree of Doctorate of Philosophy.

<u>Donald C. Clark</u>	<u>6/26/85</u>
Date	
<u>Paul M. Allen</u>	<u>6/26/85</u>
Date	
<u>Wm. D. Barnes</u>	<u>6/26/85</u>
Date	
_____	_____
Date	
_____	_____
Date	

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

<u>Wm. D. Barnes</u>	<u>6/26/85</u>
Dissertation Director	Date

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: _____

Beatrice Appel

To my husband, Pat Siner,
whose love and patience are always available;

To my parents, Dr. Hack Arroe and Mrs. Esther Arroe,
whose value for education gave me determination;

To Dr. L. Dow Rhoton,
who serves as my mentor, both in education and in life;

and

To the kids of the White Mountain Adventure School,
who care.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is extremely grateful to Dr. William D. Barnes (Chairman) for his sharing and accompaniment in this venture, and for his exemplification of the democratic process. Acknowledgment also needs to be extended to Drs. Donald C. Clark, Paul M. Allen, Shitala P. Mishra, and Emil S. Gavlak for their wisdom and understanding.

Appreciation is extended to Pat Siner for always being understanding, to Dr. L. Dow Rhoton for always being there, and to Dr. John Potts for being.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Assumptions Underlying the Problem	4
Limitations of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	5
Significance of the Study	6
Summary	7
2. APPROACH	8
Design of the Study	8
Method for Reporting Data	10
Summary	10
3. RELATED LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
A Conceptual Framework for Personal Processes	17
Summary	18
4. CONTACT	20
Introduction	20
Observe	23
Inform	25
Accept	27
Choice	31
Summary	34
5. CONSULT	35
Introduction	35
Question	38
Listen	39
Concern	41
Choice	44
Summary	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
6. FIND	48
Introduction	48
Discover	50
Identify Interest	53
Summary	55
7. SHARE	56
Introduction	56
Clarify Desired Outcome	60
Consider Choices	62
Plan of Action	64
Ownership	66
Accept	68
Observe	70
Summary	72
8. ACCOMPANY	73
Introduction	73
Doing It	75
Question	77
Observe	79
Reflect	80
Accept	82
Summary	84
9. SUMMARY	85
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

ABSTRACT

There is an absence of literature outlining the concepts which apply to alternative education. This study attempted to present a conceptual framework that is appropriate in developing alternative programs. It emphasized the process of personal relationships among the participants. A specific theory of personal processes was used to develop the conceptual framework. This study was descriptive in nature and limited to literature spanning the past twenty-five years.

The contention of this study was that America needs to perpetuate the ideal of democracy through the educational system. Schools must create a democratic setting where people have choices and responsibility for all important aspects of their lives. Warm, productive, and personal relationships within the learning atmosphere were also considered crucial in this effort. It was suggested that a "Theory of Personal Processes" devised by Barnes could be used as a referent in attempting to behave democratically. This theory was used to develop a conceptual framework for alternative programming.

The process of developing the democratic relationships which could form the behavioral framework for alternative schools consists of five categories: 1) Contact, 2) Consult, 3) Find, 4) Share, and 5) Accompany. Each category is broken into separate and distinct sub-categories. For Contact they are Observe, Inform, Accept, and Choice. Consult includes Question, Listen, Concern, and Choice. Find incorporates Discover and Identify Interest. Share uses Clarify Desired

Outcome, Consider Choices, Plan of Action, Ownership, Accept, and Observe. Accompany utilizes Doing It, Question, Observe, Reflect, and Accept.

Initially, a separate chapter on the review of the literature is presented. This is followed by an exploration of each category and its subcategories in separate chapters. The philosophy and literature supporting each category and its subcategories are discussed extensively within each chapter.

A final chapter summarizes the information presented. It was suggested that democratic processes can be productive if incorporated into the behavioral framework of alternative education. Such processes tend to produce warm and accepting relationships which foster productive learning.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In response to the apparent lack in meeting the needs of many school students, education has been under careful scrutiny. Montagu (1962, p. 50), reflecting on this, suggested:

The continuing traditional methods of education have really nothing whatsoever to do with the functions and purposes of a genuine education, namely to nourish and to cause the individual's uniqueness and creativity to grow. On the contrary, what traditional education for the most part succeeds in achieving is the frustration of the individual's uniqueness and creativity.

Goodman (1970, p. 212) commented, "The concept which is developed in the classroom is not an act of intellect grasping the world at all, but is a method of adjustment to the classroom, the constricted seats, the schedule, the teacher's expectations, and the boring subject matter to which one must pay attention." Smith (1974, p. 7) took note of the incongruities of operating schools bureaucratically when he stated, "This traditional model of schooling, which has dominated public education in this country, was imported directly from Western Europe, and was certainly not designed for a constitutional democracy."

It does appear that a re-evaluation of the traditional school system is needed. An alternative school movement has developed over the past several decades as a partial response to the above-mentioned syndrome. Student dissatisfaction, apathy, and underachievement, in important part, explain the beginnings of a number of today's alternative

schools (Raywid, 1981). The alternative method of education attempts to address these important issues.

The alternative method, according to Glatthorn (1975, p. 18), is used to address a crucial task of educators, that is, "creating learning communities where each person feels known, is valued, and receives respect." In large bureaucratic institutions, these goals are much less attainable than in small alternative schools. Montagu (1962, p. 61) reflected on this situation, observing, "Participation in the processes of one's own education, at every level, should constitute an essential part of the educational experience." The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1979) produced studies which indicated that one-half of the high school graduates questioned felt their high school experiences were not even "fairly useful" or "valuable." It becomes quite clear why the alternative movement has been a significant development. While it seems clear that the needs of all students must be served, only in alternative education is the concept of meeting the individual needs of all students put into consistent use and practiced daily (DeTurk, 1974).

Whatever the reasons, the alternative education concept appears to have an impact on educational thought, yet the research in this field is quite limited. Most such studies tend to congregate around 1) the alternative school versus the traditional school, 2) the academic performance of the participants, 3) the program structure and its application and evaluation, and 4) studies of curriculum.

There is a lacuna in present research findings regarding the conceptual frameworks upon which alternative programs are fabricated.

It is not clear as to what the specific structural concepts are which undergird the alternative education movement. It did appear that one approach in detailing these concepts was to study the background literature on alternative education to identify potential concepts. Another approach to the matter of identifying such concepts was to consult with participants of alternative programs to discover what concepts might inhere.

Another educational approach which recommends individuality and personal growth as an integral part of one's education is the outdoor experiences movement. Various studies (Copen, 1980; Cardwell, 1976; Murphy, 1976; Porter, 1975; Schulze, 1970) have shown that these programs offer opportunities for the participants to attain significant changes in self-worth, acceptance of others, and in building relationships that are warm, intimate, and equal.

The people who are drawn to these experiences tend to be those who are "dissatisfied both with the education they are receiving and with their own personal values and life style" (Schulze, 1970, p. 1). As with alternative education, outdoor education tends to feature intense personal relationships at the crux of the learning situation. The teacher, as Montagu (1962, p. 55) noted, "should be before everything else, one who cares for the student, is involved in his welfare, is nourishing, stimulating, and supportive; . . . he treats each student as an individual in his own right and encourages him to develop his own uniqueness."

There is also a paucity of literature on outdoor experiences which are linked with alternative education. A composite picture of the

conceptual framework behind alternative and outdoor education was constructed by looking at a variety of indoor and outdoor alternative experiences.

Statement of the Problem

In this study, the following question guided the exploration of the investigation: What conceptual framework might be appropriate in developing alternative schools which emphasize the process of personal relationships among the participants?

Assumptions Underlying the Problem

The following assumptions were made regarding the problem:

1. A review of literature using a specific theory of personal processes can be productive in developing a conceptual framework.
2. The interpersonal subjectivity of participant/observers of alternative programs can be valuable as a source of data.
3. A theory based on personal relationships is useful in developing this study.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations operated throughout this study:

1. This investigation was limited to a specific theory of personal relationships.
2. This investigation was limited in its review of related literature to the development of alternative and outdoor programs spanning the past twenty-five years.
3. This investigation was descriptive in nature.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were utilized throughout this investigation:

"An alternative program is one which is a small school which students may choose to attend in place of the conventional school, that's significantly different from conventional school, and typically emphasizes a high degree of staff and student involvement in decision making" (Glatthorn, 1975, p. 11). In this study, the underlying implications suggest choice and acceptance as rightful states of humanness. Warm, personal relationships between teacher and student are the main focus of the alternative program.

Participant/observers are persons involved in the action who note the events and the environment at the moment of action (Combs). They are observers whose perceptions and perspectives of the relationships and experiences of their fellow participants within a particular program are provided.

Personal relationships occur among individuals where warmth, caring, and acceptance are nourished.

Personal processes, as explained by Barnes and Tidwell (1974a), are a way of living that stresses individual worth and integrity of human personality in which individuals conduct social relationships on a plane of mutual respect, cooperation, tolerance, and fair play and a way of living ordered to help each individual develop himself. It can be used interchangeably with democratic processes.

Outdoor experiences, as a term, is used interchangeably with "wilderness experiences." It involves intense personal and individual

experiences through the guide of an outdoor component. The environmental setting and the student's interaction with nature foster education through reality.

Indoor experiences is a term used interchangeably with "classroom experiences." This is an approach to education where the classroom is any place where learning occurs. A primary goal is for students to acquire confidence and basic skills to take charge of their lives (Gibbons, 1984).

Structure is the idiosyncratic and unique social construction of reality that interpenetrates all human actions and interactions. It is the way the participants interact and relate.

Significance of the Study

It appeared that personal relationships figure importantly in successful learning (Maslow, 1971; Rogers, 1969). Raywid (1981) has suggested that much of the difference between alternative and other schools lies with the nature and breadth of teacher-student relationships. The true conceptual framework behind this idea and how it relates to alternative education has not received significant attention. There are over 2,500 alternative schools in this country (Raywid, 1981), yet few, if any, studies have investigated the theoretical concepts behind these programs.

A different approach to better understanding the concepts of personal relationships and their significance seemed to be to look at outdoor adventure programs. These often provide learning climates that are enhancing to both the student and the staff. In these programs,

professionals cannot hide behind their jargon. This, in turn, builds a trust and appreciation of human relations (Cardwell, 1976; Schulze, 1970). Studies have shown that students have changed their perceptions of their teachers in a positive direction after outdoor programs (Bateson, 1981; Godfrey, 1972; Rhoades, 1972). It appeared that combining outdoor programs with alternative education was an optimum and complementary way to bring out the Theory of Personal Processes.

There are few studies which try to determine the educational concepts that run through the history of alternative education. Therefore, this study attempted to do precisely that.

Summary

This study was descriptive in nature. It used participants' perceptions and a historical search through relevant literature.

The body of this study is broken into several different sections. Chapters 1 and 2 introduce the problem and procedures of this study. Chapter 3 consists of the review of the literature. The next five chapters define the conceptual framework in detail. The final chapter analyzes the data and summarizes the findings.

CHAPTER 2

APPROACH

This investigation developed out of a need for a conceptual framework for alternative education programs which emphasize personal relationships. A qualitative approach was used in this study since, as Best (1959) explained, it is concerned with conditions and relationships that exist; beliefs, points of view, or attitudes that are held; processes that are going on; effects that are being felt; or trends that are developing.

Descriptive studies have the advantage of allowing the investigator to participate in, observe, and record the data and events discovered with a minimum of constraints. According to Mouly (1963), qualitative research has as its purpose establishing the status of the phenomenon under investigation. A descriptive approach, moreover, allows material "rich in description of people, places, and conversations not easily handled by statistical procedures" (Bogdan and Bicklen, 1982, p. 2).

Design of the Study

The first section of this study is an extensive search through related literature. This review of the literature of the behavioral sciences, which tended to relate to the humanistic approach to learning, produced a theoretical base upon which the conceptual framework was developed. This theoretical base was drawn out as the most appropriate

theory for all alternative education participants. The specific theory of personal relationships was systematically applied to the review of literature in alternative education. The review of literature included both outdoor and indoor alternative education.

Interspersed within the literature review are comments of recognized participant/observers and developers of alternative programs. There are three concepts for participant/observers that are relevant to this study: 1) the participant/observer shares in the life activities and the sentiments of the people in face-to-face relationships, 2) the participant/observer is a normal part of the culture and the life of the people under observation, and 3) the participant/observer and his role reflect social processes of living in society (Bruyn, 1966, pp. 13-20).

In collecting the data, much use was made of the unstructured interview. Mouly (1963) believed this would allow the respondent greater freedom in discussing a topic of significance, as well as be most appropriate for getting insight in the early stages of investigation. In accordance with personal contact, "when skillfully used as a sociological tool, questioning frequently reveals dormant aspects of the system which are not acted out while the observer watches, and which may also be concealed from the other group members" (Riley, 1963, p. 167).

Finally, important and generally non-recognized participants in alternative programs emphasizing personal processes were consulted regarding their views. Students, parents, teachers, and professionals concerned with human services were personally contacted. Interviews and observations yielded much data for this study.

Method for Reporting Data

As the search of the literature proceeded, various concepts were developed. These concepts, with their roots in a specific theory of personal relationships, developed into a conceptual framework for alternative programs. This investigation describes the framework in detail. As each concept of the framework developed, it was discussed in a separate chapter.

Thus, Chapters 1 and 2 are an introduction to the problem and the procedures for the study. The third chapter summarizes the review of the literature and the development of the conceptual framework. Chapters 4 through 8 each provides in detail a specific concept and its development, including where in history the concept has been significant, how it applies to alternative education, and its derivation from a theory of personal relationships. A final chapter analyzes and summarizes the data collected.

Summary

The research design for this study had three areas of consideration: 1) selected historical review of scholarly works concerning education, 2) a review of literature regarding alternative education with a specific theory of personal processes as a guide, and 3) feedback from recognized contributors to the field of alternative education.

The data are reported in qualitative terminology. The conceptual framework which arises from this study is descriptive in nature.

CHAPTER 3

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The explanation for the development of the alternative school movement has received considerable attention. Montagu stated that the continuing traditional methods of education have really nothing whatever to do with the functions and purposes of a genuine education, namely, to nourish and to cause the individual's uniqueness and creativity to grow. On the contrary, Montagu held that what traditional education, for the most part, succeeds in achieving is the frustration of the individual's uniqueness and creativity. He even went so far as to call the traditional schools assembly lines or factories (Montagu, 1962, p. 50). In 1859, John Stuart Mill, according to Smith, Barr, and Burke (1976, p. 1), suggested that "an education established and controlled by the state should only exist, if it exists at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence."

A recent survey by Abram and Cobb (1984) on reasons for dropping out of school claimed school was not teaching students what they wanted to know. It appears that many high school and junior high school students are getting little from school because they fail to see the relevance to their future lives of what the school is attempting to teach them (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1979,

p. 107). The Carnegie Council (1979, p. 1) reported that nearly one-half of the 1960 high school students in the "Project Talent" survey, when questioned in a follow-up survey eleven years later, did not consider their high school experiences to have been "valuable" or even "fairly useful."

Silberman (1970, p. 10) commented that "it is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere--mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self." At another point he observed, "Schools discourage students from developing the capacity to learn by and for themselves; they make it impossible for a youngster to take responsibility for his own education, for they are structured in such a way as to make students totally dependent upon the teachers" (Silberman, 1970, p. 135).

Stoughton (1976, p. 2), in a report to the North Central Association, discovered that out of 1,000 students entering as freshmen in Arizona high schools 367 would not graduate at their scheduled time. Snow (1982, p. 14) asserted that "we now need to redefine and recreate the student role in learning."

In any event, student dissatisfaction, apathy, and underachievement explain the beginnings of a number of today's alternative schools (Raywid, 1981). At every stage of children's development, schools, according to Glatthorn (1975, p. 10), should be offering them and their parents a variety of learning environments, of curricula, and teaching styles through small autonomous units. Watson (1972, p. 1) commented that "alternative programs enable communities to avoid having to decide

between traditional and innovative schools. Instead, they offer a range of different options for different needs--and for all types of students."

Glatthorn suggested that, in an age of alienation, the most critical task for educators is to create learning communities where each person feels known, is valued, and receives respect. He continued that these fuzzy, imprecise goals may be more attainable in a small alternative school than they are in a large bureaucratic institution (Glatthorn, 1975, p. 18). Education does not seem to follow with our country's beliefs. Counts stated, "Our philosophy of education should be securely rooted in the democratic-revolutionary tradition of the American people. It should aim to foster in boys and girls a profound sense of human worth" (Dennis and Eaton, 1980, p. 111). Counts believed that, if America is not to be false to the promise of her youth, she must do more than simply perpetuate the democratic ideal of human relationships, she must make an intelligent and determined effort to fulfill it (Dennis and Eaton, 1980, p. 99). Kohl (1969, p. 78) pointed out that "a free way of existing is not necessarily an easy way of existing. Autonomy, the ability to make one's own decisions, and self-direction, the ability to act on one's decisions, can be quite painful to people who have grown up in an authoritarian system." Gibbons (1984, p. 595) advised that, "by teaching our students to function successfully as self-directed learners, we are also helping them to develop inner characteristics that will serve them well in other spheres."

Much of the difference between alternative and other schools lies in the nature and breadth of teacher-student relationships (Raywid,

1981). The feature most frequently cited in alternative programs as being special is human relationships. Smith (1976, p. 57) found that in alternative education: 1) teachers treat students as people and treat them with respect; 2) teachers establish warm, friendly, and even affectionate relationships with students; 3) teachers allow students freedom along with responsibilities; 4) teachers create a casual, low-pressure atmosphere; and 5) teachers show a genuine interest in students. In alternative schools, emphasis is placed on interpersonal skills and attitudes of respect, caring, and trust. Chandler (1983, pp. 12-14) noted that, in alternative schools, teachers appear to feel that relationships between students and teachers are as important as the curriculum.

Democratic processes, and especially the sharing of power through participation, are cornerstones of democracy (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972, p. 91). Farber (1970, p. 32) claimed "our textbooks may teach one kind of political system but the method by which our schools operate teach another." The alternative public schools have a commitment to be more responsive to some need within their communities than the conventional schools have been (Smith, 1974, p. 18). One of these needs is a democratic society where people have choices in all important aspects of their lives.

Copen and Lebowhl (1984, p. 602) devised educational aims that tend to accelerate individual effectiveness of students. These include: 1) confidence and trust in oneself, a self-esteem; 2) responsibility--choice plus accountability (not blame); 3) attitude--the way an individual thinks or feels about something (positive attitudes turn failure

into an opportunity to learn and grow, whereas negative attitudes become self-fulfilling prophecies and stifle the willingness to try new things); and 4) skills--the abilities to do a job. Many of these steps can be accomplished through outdoor experiences.

Many alternative schools choose to incorporate outdoor experiences into their curriculum. According to Cardwell (1976, p. 5), there are basic outdoor components which must be emphasized in the establishment of any outdoor experience. These are: 1) physical and/or mental challenge; 2) clear and unavoidable tasks; 3) occasional confrontations with fear, i.e., heights, solitude; 4) continuing involvement in adventure; 5) overcoming of a seemingly impossible task and/or challenge; 6) immediate results and relevant consequences; and 7) a positive experience. The reasoning behind this addition of outdoor experiences lies in the results of many studies.

"Activities which are challenging, exciting, exhilarating, and which possess immediate results are readily grasped and understood. They speak deeply to the needs of students to feel competent" (Cardwell, 1976, p. 7). These programs assist students to become aware of their potential and aid them in establishing a desire for achievement. They are helped to discover their own qualities as well as to develop pride and a better self-image (Cardwell, 1976, p. 5). Cardwell (1976, p. 7) discovered "the alternative environment of nature demands a change in outlook and an adjustment on the part of an individual that can often catalyze further growth and change." These changes centered around perceptions of teachers in a positive direction (Bateson, 1981), significantly higher school adjustments and significantly fewer court contacts

(Carter, 1980), positive change in self-concept (Dickinson, 1979; Nye, 1975; Murphy, 1976; Stremba, 1972; Wetmore, 1972), an improvement in grade-point average average (Smith, 1971), a positive change in moral judgment (Winkie, 1976), and higher levels of self-actualization (Vogel, 1979).

A significant factor which affects behavior is the self-concept (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971, p. 39). Porter (1975, p. 5) stated that outdoor experience, if structured correctly, "strengthens self-concept and this increased self-concept generalizes to one's feeling about academic ability." For each student, an awareness of who he is can limit what he will be. The tremendous impact of a person's self-perception on his behavior and functioning has only recently been clearly highlighted (Combs, Richards, and Richards, 1949, p. 276). One of the primary goals of the educator could be to aid the student in the formation of a self that is positive and definitive.

Silberman (1970, p. 312) felt that to develop positive self-image teachers would have to make clear to each child that he is a person of worth, and to respond to his behavior in ways that would convey a sense of trust and affection. To achieve any form of self-concept that is permanent, the student needs to participate in the process. Silberman (1970, p. 135) stated that "most schools in practice define education as something teachers do to and for students, not something students do to and for themselves, with a teacher's assistance." Schulze (1970, p. 6) discovered in outdoor experiences that the students found the responsibilities loomed large and were invigorating; they found, too, that they could meet these responsibilities.

Alternative school programs pride themselves on being defined as significantly different from conventional schools because they typically emphasize a high degree of staff and student involvement in decision making (Glatthorn, 1975, p. 11). Participation, in the democratic sense of the word, can be an experience providing each person a full sense of involvement in the ongoing activity. Milner (1980, p. 9) reported that involvement suggests the establishment of working relationships, that is, personal relationships, with other persons engaged in the shared activity.

Participation in the processes of one's own education at every level, according to Montagu (1962, p. 61), should constitute an essential part of the educational experience. The teacher may have every intention of behaving democratically in the classroom, but as Brewer and Tidwell (1977, p. 6) stated, democratic intent does not necessarily produce democratic behavior. The method of teaching is fundamental, for the method is the message. What is most important, stated Montagu (1962, p. 60), is not what one teaches, but how.

A Conceptual Framework for Personal Processes

Although the need and strengths behind the alternative education movement have been well-documented, the process needed to achieve these productive relationships within the programs is lacking. In his book, Democratic Classrooms: Theory and Behavior, Barnes (1977) formulated a theory which can be used as a core for describing certain democratic relationships. This theory of democratic processes in classrooms is constructed of two sections. The second section, labeled "Other

Direction," seemed appropriate for this writer in developing a conceptual framework on which to build alternative programs. It is the "actions" portion of the theory. It defines categories that are easily observable and can result in personal relationships that are warm and productive in the classroom.

Allen et al. (1970, pp. 25-26) stated:

We believe that the main influence of the teacher in the classroom occurs in his moment-by-moment interaction with students. The attitude of the teacher, and those of his students, flavor every relationship between them. The way this interaction develops tends to establish limits to the opportunities students have for participation, for making choices which appear significant to them and for the thought processes they develop and use.

The process by which a student and teacher develop a personal relationship within a learning atmosphere can be considered crucial. Gibbons (1984, p. 596) recognized that, "when we regularly challenge them [the students] to challenge themselves, we encourage them to set demanding goals and to take on demanding tasks that plunge them into new experiences or propel them toward new levels of performance."

Barnes (1977) broke the process into steps and labeled them:

1) Contact, 2) Consult, 3) Find, 4) Share, and 5) Accompany. From these categories, this writer developed a conceptual framework for alternative programming.

Summary

In this chapter, the reasons behind the introduction of alternative education were presented. The significance and incorporation of outdoor experiences into alternative education was explored.

A theoretical framework which could be applied to alternative programming was offered. The general categories of the theoretical framework, i.e., Contact, Consult, Find, Share, and Accompany, were presented. The following chapters elaborate on each of these terms. The theoretical framework in outline form is as follows:

1. Contact
 - 1.1 Observe
 - 1.2 Inform
 - 1.3 Accept
 - 1.4 Choice
2. Consult
 - 2.1 Question
 - 2.2 Listen
 - 2.3 Concern
 - 2.4 Choice
3. Find
 - 3.1 Discover
 - 3.2 Identify Interest
4. Share
 - 4.1 Clarify Desired Outcome
 - 4.2 Consider Choices
 - 4.3 Plan of Action
 - 4.4 Ownership
 - 4.5 Accept
 - 4.6 Observe
5. Accompany
 - 5.1 Doing It
 - 5.2 Question
 - 5.3 Observe
 - 5.4 Reflect
 - 5.5 Accept

CHAPTER 4

CONTACT

Introduction

The primary goal of the educator seems to be the implementation of the student's finer self and assisting the student in his quest for self-concept. Additionally, the teacher should want to provide a climate of democracy where all participants are equal and accepted as such. Elliot (1982, p. 1) believed that the difficulty in achieving democracy has been that more attention is paid to defending it as a philosophy than to developing it as a fully functioning action system in the lives of people. In addition, Counts felt "our philosophy of education should be securely rooted in the democratic-revolutionary tradition of the American people. It should aim to foster in boys and girls a profound sense of human worth" (Dennis and Eaton, 1980, p. 111). He then continued, "If America is not to be false to the promise of her youth, she must do more than simply penetrate the democratic ideal of human relationships, she must make an intelligent and determined effort to fulfill it" (Counts, cited in Dennis and Eaton, 1980, p. 99). As Glatthorn (1975, p. 186) claimed, "those who live in a community that operates democratically are more likely to internalize democratic values and ways of being."

In the traditional classroom, according to Silberman (1970, p. 324), the "teacher-student relationship is a form of

institutionalized dominance and subordination . . . the values they transmit are the values of docility, passivity, conformity and lack of trust." One major difference between traditional schools and the alternative program lies in the importance of establishing warm relationships between students and teachers (U.S. Department of Justice, 1980, p. iv). Smith (1976, p. 48) suggested that, "in schools, particular programs or organizational patterns are not important. The important thing is the human element . . . teachers who combine a sense of humanity and justice in dealing with young people with the requisite knowledge and teaching skills."

What would be ideal in the realm of education would be "a democratic classroom where pupils and teacher find ways of functioning together without invoking arbitrary or absolute authority" (Kohl, 1969, p. 22). What we need, according to Duke (1978, p. 46), is "democratic relations in which teachers relate to students in an informal, particularistic, egalitarian way." Rogers (1969, pp. 105-106) added:

We know . . . that the initiation of learning rests not upon the teaching skills of the teacher, not upon his scholarly knowledge of the field, not upon his use of audio-visual aids, not upon the programmed learning he utilizes, not upon his lectures and presentations, not upon an abundance of books, though each of these might at one time or another be utilized as an important resource. No, the facilitation of learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist in the personal relationships between the facilitator and the learner.

Coltrin (1974, p. 12) presumed the relationship which develops between the teacher and the student can range from situations of total teacher direction with no concern for student interests, to situations of openness where student interests are the basis of the classwork. The magnitude of classroom behaviors displayed is a direct result of the

range of relationships. "Human relationships and behavioral patterns in the classroom should be considered an important phase of the student's school life" (Cronbach, 1963, pp. 32-52).

Personal relationships commence with the teacher making contact with the students. Through this contact, if conducted on a personal level, the student grasps a willingness on the teacher's part for them to work together. To make contact is the first step in acknowledging the other person as his own being. "Significant contact with pupils is most effectively established and maintained when the content and method of instruction have an affective basis. That is, if educators are able to discover the feelings, fears, and wishes that move pupils emotionally, they can more effectively engage pupils from any background" (Weinstein and Fantini, 1970, p. 10).

Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman (1951, pp. 121-122) considered that, "when persons are in contact, they not only respect their own and the other's opinions, tastes, and responsibilities but actively welcome an animation and excitement of the airing of disagreements." MacCracken (1975, p. 29) stated, "You can instill a hundred techniques in a teacher, having her memorize thousands of technical terms; but if she cannot make contact with the children they are useless." Any meaningful personal relationship is initiated and sustained through contact.

Sterman (1976, p. 16) defined contact as a process by which a teacher makes an initial move to form some sort of relationship with a student. Barnes and Tidwell (1974) proposed contact as the preliminary act of establishing warm, personal relationships. It is the way one meets and relates to another person during the initial phase of

interaction (Zunin and Zunin, 1972, p. 3). It is through the process of Contact that the teacher can begin to perceive the various characteristics of the student (and vice versa). Various behaviors can be identified within the process of Contact. These are: Observe, Inform, Accept, and Choice.

Observe

The first discernible behavior within Contact is Observe. As Contact sets the stage for interaction to occur, observation may possibly introduce Contact.

The attitudes and behaviors the teacher models in the classroom will pervade the atmosphere of the group. The teacher sets the ambience of the classroom. If the teacher sets a mood of distrust and apathy, the climate of the class will be affected by these. The warmth and concern generated by the teacher will be observed by all who enter the classroom. "The method of teaching is fundamental, for the method is the message . . . what is most important is not what one teaches, but how" (Montagu, 1962, p. 60).

Upon opening contact, the student tends to carefully observe the teacher, while the teacher tends to carefully observe the student. Observation implies regarding each member of the group as an individual and unique person, as well as possessing no preconceived expectations for the person.

Combs (1962, p. 76) felt:

If we can understand how a person is perceiving right now, we may be able to help him change his behavior even if we do not know how he got this way. That is, if human behavior is a function of perception and if perception exists in the present, then

it should be possible to change behavior if we can change present perceptions. This opens vast new possibilities for education.

Whatever the student's preconceptions, upon first contact, he will tend to see the teacher as he is.

"Perhaps the most basic attitude of a teacher is realness or genuineness. When the facilitator is a real person entering into a relationship with the learner without presenting a front or a facade, he is most likely to be effective" (Rogers, 1969, p. 106). Studies have shown that students are influenced by and may imitate their teacher's behaviors and values (Portuges and Feshbach, 1968; Ross, 1966; Bandura and Walters, 1964). These are transmitted to the student through observation on the student's part. The teacher must set a democratic example and watch to see who and what the student is and allow that to be. Kohl (1969, p. 18) presented the idea that the teacher must learn to perceive differences, but these should emerge from what actually happens in the classroom during the school year and not from preconceptions. "Learning is a process of acquiring values from the environment" (Neill, 1960, p. 254).

For honest and true observation, the teacher listens competently to what the student is saying. Lembo (1971, p. 74) believed competent and empathetic listening is, perhaps, the most basic and most necessary condition for facilitating the development of an open and trusting relationship. The teacher will hear not only words, but will observe the student's feelings and meanings. In addition, the teacher should strive to be open and not prejudice any student. Each day the student enters the classroom the teacher should try to be unbiased and allow the

student to be the best he can be. Studies have shown the crucialness of this concept in that what the teacher believes or expects of the student is what the teacher generally will receive (Brookover, 1965, 1967; Fink, 1962; Davidson and Lang, 1960). "If the record cards indicate that several pupils are particularly troublesome, and if the teacher singles them out when they enter, and if the teacher treats them differently from the other students . . . the students will sense this and act in the manner expected of them. Thus the teacher traps both himself and his pupils into repeating patterns that have been set for years" (Kohl, 1969, p. 16). If the teacher makes any prejudgment of his student, it is highly likely that it will come true. Brown (1971, p. 8) added, "Once a student is categorized and classified, it is psychologically and practically almost impossible for him to break out of his category. Once branded 'slow' or a 'failure' he is immutably branded. Those thus defined react in predictable ways."

For the student-teacher relationship to be productive and useful, it would seem the teacher must observe the student in his interactions and not place limitations or expectations on the student. The teacher could also model appropriate and honest behavior which the students can, in return, observe and learn from.

Inform

In the alternative school, upon first appearance of a new student, the "old" students generally take it upon themselves as part of the contact procedure to inform new students about the nature of the program. They orient the new student as to the structure (see

definition, p. 6) of the program. This includes not only whatever rules and procedures may exist, but the general "how things are done."

"Even the most fleeting contact with someone entails some involvement. Involvement entails communication, verbally and/or non-verbally" (Zunin and Zunin, 1972, p. 149). Contact can be synonymous with a reaching out from one person to another. Contact is not limited to merely an observation, but expands to a reaching out across the realms of interpersonal experiences. This behavior is labeled Inform. Inform can be described as in contact "the way one meets and relates to another person during the initial phase of the interaction" (Zunin and Zunin, 1972, p. 3).

The social notion that a person can be lonely even when there are many people around has been noted by Moustakas and Perry (1973, pp. 34-35). In traditional schools, the classroom can be a place where participants seldom take notice of each other, fail to enter into discussion with one another, and run aground when it comes to sharing. Such classroom and societal behaviors can produce feelings of alienation, loneliness, isolation, etc. Fromm (1947, p. 51) claimed that people are alone and related at the same time. They make decisions or judge experiences all alone. However, he stated, they cannot bear separateness or to be completely unrelated.

Democratic relationships as found in some alternative programs can offset this feeling of separateness through personal contact. Being democratic fosters a feeling in the participants of self-orientation as well as others-orientation (Brewer and Tidwell, 1977). Classrooms that employ personal processes tend to create an ambience in which those

involved can relate in non-threatening, responsive, and trusting ways (Sterman, 1976, p. 2).

Rogers (1969, p. 167) suggested that each person prefers personal relationships rather than relationships where roles are acted out. The role relationships, he continued, appear as a mask worn by one or both participants so that the real self does not emerge in the interaction.

Through the method of Inform, the teacher and students welcome another student through a process of making warm and personal contact and orienting the student to the structure of "their" program. Thus, by definition of democracy, all must be involved and equal.

Accept

For a trusting relationship to occur between a teacher and a student, there needs to take place an acceptance of the student and his expressions of himself. Every person, Lembo (1971, p. 75) claimed, needs to believe that when he communicates his true feelings and convictions he will not be criticized for being himself. It is of utmost importance that teachers do not impose their values on their students. This places standards which have no guaranteed validity. If students are required, Lembo (1971, p. 8) continued, and coerced to adapt to adult standards, freedom to communicate one's real self is precluded. The teacher sets the climate for acceptance by modeling the behavior and assisting the students in being accepting of others.

The democratic classroom contains an ambience of accepting behaviors. If a student feels accepted by the teacher, he most

generally develops accepting attitudes towards himself and those around him. A person's perceptions are greatly affected by his concept of himself (Combs et al., 1971, p. 43). Self-concept is of the utmost importance in a person's life, for through it perceptions are made about the world (Felker, 1974, p. 8).

Because the self is made up of "reflected appraisals" of other people, the quality of a person's life is very much affected by the quality of the relationships with the important people around him (Sullivan, cited in Phenix, 1964, p. 200). Sullivan commented that, "if one is rejected by the significant persons, he will tend to develop a self-rejecting personality. If he has been welcomed, he will tend to develop a confident, self-accepting personality" (Phenix, 1964, p. 200).

Acceptance is learned behavior (Sugarman, 1978; Fitts, 1971; Combs, 1962; Rogers, 1961). "Apparently one learns to accept himself and others as a function of having experienced acceptance" (Combs, 1962, p. 50). The significance of self-image to young people was emphasized by Argyle (1978, p. 198) when he stated that adolescents "who have only just formed a tentative self-image are particularly sensitive to the reactions of others, and are 'insecure' in this sense."

Davidson and Lang (1960) discovered that how a student perceives the teacher's feelings towards that student correlates positively with the perceptions the student has for himself. The more positive the student's perception of the teacher's feelings towards the student, the better his academic achievement and more desirable classroom behavior displayed. The importance of the teacher displaying acceptance of each student is quite clear.

Students, like any other persons, need to be allowed to live their own lives. The most successful way to teach this philosophy is to live and represent it to the student. Everyone desires to live life to the fullest extent imaginable. Often what keeps them from doing so is their thoughts and beliefs about themselves and others. The only true motivation comes from a sense of self-worth (Piper, 1983). This feeling of self-worth seems to derive from acceptance of other people and the self as someone of worth as individuals, as responsible, interested people, and as unique and equal people underlines another concept inherent in the democratic classroom. Acceptance of a person, according to Rogers (1961, p. 34), could be defined as "a warm regard for him as a person of unconditional self-worth, of value no matter what his condition, his behavior, or his feelings." The democratic teacher perceives the student as being adequate, and he accepts the student and his expressions of himself, that is, being favorably disposed towards or appreciative of each of them.

Acceptance does not mean asking less, or making fewer demands, or standing by. Acceptance is a mutual behavior between participants where both are equal, receiving respect, and are valued. Wees (1971, p. 49) assumed the teacher respects the child, first, because he is a human being; second, because the child has already accomplished a feat of growing, the like of which the teacher himself will never again achieve; and third, because he has a potential contribution to make to the future of mankind. When mutual respect has been achieved, then equality may result. After equality, the teacher and student, many times, learn to like one another. When teacher and student have found

that personal relationship, learning and "other wonders" happen (Maslow and Rogers).

Acceptance means not labeling people or placing limitations upon others. Teachers need to "accept each child as an individual, the way he is . . . and maybe in this atmosphere of accepting and trusting each other we can grow a little more" (MacCracken, 1975, p. 143).

Acceptance suggests that, when the student makes mistakes, as is necessary in the learning process, then the experience of imperfection is not self-defeating. Lembo (1971, p. 76) believed that "the teacher who cannot accept the fact that errors are a natural part of learning and developing cannot hope to create a climate of openness and trust and cannot hope to provide conditions appropriate for each student to develop the best that is in him."

In recognizing the importance of acceptance, one must distinguish between accepting and approving. One term does not suggest the other. Accepting means the student needs to know he is being understood for himself. This does not mean the teacher must necessarily approve of everything the student communicates. Teacher and student may need to agree to disagree on specifics. The underlying assumption requires that, even in disagreements, the two are still accepting of each other (Rhoton, 1985).

If there are behaviors or attitudes that are dishonest or destructive, they do not need to be accepted, but they must be communicated and compromised on. "When disapproval of behavior is expressed, it must be borne in mind that the effectiveness of the teacher's disapproval and the likelihood of a constructive change in the student's

behavior are contingent on a climate conducive to a safe examination of the student's behavior and on his ability to display acceptable alternative behavior" (Lembo, 1971, p. 75). The teacher cannot simply express to the student that his behavior is not approved. Together, they must identify behaviors that are acceptable alternatives to both student and teacher. This interaction displays acceptance of the student as a person, but not of the behavior.

Accepting the student as a person for himself implies appreciating his ideas, his interpretations of his success, his fears of failure, his frustrations and anger, his behavior and his logic behind it. If the teacher does not accept the student's needs and goals, he will not be able to facilitate the student's learning or self-development.

Kelley (1962, p. 92) advised that, "if schools are going to be good places for students, all kinds of young people will have to be accepted and made to feel accepted, cared for, and honored for their uniqueness . . . schools are needed where students will feel that somebody cares about every single one of them; where there will be no second class citizens." "Teachers who make genuine contact with students show genuine warmth, awareness and regard for each student and begin perceiving them as they are, not as the teacher wants them to be" (Combs, 1962, p. 19).

Choice

The teacher and student must always remember that just because they wish a personal relationship to occur does not always make it happen. This is part of the concept of choice. Gefke (1972, pp. 8-9)

postulated that the definition of a democratic person in a classroom is a person who assumes individual responsibilities and respects the thinking of any group member. A member of any group who is commanded in every act loses on two counts: 1) he loses the ability to think for himself, and 2) to profit by whatever foolish act he commits--and he also loses dignity (Schneideman, 1945, p. 434).

When the teacher makes contact with the student, he must remember that the student may not at first be willing or able. The teacher must accept that choice. But, as Barnes (1977, pp. 59-60) pointed out, without continuous contact the opportunities for developing warm, personal, equal, and productive relationships are not present.

"The function of the child is to live his own life--not the life that his anxious parents think he should live, nor a life according to the purpose of the educator who thinks he knows what is best" (Neill, 1960, p. 12). In the current traditional educational confines, Neill (1960, p. 255) added, "teachers make it a business to influence children because they think they know what children ought to have, ought to learn, ought to be."

Smith (1974, p. 41) presented three historical accidents that are constraints on the public schools today: 1) the monolithic approval to learning, which assumes all students should learn in the same way at the same time; 2) the authoritarianism that allows students and teachers little opportunity to determine what goes on in the school; and 3) the lack of choice in public education, which forces all the students in a designated geographic area into the school and one program. "For children and youth growing up in the third quarter of the 20th century fewer

options in education were available than in any other period in America's 200 year history" (Smith et al., 1976, p. 1).

The public school is often the only institution in the community that does not allow for choice; most school systems tell their consumer supporters, "Take it or leave it" (Watson, 1972, p. 6). "There is essentially one public school system in the United States and it is authoritarian and oppressive. Students everywhere are deprived of the right to make choices concerning their own destinies" (Kohl, 1969, pp. 9-10). Democratic living implies the freedom of individual choice. Within a democratic society, there should be options available within education as there are in all other aspects of our society. In the democratic classrooms, which are generally found in alternative programs, choice is an underlying concept. Barnes (1977, pp. 71-72) maintained that to be able to choose, to select from as wide a range of choices as possible, is extremely important to each person. He contended that when one uses the term democracy in learning there is the suggestion that every person should have the greatest amount of choice possible in what he learns and how he wants to learn, that the matter of choosing is at the very heart of democracy and that the schoolroom is an excellent place for young people to experience it continuously.

Smith (1974, p. 41) presented the idea that "many adolescents inhabit two worlds: the one outside schoolhouse walls where they exercise considerable self-determination and one involved in life-shaping decisions, and the work inside the walls where every phase of their lives is dictated." The concept of having the autonomy to exercise

choice drives directly to the core of a person's freedom. Chaitanya (1978, p. 30) stated:

The extent of freedom is measured by the range of alternatives from among which a choice can be made. The range by itself does not guarantee that the freedom will be used by man for his self-actualization and moral growth, for he may make the wrong choices. The possibility of choice, however, is the first condition for any meaningful analysis of the concept of freedom and the possibility of its exercise in any given situation.

The concept of choice in a democratic setting is much more crucial than curricular content. Without choice, curriculum can become static, often irrelevant, and, for many youngsters, totally unacceptable (Smith et al., 1976, p. 126). Only in classrooms advocating democratic processes is the possibility of choicing even existent.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the concept of Contact as it relates to a theory of personal processes. It is the first step in achieving a personal relationship between the two participants. Behavior intrinsic to this concept, it was suggested, consists of Observe, Inform, Accept, and Choice. Dewey (1966, pp. 257-258) affirmed that the most productive contact with a person results when the initiator begins with the experiences of the other person and uses them to locate the interests of that person. Within a relationship, this disclosure of another person's experiences takes one from the first step of Contact to the second category of this investigation, designated as Consult. After Contact has been established, Consult will be set in motion.

CHAPTER 5

CONSULT

Introduction

Counts stated (Dennis and Eaton, 1980, p. 131):

Democratic education is committed to the basic values and processes of democracy, to the conception of human equality, and worth, to all the civil and political liberties. It must therefore be designed to bring the individual to full maturity as a free person, to foster enlightenment and release creative energies and talents. It should be a place where the honest questions of the young may be raised with the assurance that they will receive honest consideration.

Siner (1985) added that traditional education is structured on a "the teacher gives the student information" basis. He also felt if the student is brave enough to raise questions, or make any moves towards the concept of Consult, he tends to be ignored or chastised. In establishing warm and productive relationships between teacher and student, Consult is the second crucial step. To consult is to question and listen with an assumption of concern and choice.

Personal relationships in the classroom consist of the teacher making contact with the students and inviting their participation (Strauss, 1959). Once verbal interaction takes place, participation in Consult has occurred. To consult is to make the effort to learn about the other through dialogue (Barnes, 1977, p. 69). One of the primary focuses of consulting is to determine how the student sees or feels about something. Clark and Kadis (1971, p. 31) suggested "we often make the mistake of assessing a student by his progress toward the goal we

think he ought to have, or in relation to standards and values we have overtly or covertly set for him. . . . We fail to understand him in terms of the direction towards which his own unique goals, needs and values are steering him."

"In the schools, few activities call for or even permit active student planning, follow through and evaluation . . . classroom contingencies encourage and support minimal movement, minimal student-to-student or student-to-teacher interaction and low non-intimate effect" (Goodlad, 1975, p. 467). In "A Study of Schooling," Goodlad (1975, p. 468) stated, "The students rarely planned or initiated anything, read or wrote anything of some length, or created their own products. And they scarcely ever speculated on meanings, discussed alternative interpretations, or engaged in projects calling for collaborative effort. Most of the time they listened or worked alone."

Bishop felt reciprocal relationships can be threatening, but they are always mutually responsive and cause change. He also added that democratic relationships seem to promote a reduction of social distance (Bishop, 1972, p. 9). A reserved attitude can promote isolation and separation. Studies have shown that indirect teaching (question and discussion versus lecture and demonstration, frequent pupil-to-pupil interaction, frequent praise, and infrequent criticism) is associated with improved student learning and/or better attitude towards teachers and schools (Flanders, 1970, p. 33).

When the educational system is devoid of teacher-student consultation and mutual acceptance and trust, education's negative characteristics often prevail. In commenting on this, Kohl (1978, p. 10) claimed

most of the public schools seem more like kennels than places of instruction, and the service they provide is more like obedience training than preparation for future citizenship. Principals, counselors, psychologists, and administrators are there to ensure student conformity and compliance. "Since premature withdrawal from high school is so frequently the culmination of disintegrated teacher-student relationships, it comes as no surprise that two of those dropouts testify that they were never really friends with any teachers, and one of three maintains that teachers were not even friendly" (Cervantes, 1966, p. 112).

Mutual consultation is built upon the assumption that the participants are capable of relevant contributions and that they have value. Consulting makes possible the oft-stated need for relevance in learning (Noble, 1981, p. 20). Becoming aware of each student and his needs through consultation is another step toward productive classroom relationships.

Consult is the intense personal process where teachers must discern and treat students as equals and locate a direction for the learning process. In discovering the student's interests, the learning situation can develop into an experience that becomes productive for the student. Through consulting, a setting can be created where the student has an active role in deciding which direction his education should take. Certain actions need to take place during consulting. These are: Question, Listen, Concern, and Choice.

Question

A democracy runs on more than information; it runs on participation. In participation, there is generally interaction. As part of Consult, the teacher initiates interaction and, consequently, participation through a process designated as Question. Initially, in order for dialogue to take place, some questioning on the part of the teacher must occur.

In the traditional classroom, the teacher-student relationship is a form of institutionalized dominance and subordination (Silberman, 1970, p. 137). Therefore, the student has not learned that it is acceptable to carry on open and honest dialogues with the teacher. This must be modeled and practiced. Through questioning, the teacher can determine the student's interests and show interest.

For Dewey (1947, pp. 257-258), the most productive contact with a person results when the initiator begins with the experiences of the other person and uses these to locate the interests of that person. To uncover the other person's experiences is the goal of Question.

The process of Question is a particularly important behavior in the interactive procedure. Through the intense personal process of Question, the teacher can locate and achieve certain direction for the learning process. The necessity for Question as a basis for relevant learning is analogous to the requirement for a positive self-perception as a foundation for relevant learning. While the teacher discovers the student through intense personal consulting, the student is in a process of increases in positive self-perception. Rogers (1961, p. 53) observed, "If I accept a person as a process of becoming, then I am

doing what I can to conform or make real his potentialities that are to be discovered and rediscovered." This is attained through the process of Question.

In questioning, "when a person is consulted, he faces the problems and the interests of his life, which themselves educate him. If the lessons of life and work run counter to what is formally taught, they will probably supersede it" (Jung, 1954, p. 80). After the relationship is solid, questioning serves as a tool for the student to face himself more honestly.

Listen

In consulting, listening plays a key role. What the teacher is hearing is the student's view of reality. Rogers (pp. 223-224) pointed out that "when a person is heard he feels released . . . he surges forth in a new sense of freedom . . . he becomes more open to the process of change." The teacher must be observant and perceptive in his listening. If he does not understand what he hears, it is imperative he reverts to questioning. The student needs to feel worthwhile and respected as a human being. If he is not being seriously listened to and understood this will not happen. Consulting, a part of the identity process, is built upon the assumption that each person is capable of relevant comment and action, and that his existence is of primary worth (McMurrin, 1954, p. 13). This phase of consulting comes through questioning and, more importantly, listening.

As important as Question is to Consult, so equally is Listen. In the classroom, if the teacher continually questions with little

effort put into Listen, students will sense that they are not involved and accepted by the teacher. They will then tend to perceive the teacher as being non-democratic (Sterman, 1976, pp. 15-16). Students have the desire to be consulted about their experiences. Many times, they perceive they are being ignored when the teacher extends a question, but then does not listen. Through listening with the same intense personal interest used in Question, the teacher is capable of rendering recognition and acceptance of the student. Patterson (1973, pp. 106-107) took note of this when he said, "A basic characteristic of the humanistic teacher is a profound respect for each child as a unique human being, a person of worth."

Democracy can be realized in the classroom. People can come to listen to each other and care about each other's thoughts and feelings. It takes patience, and a belief in the potential of the children (Kohl, 1969, p. 22). The teacher, participating in discussion, first listens and then informs students of his own enjoyment, desires, and feelings (Tidwell, 1971, p. 30). The students share this process. An integral part of response is Listen.

The personal feelings, attitudes, and perceptions of students in classrooms are frequently neglected (Sterman, 1976, p. 19). Very often, the schools are inclined to participate in isolating and alienating youth. This can result in pushing these young people down paths leading to trouble. Reich (1970, pp. 143-144) postulated that the school is a brutal machine for the destruction of self. Tidwell's (1971, p. 22) statement, "The teacher needs to be sensitive to all behavioral acts of the student," implies listening and entails more than simply hearing

words. This belief hinges on Dewey's (1966, p. 18) belief that "democracy is a way of life requiring sensitive participation of every human being in the formation of values that assist men to pattern their relationships to act together." The democratic behavior of the teacher tends to make him "real" and give him the ability to meet students on a "person-to-person" basis (Rogers, 1980, p. 106).

Brown (1971, p. 12) stated teachers should perceive and treat students as feeling, thinking humans. He also explained that the personal consultative relationship is the very foundation of learning. Until teachers learn to respond in authentic ways to young people, they will continue to repeat over and over the same wasteful, destructive mistakes (Brown, 1971, p. 17). Combs (1965, p. 16) made the suggestion that potential teachers must learn to use student perceptions and to respond and relate with them in the process of teaching. If not, many students will be "pushed" out of the system. Anderson (1983, p. 25) suggested that little student-teacher interaction and very little student involvement in activities contributed to the causes for student drop-out.

MacCracken (1975, p. 163) advised that in education the most important thing to learn is "to throw the plan away." What is necessary is to listen, to follow each minute to its peak, learning as one goes.

Concern

Combs (1962, p. 88) felt teachers who desire to make genuine contact with students should show warmth, awareness, and a regard for each person, accepting each as he is and not as the teacher wants him to

be. Concern for the student when in the consultation phase is synonymous with being sensitive and accepting. The presence of acceptance is so significant to learning that the following statement can be made: "An individual wants to be accepted by persons with whom he feels affinity, to the degree of acceptance . . . that degree of learning" (Lembo, 1969, p. 94). Montessori believed that opportunities for warm, personal relationships were impossible if a teacher did not possess a "spirit" of love and understanding for the individual student (Tippa, 1971, p. 359). When a teacher makes the initial move to form some sort of relationship with the student, the integrity and respect for the student tends to be upheld (Wilde, 1984, p. 38). In the intense personal process of consulting, concern for the other person is the underlying condition.

Montagu (1962, p. 55) believed "a teacher should be, before everything else, one who cares for the student, is involved in his welfare, is nourishing, stimulating and supporting: one who leads the student into the universe of the best that has been said, done, and thought in the world; and who helps the student to acquire those techniques and skills which will secondarily serve to implement his knowledge." Barnes (1977, p. 61) considered showing interest in how the other person feels as part of the consulting process.

Through the process of caring and showing concern, a student is more likely to acquire what Parker (1968) called "person-ness." The results of this phenomenon are as follows: 1) the person comes to care for himself and for others with whom he has in-depth contact; 2) through caring, the person develops a greater empathy for the other person; 3) a person is able to parallel his outer expressions with his inner

feelings; and 4) a person develops a feeling that he knows who he is and what he is becoming (Parker, 1968, pp. 38-39). "To be treated kindly by someone who is not a primary caretaker is like a stroke or a caress. It is unnecessary, but a delight. To be neglected by someone who should be in a caring position has the implication and the potential for real damage" (Gaylin, 1976, p. 153).

Within the concept of Concern is the implication of having respect for the other person. Holt (1969, p. 103) defined respect as "treating students as if their ideas made some difference, and when we treat people this way, whatever their age, color, or background, we find that communication barriers disappear and learning takes place." Patterson (1973, pp. 106-107) depicted this important concept: "A basic characteristic or attitude of the humanistic teacher is a profound respect for each child as a unique human being, a person of worth in his own right. Respect involves an acceptance of each child as he is, for what he is. It makes no demands that he must be different--it is unconditional." Concern falls within the auspices of respect for the other person.

The concept of Concern, with the implication of respect within the process of Consult, tends to promote self-perception. Gold (1978, pp. 303-304) maintained that "warm, accepting relationships can enhance self-esteem and constrain delinquent behavior." These elements are necessary ingredients in the interaction of the classroom.

Traditional education rarely employs this technique of Consult, much less the process through which personal relationships are

established. Crary (1969, p. 35) relayed his concern about the lack of concern:

Education deals with only one child at a time. The responsibility implied is grave indeed. For the child, if education to any considerable degree is effective, it can truly make or break him. Society often expresses considerable concern for children in general, but society calls no single child by name. The child may be the only one concerned for himself, and this subjectivity unguided may lead to a distorted image of self, and, at worst, to a destruction of self.

Chandler (1983, p. 13) reported that alternative schools generally accept each individual student, encourage growth opportunities in friendship, belonging, and achievement, as well as in self-actualization and personal growth.

Riordan (1972, p. 34) proposed that "informal relationships between students and teachers and shared decision-making were as important for student learning and growth as the structured learning units." For any change to occur in an individual's behavior, a change in personal meaning must occur (Combs, 1962, p. 75). For a change in personal meanings to occur, there must and should be a climate of personalization in the student-teacher relationship. This, Combs observed, would facilitate a less threatening environment and would progressively tend to create an attitude of accepting and caring on the part of the teacher. Without this concern, the student probably would not achieve his potential.

Choice

Watson (1972, p. 5) suggested "democratic living implies the freedom of individual choice. In a democratic society options should be available in education as in all other aspects of society." At present,

our education system is monolithic. One has no choice but to accept the sole approach to learning offered by the schools. Postman and Weingartner (1973, pp. 12-13) claimed the situation, if not un-American, is not American in spirit.

Although personal choice is at the core of democracy, schools seldom emphasize the matter of choice in terms of how, what, where, and when the students will learn. It is not usual that schools employ consulting with the students to determine their choice. Perry and Perry (1976, p. 484) claimed:

Students have little choice about being in the school until the age of sixteen, an age set by adults. Although students are the reason for the school's existence, and all decisions are officially made for the benefit and welfare of the students, students have little or no impact on these decisions. Adults define what is good for the students, and adults do not happen to believe that what is good for students is necessarily what students want to do. A democratic society has an obligation to treat all its members with respect, and to consider its demands.

Coltrin (1974, pp. 17-18) recalled, "In the traditional classroom, the teacher in consultation with colleagues and administrators often is expected to select a textbook . . . and determine what is to be used . . . in the basis of teacher interest and with little regard to student interest."

"Democratic learning is not so much concerned with designing effective learning packages, but with creating a setting where students can play an active, creative role in deciding the direction their education should take" (Riordan, 1972, p. 10). Coltrin (1974, pp. 20-21) believed that the relevant learning that flows from the process of consultation has the best opportunity for occurring in a democratic environment. He asserted:

In a democratic environment, the teacher will not appear so constrained in his relationship with the students, since he will be consulting with them about their interests . . . for significant data for learning. In the democratic environment, work is centered around the needs, ideas, and questions of the individual members of the class. In this process . . . students are encouraged to pursue questions to logical conclusions.

Milner (1980, p. 15) stated, "We believe that the main influence of the teacher in the classroom occurs in his moment-by-moment interaction with students. . . . The ways this interaction develops tend to establish limits to the opportunities students have for participation." In the educational setting, to have the option to choose can create productive human relationships within the group. Each person's choicing quality appears to be an expression of a sense of freedom (Barnes, 1968). Within an authoritarian system, most members therein find themselves in various degrees of dependency in their personal relationships (Rokeach, 1960). This dependency can eliminate the person's feelings of personal involvement and can produce alienation.

Involvement seems to be enhanced when traditional expectations are removed. Wilson (1977, p. 85) claimed "the absences of behavioral expectations that are imposed through traditional roles result in an informal atmosphere in which staff and students feel more at ease to discuss subjects formerly 'off limits,' like personal problems. . . . The new kind of relationships had beneficial effect on both teachers and students and seemed to be serving educational purposes."

Students, when given opportunities to behave democratically, tended to make better choices regarding goals. Broad (1977, p. 68) discovered "districts with alternatives that have been in operation for several years have found that students who have grown up with the idea

of choosing their own programs and setting their own goals make more responsible and more effective choices with experience." It would seem justifiable for students in a democratic society to experience and learn wise choicing, and to practice the decision-making process under all circumstances. "This makes particularly important the kind of education that will enable a person to make desirable decisions for himself," and there is an obvious need for young persons to learn that they do have choices in their lives and that they are capable decision makers regarding these choices (Butts, 1961, p. 123).

Duke (1978, p. 28) expatiated on the idea of choices as an integral part of alternative schools, recognizing as crucial "a firm belief in democratic processes, specifically where students and parents, as well as teachers, participate in the governance and administration of the school."

Summary

The second phase of developing personal and meaningful relationships through a method of personal processes is titled Consult. Whereas Contact sets the framework, Consult deepens and expands the relationship. This is done through Question and Listen, with the underlying qualities of Concern and Choice. Consult is the intense personal process which, when extended, has its results in the next category, Find.

CHAPTER 6

FIND

Introduction

Smith (1974, p. 41) claimed that many adolescents today perceive little relationship between the world of the school and their present and future lives outside the school. In this light, "school drop-outs and growing truancy rates may best be understood as indictments of the schools and the teachers" (Simmons, 1969, p. 134). Simmons (1969, p. 133) continued, "One of the conclusions from my study of deviance is that every deviant subculture that develops is reflecting an ill or inadequacy in the social fabric itself. Its contents are the clues as to how that society is failing to meet the needs and wants of its people."

As consumers, the students deserve to have education tailored to their needs. Yet, the concept of finding a student's interest, and realizing it, is virtually nonexistent in traditional schools. Students have been spoonfed for so long they may not even realize they have interests. Kohl (1969, p. 77) accepted that "most [students] are so used to doing what they are told in school that it takes quite a while for them to discover their own interests. Besides that, their whole school careers have taught them not to trust teachers, so they will naturally believe that the teacher who offers some freedom isn't serious."

Dewey (1963, p. 88) commented on the value of personal experiences and finding them, stating, "Basing education on personal experience may mean more multiplied and more intimate contacts between the mature and the immature than ever existed in the traditional school, and consequently more, rather than less, guidance by other." Purkey (1970, p. 58) maintained that "what a person says about himself and the inferences we draw from his behavior are valuable data for locating personal interests. However, one can never understand a person until he learns to look at things from that person's point of view."

For education to be more relevant, Rogers (1969, p. 166) specified the need "to elicit and clarify the purposes of the individual as well as the more general purposes of the group." At any given opportunity, there are many options for the perceived, but he will only choose that which has personal meaning to him (Fitch, 1976). The specific interests the student chooses to locate are aspects of his personal freedom. For the teacher, the skill of guiding the finding of interests with regard to personal meaning includes recognition of the student's self-concept and awareness. Once an interest is found, it is not necessarily carved in stone. Personal interests are discovered, and then rediscovered.

Through an intense personal interest and after consulting with a student, the teacher will ascertain results. Barnes (1977, p. 63) called the discovery of some of the other person's needs, interests, and concerns Find. Only by finding and identifying the other person's interests can the relationship grow. As each person encounters the interest of others, it enables him to move beyond his own experiences

and to rediscover his own interests (Rogers, 1969, p. 25). The finding of student interests is crucial to democratic learning. Whenever an interest is kindled, learning will take place. Within the concept of Find there lies the framework of Discover and Identify Interest.

Discover

In finding interests and finding each person's relationship to those interests, Peters and Farwell (1959, p. 320) felt it was not generally a question of pupils lacking interests, but a matter of discovering people's interests and joining with them to utilize their interests. Students will learn, provided the material appears to be relevant to their lives and provided they have the freedom to explore and to discover its meaning for themselves (Purkey, 1970, p. 45). Students need to feel they have a part of their education. In working with them democratically, they will, in fact, be discovering for themselves where their interests lie.

Albeit teachers and students assume the directives, orders, and assignments given by the teacher as being quite normal, this does not imply that they accept the implicit constraint or welcome the intent as their own. Kilpatrick (1925, p. 349) commented that "with young people it is only in slight degree that problems can be assigned. Assigned problems as a rule remain teachers' problems; they do not thereby become pupils' problems. Purpose cannot be assigned." The children must not be taught, but be allowed to discover. They must be encouraged to guess and to brainstorm rather than be tested on the right answers (Goodman, 1970, p. 212). "How a student thinks a problem out is often more

important than getting the exact numerical answer" (American Association of School Administrators, 1981, p. 14).

Rogers (1980, p. 48) agreed that learning by discovery is significant learning. He said, "Significant learning takes place when subject matter is perceived by the student as having relevance for his purposes." In considering what has value for the student, Weinstein and Fantini (1970, p. 33) noted that "the most valuable and direct indications . . . are found in what the learners themselves say or write about their lives and their relationship with the world."

Kelley (1962, p. 17) found that democratic classrooms enhanced the discovery of interests. It also lends itself to making the learning situation more productive for them. Discovery of interests can be largely expedited through the process of careful and patient consultation by the teacher. With the goal of discovery in mind, the teacher seeks materials which will engage the person in specific activities having an aim or purpose of moment or interest to him (Dewey, 1961, p. 132). By encouraging the discovery of interests, Tidwell (1971, p. 29) observed, "the student's ideas, concerns, and efforts become the focal point . . . the matter of consideration."

The fact that education is in the learner, waiting to be discovered, was emphasized by Dewey when he observed that the teacher is only the person who calls forth what is already there (Friedman, 1974, pp. 242-243). Buber (1953, p. 10) concluded, "To produce is to draw forth; to invent is to find; to shape is to discover." In a classroom situation employing democratic processes, there is a great dependence on actual participation and productive actions. Silberman (1970,

pp. 253-254) made a contrast of this and an autocratic environment where the opportunity to "thrash out" a variety of ideas, reflect upon possible alternatives, or consider created changes is unavailable. Reichle (1978, p. 27) accentuated positive human relationships in learning: "An environment based on the quality of human relations is not a place where learning can be forced or pressured . . . but an environment wherein from the standpoint of the learner there is real discovery."

Coltrin (1974, p. 21) noted that, in a democratic classroom where discovery is held at a premium, "the student tended to learn that his ideas and interests were important and significant, and he began to see himself as a more worthy and significant human being." Maslow (1976, p. 31) explained that a model of humanistic teaching needs to be one characterized by uncovering and unleashing the self--as opposed to a model emphasizing creating and shaping the self. Hall (1979, p. 43) claimed the process of discovering the self--one's uniqueness--and relating to others in a growth-producing way inevitably leads to the actualizing of self.

Butts (1961, p. 123) believed that "there is an obvious need for young persons to learn that they do have choices in their lives and that they are capable decision makers." In expanding on this idea, Wilson (1981, p. 88) postulated, "We have to know when to stand back and let things happen. Some students respond that others have to be pushed a little to deal with what's in front of them. We must not run over our group with an iron fist or give the impression of knowing it all. Most of us are still working on ourselves, and we should allow the student to

know that." The choices people make are simply exhibitions of discovered interest.

Identify Interest

Whereas discovery may be regarded as the result of consulting with intense personal interest, the next step is to ensure identification of the interest. Before sharing of the interest can be undertaken, it is imperative that teacher and student communicate and define the specific identity of the interest.

Many times, a student has never been questioned on where his interests lie. "Students are no more used to making choices and functioning in a free environment than their teachers are. We have all been taught to obey and be dependent, and breaking the habit of dependency is difficult" (Kohl, 1969, p. 95). In this process of studying the interest, it is fundamental that the interest found is genuine. Students new to a democratic classroom will need to discover it is acceptable to be honest and open. Students indoctrinated in the traditional dependent system of public schooling find themselves falling into the belief that "I should live . . . a life according to the purpose of the educator, who thinks he knows what is best" (Neill, 1960, p. 12). The teacher must try to work with, and avoid working "over," the student in finding the interest and studying it to determine its authenticity.

Before any further advancement in the theory of personal processes can be attained, it is important the interests found are clarified. A slight miscommunication on either the student's or the teacher's part can result in a breakdown in the process. Any break in

the process would cause a retracing of steps. "The adult in the classroom is the major force enhancing or limiting growth" (Milner, 1980, p. 155). The teachers can help the participant to transform information for adequate use (Bruner, 1964, p. 166).

As was previously mentioned, learning was found to be enhanced by focusing upon individual interests. Rogers (1969, p. 156) stated, "Significant learning takes place when the subject matter is perceived by the student as having relevance for his purposes. A somewhat more formal way of stating this is that a person learns significantly only those things which he perceives as being involved in the maintenance and enhancement of his own self." The process is the emphasis, not content.

Riordan (1972, p. 10) suggested:

This emphasis is consistent with the general emphasis in alternative schools which frequently develops out of a concern with the so-called hidden curriculum; the effect of the structure and process of schooling independent of school curricular content. Therefore, their concern is not so much with designing effective learning packages, but with creating a setting where students can plan an active, creative role in deciding the direction their education should take.

Ginott (1965, p. 87) expanded: "Selecting a given problem in a democratic classroom involves the act of choice. Choosing is an act of responsibility, and both are integral parts of an individual's welfare."

The act of identifying what one's interest is and from that interest selecting what one is to learn tends to advance the student towards personal autonomy. "Democratic education is one which maximizes both freedom and individual development" (Illich, 1971, p. 52).

As students grow, their needs change, and so do their perceptions. Within identification, the focus shifts to those things which

will aid the student to satisfy his immediate needs (Noble, 1981, p. 9). As the student pursues new meanings for his changing needs, the process of self-actualization takes place. Democratic processes in the classroom tend to liberate personal capacities and afford opportunity for productive creation (Fromm, 1947, p. 84). The learner, therefore, has more feeling of being free and more responsibility for his learning, because of complete choice in selecting and using resources (Chandler, 1983, p. 14). Combs, Richards, and Richards (1949, p. 203) concluded that "the business of helping people explore and discover the personal meaning of information for them requires human interrelationship. This is the very heart of teaching."

To be able to do this effectively, both teacher and student need to clarify, in as simple terms as possible, what the interest is they are going to seek. This can avoid frustrations and conflict if both parties misunderstand each other and spread out on different tangents. Once the interests are discovered, studied, and clarified, the student and teacher are ready to advance to the next category, Share.

Summary

If consulting is the intense personal process of locating interests, then Find is the intense personal result. If the teacher does not find any interests, he must return to the process of Consult. This category includes the steps of discovering the interest and then clearly identifying it. Once identification is comprehended to the mutual satisfaction of both teacher and student, they can proceed to the next step in the democratic process, Share.

CHAPTER 7

SHARE

Introduction

In democratic processes, after contact has been made, consulting has been accomplished, and interests have been found, a cooperative action called Share begins. This is when student and teacher collaborate on the interest and formulate a plan which they can mutually undertake.

Sharing implies the concept that people have something to share. For many students, this concept is not always available in a traditional school. Andrews (1975, pp. 20-21) claimed "traditional knowledge is the overriding purpose; vertical and sequential learning its mean. Much of our education today is characterized by a predominantly verbal discursive logical, linear mode of learning and knowing. Its intent is to promote respondent rather than operant behavior." For sharing to occur and be acceptable would do much to increase self-worth in a student. Sterman (1976, p. 24) felt students are anxious to be in classrooms organized in such a way that they can pursue and share their interests. He observed that when students share interests they will respond with a positive attitude toward school, society, and learning (Sterman, 1976, p. 24).

Cusick (1973) completed an important study of the traditional high school. He discovered that the structure of the school and its

organization isolated students from the teachers. A few of the essential characteristics of the school, such as subject compartmentalization, vertical organization, and routinization of activity supported by extensive rules and regulations, served to deny freedom of activity by students (Cusick, 1973, pp. 206-212). Not only were physical and social structures of the school barriers to student-teacher relationships, but the teachers themselves presented obstacles. Cusick (1973, p. 184) maintained that teachers, in order to assert control, kept a distance from their students. "That teachers behaved as they did, doing most of the talking, keeping their distance from the students and ignoring non-task-oriented activity, was probably an attempt on their part to avoid the inevitable conflicts that arise when the student social structure emerges in the class situation" (Cusick, 1973, p. 184).

Maslow (1968, p. 203) commented, "Man does have a need for relating, accepting, sharing and communicating." Combs et al. (1949, pp. 31-32) added, "By man's need to share another's perceptual world, understanding comes about." The classroom can be a prime target for teachers to encourage students to become fully functioning persons through sharing relationships. Teachers need to make the initial moves for these processes of consulting and sharing to happen.

Silberman (1970, p. 332) felt that if teachers extend arbitrary rules and regulations the students will tend to view these actions as signs of excessive power which ignore their lives and personal interests. He continued that students wish to share their experiences with those with whom they have established personal relationships (Silberman, 1970, p. 35). Students have the desire to increase their knowledge by

sharing, but teachers do not always offer that opportunity. By definition, sharing is contingent upon mutual trust and respect. This sharing can only serve to enhance and deepen the relationship.

Dewey (1947, p. 101) suggested that, "in democratic processes, isolation tends to be avoided. Isolation makes for rigid and formal institutions often accompanied by static and selfish concerns within a group. Democracy not only seeks to avoid isolation and exclusivity, but also broadens the shared concerns of individuals and groups."

In a democratic classroom, "the most unique thing about sharing is that both parties are listening to each other" (Noble, 1981, p. 7). In the democratic environment, when learning occurs, the opportunity for identical observations can be realized. Brewer, Chandler, and Tidwell (1983, p. 10) stated:

A person has to listen to particular interests to make any contact whatsoever. The sharing of interests builds in this contact. A person identifies the particular interests of the other, sorting out those he wants to share. A person may be involved in the excitement of another person, what the person is and does, his or her conversations, gestures, words, and other behaviors.

Each person's interest in the feeling about other persons makes this experience possible and enjoyable. This can be done when another person's particular interest is one that may not be enjoyed by the teacher, for instance; however, the excitement about the other person makes many interests sharable regardless of any desire to participate directly in those interests.

In this age of conflict between people, it is extremely important that students learn to acknowledge and accept differences of styles and values and try to work together. This is one implication of the concept Share. Only through sharing can persons truly understand and appreciate each other.

Many studies have been undertaken to determine the results of outdoor experiences (Bateson, 1981; Dickinson, 1979; Godfrey, 1972; etc.). The studies consistently showed that participants in these types of programs return with greater self-concept and acceptance of others. Results also show the teacher-student relationship improved as self-actualization occurs. Outdoor experiences can do much to develop sharing between student and teacher.

The outdoors "provides a learning climate that is enhancing to both the students and the staff. It is a program in which the professional cannot hide behind jargon. These activities help build relationships that are warm, intimate, and equal where people may interact with respect, dignity, and humanity" (Cardwell, 1976, p. 9). In the outdoors, the group works together on shared goals and all members are equal. It is the group pitted against nature, and no individual is favored or considered "better." "One of the most significant results of Outward Bound courses appears to be an appreciation and tolerance of others different from oneself" (Schulze, 1970, p. 18). Schulze (1970, p. 6) continued, "The activities embarked upon in the outdoors contribute to give the student a deep feeling of responsibility and concern for his fellow participants. . . school situations rarely develop this sense of concern for others . . . students generally do their work alone and rarely feel a responsibility for whether the other guy is 'getting it.'"

A small group structure in the outdoors fosters cooperation and teamwork and helps to build trust in human relations (Cardwell, 1976, p. 7). Bateson (1981) noted in his study that, when classrooms had

embarked upon outdoor experiences, teachers perceived the interpersonal relationships within the classes to be more unified. Godfrey (1972) claimed those who participated in outdoor experiences experienced significant personal growth and showed considerable improvement in the way people worked together. The benefits from Share are enormous.

Barnes (1977, p. 65) marked Share as the real beginning of cooperative action--where each person contributes, receives, and learns.

He stated:

Share is the stage in personal relationships where contact is becoming well-established, where consultation has assisted us to find the other's interests, and where we are interacting through one or another of these interests. It is that point, we believe, where each person involved in the interests provides, receives, and learns. Discussing, listening, and contributing are at a maximum within the group, and an air of anticipation and excitement builds as ideas begin to develop and mesh.

Involved within the process of sharing are Clarify Desired Outcome, Consider Choices, Plan of Action, Ownership, Accept, and Observe.

Clarify Desired Outcome

After an interest has been determined and before action can be attempted, a clarification of the desired outcome must be achieved. Both student and teacher must determine what they determine the goal to be. Potts (1985) felt it was extremely important for teacher and student to agree together on the definition of a desired outcome and "what it looks like." He pointed out that, if that did not occur, how could the teacher assist the student in getting there?

Gibbons (1984, p. 593) assumed that, "as we teach over the years the knowledge and skills we choose to have students learn, we diminish

their own drives and increase their dependence on the school for all major decisions about learning." He continued (Gibbons, 1984, p. 593):

As a result, students do not learn social skills or responsible social roles, and they do not benefit from the power of cooperative learning. Nor does the school environment usually model these kinds of social interactions, since the school is seldom a democratically run institution that shares decision making and responsibility among all the participants whose lives are affected by it and who, in turn, affect the performance of the school.

Smith et al. (1976, p. 107) questioned whether schools should respond to the goals and needs of the children, or children should continue to have to conform to the goals of the schools at the expense of learning. They continued with the idea that, to have adults who will make wise decisions tomorrow, we must have students who today have opportunities for decision making (Smith et al., 1976, p. 13).

Before a student can make wise choices, he must learn to set a desired outcome based on his interest. Dewey (1947, pp. 407-409) suggested that, when "one makes a choice, one does so because of the desired results of that choice. There are no selfless choices without self-interest. One cannot make a choice without having one's self as the primary factor in making that choice."

In the alternative schools employing democratic process, the learner has a great deal of responsibility for his own education. "The free school alternative enables each learner to orchestrate his own education" (Fantini, 1973, p. 48). Alternatives normally stress the teacher and student working cooperatively with regard to the student's own interests and, after clarifying a desired outcome, creating a program that satisfies the needs of both student and teacher. This first

step in Share, a process of clarifying a desired outcome, utilizes mutual participation and involvement.

Consider Choices

Neill (1960, p. 25) claimed children, like adults, learn what they want to learn. Instead of being authoritarians, bent on cocooning students with knowledge the teacher sees as paramount, a democratic classroom lets student and teacher work together, with the student choosing what he ought to learn. In the final analysis, the student will only learn what he chooses to, anyway. In any context, Stipek (1982, p. 18) added, individuals work harder and enjoy their work more if there is some choice involved and the work satisfies their need to develop competencies. Therefore, one purpose of the process of Share is for the student to be presented with and discover unlimited choices. Thus, an avenue for learning can be formulated.

After goals have been established, the student and teacher need to consider their choices to achieve their target. "The main principle underlying these alternatives is the individualization of experiences by making them meaningful to a particular individual or population or to the resolution of a particular problem" (LaBelle-LaBenne and Greene, 1969, p. 30). The student will need to look at possibilities and select the appropriate learning experience that will aid in solving his problem and will have meaning for him.

Personal choice to respond and to share is the central part of individual autonomy and self-actualization, and a reflection of the mind and will of a maturing person (Peters and Farwell, 1959, pp. 217-218).

In this step, the participants contribute, share, present, and discover choices, based on the desired outcome. "Only actual participation constitutes socially valuable learning, a participation by the learner in every stage of the learning process, including not only a free choice of what is to be learned and how it is to be learned, but also a free demonstration by each learner of his own reason for living and learning the part that his knowledge is to play in life" (Illich, 1971, p. 6).

Weinberg (1975, p. 63) believed psychological growth occurs when people gain confidence in their ability to make decisions on their own and discover that freely made choices allow them to move in directions that are compatible with their interests and personal styles of learning. Each human, alone, determines the values by which he lives; he is not endowed with a ready-made self, but is constantly making himself through choice (Barnes, 1959, p. 42). "Students who have a choice in selecting their style of education and to some extent, the content, are happier and better performers" (Broad, 1977, p. 18). "People who choose to participate have a greater chance of success in any activity" (Smith et al., 1976, p. 120).

There is no validity in the notion that any one choice of learning works better than another. "Learning is of diverse sorts. No type of teacher, method, or climate is inherently superior. Thus, a range of teachers, methods, or climates will better respond to the varied needs of students in mastering different types of learning. So the solution is multiplicity, diversity, and choice" (Glatthorn, 1975, p. 7). Learning by sharing can take place in a climate of freedom and choicing (Hall, 1979, p. 43).

Plan of Action

Barnes (1977, p. 65) stated, "Plans take shape as personal relationships among the group members become closer and more productive." After taking the choices and studying them carefully, the student and teacher need to choose what choice(s) to devote themselves to. "Discussing, listening, and contributing are at a maximum within the group and an air of anticipation and excitement builds as ideas begin to develop and mesh" (Barnes, 1977, p. 65). What is a priority here is that the student determines and has a primary role in formulating the plan of action he is to follow. Rogers (1961, p. 123) suggested that teachers, rather than attempting to share common interests, frequently will exclude students by focusing on their own interests. What is being advocated in Share, according to Corey (1973, pp. 34-35), is a degree of genuine freedom for the learner where he becomes a partner in his learning journey.

Stipek (1982, p. 4) advised,

De-emphasizing external evaluation, selecting tasks that challenge each student's current skill level and providing opportunities for student choice in educational environments are recommended as strategies to maintain intrinsic motivation. Encouraging students to trust their own evaluations and to set reasonable goals and providing greater autonomy in learning situations are suggested to help students develop independent self-directed learning strategies.

For students to have meaningful learning experiences, they need to assist in structuring them and achieve some success. Combs (1962, p. 109) believed,

People measure their success by the degree to which they are able to meet expectancies and reach the goals they have established either for themselves or from others. To provide the kinds of success experience out of which a feeling of adequacy

is produced; children need to feel they are reaching goals and meeting expectancies continuously. This means the goals and expectancies created for children in the classroom must be accurate and realistic and within the capacities of the child.

Thus, in working out a plan of action, it needs to be realistic. The teacher would have to aid the student to structure activities that would give the learner frequent experiences of success (Silberman, 1970, p. 312).

In striving to compose a plan of action, Riordan (1972, p. 34) suggested the "informal relationships between students and teachers, and shared decision making were as important for student learning and growth as the structured learning units." Barnes (1977, pp. 71-72) suggested that, in employing democracy in learning, there is the implication that every participant must have the greatest amount of choice possible in what he learns and how he wishes to learn it.

Gefke (1972, p. 22) claimed the teacher, as a democratic leader, tends to encourage students to select goals for their plan of action that are in response with their own needs and interests. "In a democratic classroom, materials will be developed and used according to the needs expressed through the process of consultation between teacher and student" (Silberman, 1970, p. 324). The democratic classroom generates more trust and significantly more positive attitudes towards learning (Bills, 1952, pp. 313-320). Gefke (1972, p. 9) added participants set their own goals, assess their own development, and people attain greater security.

Dewey (1966, p. 8) responded to making learning relevant and aiming towards sharing with: "Sharing in actual pursuit, whether

directly or vicariously . . . is at least personal and vital . . . formal instruction, on the contrary, easily becomes remote and dead--abstract and bookish." Thus, composing a plan of action is a personal venture for the student. Illich (1971, p. 16) noted, "Only actual participation constitutes socially valuable learning, a participation by the learner in every stage of the learning process, including not only a free choice of what is to be learned and how it is to be learned, but also a free demonstration by each learner of his own reason for living and learning--the part that his knowledge is to play in his life." Through Plan of Action, the participant chooses his own learning experiences.

Ownership

Sterman (1976, p. 25) believed, when students and teachers work in partnership, they share responsibility in all areas of school life. Education moves from being something done "to" the student, to something the student does "for" himself. "Our students have to learn to be responsible for their own education, to make choices, and to face the consequences of those choices (Silberman, 1970, p. 336). In doing so through democratic processes, a sense of ownership and responsibility for their choices appears.

"Pupils will learn more effectively when the teacher and fellow pupils show, by attitude and action, that they are accepted, belong, and their involvement is desired and significant" (Bernard and Huckins, 1974, p. 36). Unless the student regards himself, through the teacher's actions, as an acceptable part of the group, he may come to view the

teacher, administration, and the system as the power and the "they" who own all control. This results in behavior linked to resignation or rebellion. The student does not see himself as having any control over the situation and, thus, falls into the trap of blaming "they" whenever unwanted results occur.

The person who does not see himself as accepted and involved does not see himself as responsible for anything which happens. If the student sees himself as belonging and accepted, he learns to be responsible for his own decisions. "Choice in education is important because the corresponding responsibility or accountability for a given choice is shifted from the institution to the teacher or student or both" (Smith et al., 1976, p. 119).

Kelley (1962, p. 93) spoke of the democratic classroom climate when he said, "The secondary school we need is one where acceptance and love replace rejection; where there is enough consultation with youth so that they feel some ownership and involvement; where someone cares." Lembo (1969, p. 94) commented, "An individual wants to be accepted by the persons with whom he feels an affinity. To the degree that acceptance and approval are dependent on achievement, and the need for affiliation high, the affiliative need is a potent force in classroom learning."

Peters and Waterman (1984) discovered that the best managed companies in this country are based in part on the belief that all participants need to be a part of something important and they need recognition. People want to feel they are part of a team as well as need to feel they have some control. If these criteria are met, productivity

increases. Waller (1967, p. 136) labeled this need as a "desire for participation. It appears as the yearning to be attached to some super-personal entity, a group, a cause, a movement, something larger than one's self." Also, "participants in an informal group must do more than share common interests and goals. Each participant must perceive the other participants as group members capable of genuine contributions" (Hartley and Hartley, 1952 p. 386). Participants in the democratic group tend to experience a shared image of the group which sets it off from the other groups in which they may or may not associate (Bishop, 1972, pp. 10-11).

In order for a student to feel ownership for something, he must feel he is an accepted part of that larger entity and that he "belongs." He also must have some sense of control over himself and his decisions. Through the actions of sharing and the choicing that is inherent in this process, ownership can occur. "There is a natural loyalty and affiliation for that which is chosen over that which is mandated" (Smith, 1974, p. 74). Acceptance of responsibility, Lembo (1971, p. 47) continued, can be required only when the learner has a major and consistent role in choosing the direction and quality of his own learning and development. Thus, a democratic setting breeds responsibility and a sense of ownership.

Accept

Acceptance is a behavior that runs through the entire democratic process. Acceptance, in respect to sharing, is important between student and teacher so that the two can believe at face value what they

communicate. To a student, a teacher has great power and influence commanded by his position. Combs et al. (1971) showed that a person who has a position of power and influence has a difficult time establishing and maintaining meaningful channels of communication. Harvey (1967) claimed this happens because of the inverse relationship among perceived threat, trust levels, and defensive behaviors. "When a person's potential for influencing the destiny of another is perceived by the latter to be high, the suspicion experienced in interacting and communicating will probably rise and the trust fall. He will be unable to accept at face value messages from the person he sees as having power over him" (Bernard and Huckins, 1974, p. 298). Thus, it is important for the teacher to be sincerely accepting and treat students as equals. Combs (1962, p. 178) pointed out, when a teacher relates to a student as an equal, the student is encouraged to become active, responsible, and trustworthy.

In an alternative program using a theory of personal processes, the teacher must be able to accept and clarify emotional expression and to relate emotional expression to ideas (Amidon and Flanders, 1967, p. 3). Ginott (1965, pp. 39-40) emphasized this: "It is imperative to share feelings, emotions, attitudes, and perceptions while conversing with another." But, this productive sharing of ideas, interests, and feelings is based upon the assumption that a person must be free in using his personal powers (Fromm, 1947, p. 84).

Gefke (1972, p. 10) pointed out that "democratic leaders create a positive climate wherein all members are encouraged to give their opinions." Fox (1969, pp. 279-289) suggested the most effective leader

encourages maximum communication and more member acceptance of group decisions. In such an atmosphere, there is more potential for exploration of personal meanings without the fear of being subjected to ridicule or attack for expressing unique feelings, beliefs, and ideas (Combs et al., 1971, p. 228).

Glasser (1969, p. 131) added that a teacher must be nonjudgmental. When the teacher is nonjudgmental, "each child learns that he is important to every other child, that what he says is heard by everyone, and that his ideas count. When children experience the satisfaction of thinking and listening to others, they are not afraid to have ideas, to enter into a discussion, and to solve their own problems and the problems of their class by using their brains." To sum this point up further, Combs (1962, p. 71) commented:

Acceptance does not mean the teacher agrees that a student's meanings are valid, nor does it mean that these perceptions are made a part of the teacher's way of perceiving. It means giving the student the privilege of holding and presenting his meanings without ridicule or attack, the privilege of seeing things the way he does. It is in interaction with others that a student builds his perceptions, the meanings that people, ideas, information have for him. There should be ample opportunity and time for this type of exploration.

Observe

Daniels and Horowitz (1976) submitted that essential to a caring relationship is a sensitivity to the needs and directions of others. Many times, sensitivity in a sharing and caring relationship is displayed through observation. "The closest we can come to knowing a child is by making inferences from what we hear him say and see him do" (Wees, 1971, p. 55). As Wees (1971, pp. 57-58) claimed, "Nobody but me can do

my perceiving for me, nobody but me can turn my perceptions into ideas and relate my ideas to create concepts, and nobody but me can form these concepts in to the patterns of the mind by which I appraise my own and other people's education." Through perceptive observation, a wealth of knowledge about the student may be obtained. This knowledge must be attained by the objective self, and not through heresay.

Not only must the teacher be sensitive in his observations of the students, the students must, in sharing, be allowed to be the observers. "The self, we are told, is largely learned in the 'mirror of other people'" (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972, p. 111). Students will learn who and what they are not only from the interactions they have with others, but from observing the actions and interactions of significant others in their world.

The teacher must be a facilitator in this process of observing. He cannot control it, though. Learning is a discovery, sometimes through observation of personal meaning. "Meanings lie inside of people and cannot be directly manipulated and controlled. Learning only occurs when something happens inside the learner and this is for the most part, in his, not the teacher's control" (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972, p. 69). By being a facilitator, the teacher allows these observations to be made by making the classroom as social a situation as possible. Students must not be isolated from each other, or the world.

Summary

Sharing is the fourth step in the theory of personal processes of learning. If there is a breakdown, the teacher should consider retracing his steps in this theory. One cannot progress until each step, in its entirety, has been accomplished. This particular step is the relationship that develops between co-equals. This is the initiative of teamwork. All members give to the relationship, and they reap the rewards of a productive learning relationship.

CHAPTER 8

ACCOMPANY

Introduction

Wilde (1984, p. 61) advised that knowledge obtained from mutual sharing is dependent upon the element of mutual accompaniment. Nothing is bleaker than the sight of a person striving, yet not fully able to control his own destiny in a situation of consequence to him (Milgram, 1969, p. xiii). In answer to this quandary, it is suggested that the teacher accompany the student in his quest, as a participant. The student must make his own decisions, and will do his own learning. Combs et al. (1971, p. 211) added, the democratic leader of learning is one who accompanies others by offering guidance and understanding and moving with the help and desire of each participant.

Noble (1981, p. 28) saw accompaniment as one system of incorporating and using the views of both the student and the teacher, where the student is equal and has as much to say as the teacher. "The word accompany describes the situation," Barnes (1977, pp. 68-69) claimed, "where the role of the teacher dissolves into that of learner/participant within the group and where the terms leader and follower seem inappropriate." This is the stage where the student, with assistance from the teacher, has formulated what his learning experience might be. He now will go out and "do it."

Many times in the traditional schools, the students are left on their own to accomplish this learning phase. Many students have no say in their assignment, have little motivation, therefore, to tackle it, and achieve frustration. So, as a result, many students never participate in the learning process itself. Non-participation of students in their educational process was even more significant for dropouts than for those remaining in school. Cervantes (1966, p. 8) found that dropouts were very seldom involved or participated in any school-related activities.

With accompaniment, the student is not simply abandoned by the teacher. The democratic process has led them to the point where they have established a personal relationship, and have set goals based on the students' interests; they will consequently accept their goals together. With the element of accompaniment, education is marked by "learning to learn skills" and involves initial thinking, analytic procedure, inquiry, and self-evaluation (Weinberg, 1975, p. 120). But, as importantly, it implies a mutual and continuous participation on both the teacher's and the student's part.

To bring a student through the process of Contact, Consult, Find, and Share and not to carry out the accompaniment nullifies the entire process. This is because a student tends to fail in learning when he perceives his goals and values are abandoned (Clark and Kadis, 1971, p. 31). Thus, Accompany is the fifth and final crucial category. Actions within this category include: Doing It, Question, Observe, Reflect, and Accept.

Doing It

The interpretation of Doing It has two implications. The first is that the student/learner must now follow through with his interests. The second implication is that the teacher/participant must willingly move with the student in his quest and not leave him stranded. Daunie, Loudfoot, and Telfer (1974, p. 39) presumed the teacher cannot cause a pupil to undertake intellectual activities--he logically cannot induce a pupil to understand something; he often empirically cannot cause a pupil to understand. The pupil will only learn if he chooses to do it. The teacher may assist as a guide, but the student participates in the "doing." When students tackle learning by "doing it," then education, according to Fromm (1947, p. 33), will relate itself to the living tradition, not simply by accepting it, but by digesting it, by being in touch with it, and by creatively changing it.

Reichle (1978, p. 26) claimed that the teacher who accompanies the students in the processes of learning functions as a builder of alternatives, a sounding board for choicing among alternatives, a suggestion maker, and a co-designer of new activities. This is what education might want to encompass--the teacher accompanying the student.

Gibbons (1984, p. 595) suggested, in teaching students how to be self-directing in their learning, "We are saying you have a major responsibility for what you learn here. We will show you how and give you all the training, practice, and support, that we can--but learning is your job, now and throughout your life." The goal of education ought to be to teach children to consider the consequences of their actions and inactions (Hechinger, 1970, p. 44). Unless they "try out" their

knowledge, they will not keep it. Thus, the first step in Accompany is to encourage the student to get out there and "do it." Farber (1970, p. 33) stated, "You learn democracy in school not by defining it or by simulating it but by doing it." So is it with anything else.

Fantini (1976, p. 44) assumed that "it does not take much time for the interested learner to acquire almost any skill that he wants to use." Spears (1951, p. 96) recalled, "Since a person learns by doing, the school must provide practice in, as well as knowledge of, democratic living." Dewey (1961, p. 101) noted, "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience." Gefke (1972, p. 12) commented, "The democratic teacher assumes that his role is that of leader-member and helps the group grow and work productively while sharing the control responsibility." When a classroom has a democratic setting, each member of the group accompanies the other in communicative processes. Barnes (1977, p. 71) suggested a teacher become equal to the student in the learning process in order to accompany each student in being self-directing, self-controlling, and yet cooperating and participating.

The concept of working cooperatively and attempting to overcome pre-designed challenges to achieve short-term goals has the effect of improving a child's peer relations and helps to break the failure pattern that he or she has had to cope with for many years (Cardwell, 1976, p. 5). "Learning," suggested Rogers (1969, p. 162), "is facilitated when the student participates responsibly in the learning process." Illich (1971, p. 16) continued, "Only actual participation constitutes socially valuable learning, a participation by the learner in every

stage of the learning process, including not only a free choice of what is to be learned and how it is to be learned, but also a free determination by each learner of his own reason for living and learning the part that his knowledge is to play in life." Dewey (1971, p. 67) summarized: "There is . . . no point . . . which is sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which direct his activities in the learning process, just as there is no defect in traditional education greater than its failure to secure the active cooperation of the pupil in construction of the purposes involved in his studying."

Outdoor experience holds great potential for accompaniment. It forces people to work together cooperatively. Wilson (1981, p. 63) claimed it might be the quickest and most effective way for people to discover how much they depend on each other and how much more they are able to do than they ever imagined they could. By the time the group in the woods has reached a pre-set destination, it has already begun to function as a cohesive unit. "In the woods, the choices are limited, and making wrong decisions has an immediate effect, you lose your way, go hungry, overturn your canoe and get everything you have in it soaking wet" (Wilson, 1981, p. 87). By doing it, the student has much to learn.

Question

During the actual accompaniment, there are several behaviors the teacher needs to engage in to be able to make the learning experience as fulfilling as possible. These are Question, Observe, and Accept. This questioning is to be non-threatening, interested, and serve as an

inquiry for extended learning. It should not serve as a threat to the student. Combs (1962, p. 105) pointed out that "children need to be challenged, but the negative effect of threat in narrowing perception and forcing individuals to the defense of existing positions is clearly antithetical to the kinds of open exploration and discovery essential for development of a truly adequate self."

Corey (1973, pp. 34-35) felt the learner/participant teacher adheres to a degree of genuine freedom for the student wherein he can become a partner in the learning journey. This type of teacher operates as a facilitator and uses openness and student freedom to inquire as studies evolve and develop (Tidwell, 1971, p. 31).

While the participants are involved in their learning process, it is important the participant devise questions along the way. This will be to ascertain the progress the student is making, as well as solidify the learning. This also involves careful listening. The questions should vary and not be strictly affirmative or negative response types. This will build closeness between the participants and serve to keep the relationship on a personal level.

Questioning serves as a guide for the teacher to be able to better understand what the student is achieving. It also helps the teacher to be able to supply the student with tools he may need to further his progress. Without questioning, the teacher would not have any idea how the accompaniment process is proceeding.

Observe

Through observing the student in his "doing it" phase, the teacher will gain much insight about the student. Gibbons (1984, p. 595) pointed out, "We will be struck by the uniqueness of the individual students expressed in the activities they choose and in their struggles and progress." The joy of learning is seldom expressed verbally, but if there is genuine, interested learning happening, it will be observable.

The teacher needs to be perceptive to the student's behaviors. As Potts (1985) stated, language is not so important as observation. He continued with, observation gives validity to the assumptions one makes about the student's behaviors. The teacher who observes, Potts felt, has a key to the student for he can observe the reactions the student makes to certain stimulus.

The teacher needs to observe the student, his progress, and his reactions while he accompanies him. Montagu (1962, p. 56) felt man is most precariously dependent upon his fellow human beings for support. Through questions and then careful observation, a perceptive teacher will know when and if the student needs support. The teacher's purpose is to create a pattern of competence and success for all students, one that will affect everything else that they do (Gibbons, 1984, p. 595). If the teacher is not observing the student while he's "doing it," he cannot assist in creating that pattern. After questioning and observation, it is imperative reflection take place.

Reflect

Reflect is having the quality, between the teacher and student, of evaluating, if necessary, the learning; setting future goals based upon what has been accomplished; and contemplating together upon the value of what has been experienced. Reflection needs to be nonjudgmental about personalities. It is an open, honest interchange in which the experience has some sense of completion or application. When teacher behaviors tend to be "closed," the student responses tend to be "reproductive." Rogers (1969, p. 119) felt teachers who are interested in process, and facilitative in their interactions, produce self-initiated and creative responses in their students. Teachers who are interested in evaluation of students produce passive, memorized, "eager to please" responses from their students. Evaluation within the democratic setting needs to be a self-evaluation. Combs (1962, p. 147) assumed the learner/participant teacher is one who uses self-evaluation and has no use for the marking system, whether it be for punishment or reward. In the traditional system, "grades are used to force irrelevant knowledge on students" (Glasser, 1969, p. 59). Students need to work with the teacher to consider if and what he has gained. Only the student will have the answers and the right to judge himself.

In Reflect, it is important that learning be considered as ongoing. The student always has choices of "where to go from here." The more the student learns, the more there is to learn. Many alternative programs advocate the expansion of choices. This means a gradual development of a variety of choices, of which the student may choose as satisfying or relevant to his needs. "If one option doesn't work out,

the child has a right to another, and, if necessary, still another" (Fantini, 1976, p. 21).

In contemplating the student's achievement, it is important within the theory of democratic processes that anxiety be held at a minimum. Tidwell (1971, p. 47) mentioned it is the intention of the democratic teacher to become involved with the student in order to develop a relationship of high trust and minimum anxiety. Anxiety is the emotion that is felt by a person who is faced with a threat to his beliefs or values. It is "the apprehension cued off by a threat to some value which the individual holds essential to his existence as a personality" (May, 1953, p. 191). May (1953, p. 148) continued, anxiety arises out of apprehension of disapproval by significant persons within the interpersonal world.

Anxiety takes a different form from student to student. What is consistently occurring is there is a threat to the student's value system. Combs et al. (1971, p. 107) expressed:

When a person feels threatened, he is forced to defend the perceptions he already has. This effect of threat upon perception is extremely well-known to the man in the street, but it is truly amazing how little attention it has been given as a principle affecting learning. Almost everyone is aware that when he feels himself threatened, his first reaction is to defend himself in every way he can. What is more, the greater the degree of threat to which he is exposed the more tenaciously he holds the perceptions, ideas, or practices he already has. Under the experience of threat, people find it almost impossible to change.

A reduction in anxiety may come about in the student "when all of the ways in which the individual perceives himself, all perceptions of the qualities, abilities, impulses, and attitudes of the person, and

all perceptions of himself in relation to others are accepted into the organized conscious concept of the self, then this achievement is accompanied by feelings of comfort and freedom from tension which are experienced as psychological adjustment" (Kuenzli, 1959, pp. 63-64).

Gefke (1972, p. 17) suggested "a democratic leader . . . reflects . . . communications with the group and leads the way for associated relationships." Reflection is the considerations and contemplations of the participants in their pursuit of knowledge. It is the reinforcement the student needs when he gets frustrated. It is the evaluating of the student progress as he struggles and grows within this step, the process has reached its peak. Both participants have shared and given both to a multitude of experiences. A solid, trusting relationship should be in progress. Reflection uses all the categories thus far encountered: Contact, Consult, Find, Share, and Accompany.

Accept

As previously mentioned, only by being accepted can a student learn to be accepting. As part of Accompany, the teacher must continue to display sincere acceptance of the student. Combs et al. (1971) pointed out a major requirement for the development of a good atmosphere for change is acceptance. "The teacher must prize the learner and care for his feelings, his opinions, and his attitudes and thus develop a basic trust in him" (Rogers, 1969, p. 105). LeShan (1970, p. 134) felt the educator will accompany the student and must be a respecter of differences, fully aware that he cannot change a rose bush into a violet, and not the least bit interested in doing so. When a student is

accepted as a person of worth, his point of view is regarded as substantial and as a real and authentic way of knowing him (Moustakas, 1966, p. 282).

Fitts (1971, p. 25) suggested the teacher needs to make note that he must accept the student unconditionally, but he does not have to accept all the behaviors. A person has limits of acceptance, and if the student continually insults, threatens, or mistreats the teacher, that behavior will exceed his limits (Fitts, 1971). Acceptance of a student as an individual and unique being means accepting his interests, and often, in doing so, the teacher must remember to refrain from "helping" where help may be perceived as interference (Ginott, 1965, p. 20).

"As we move from a competitive, win-lose attitude toward life into a cooperative, everyone can-win attitude, we will all find it easier to be with one another in caring ways. Through sharing and caring we can all feel better with our lives" (Daniels and Horowitz, 1976, p. 337).

When associated relationships transpire into mutual value, potentials for self-correction are realized in an atmosphere of acceptance (Wilde, 1984, p. 64). The benefits of mutual acceptance are stated by Fitts (1971, p. 25): "Man can learn to shed prejudice, judgments, conflicts, hate, and misunderstanding if he exhibits genuine acceptance." Everyone is personally engaged in a search for acceptance as a person rather than as a performer of a task (Glasser, 1969, p. 10). When a student has the experience of appreciating mutual acceptance, it is then he can choose to be himself. The acceptance of the self exemplifies the well-educated person.

Summary

Silberman (1970, p. 80) assumed, "It is taken for granted that if children fail to learn, the fault must lie with them rather than with the school." Accompany would put the responsibility on both the student's and the teacher's shoulders, for they are venturing into a mutual experience. Accompaniment is where participants choose to escort others in experiencing their shared interests. "Accompaniment implies companionship and equality of situation in informal groups" (Erickson, 1980, p. 44). To accompany implies participating in the learning experience (Doing It), to question and observe, to reflect and, always, be accepting.

CHAPTER 9

SUMMARY

The problem of this investigation was to search out, through literature and experiences, a conceptual framework which might be appropriate in the development of alternative schools which emphasize the process of personal relationships among the participants. The study was descriptive in nature.

The studies reviewed tended to show that traditional education is not meeting the needs of all children. Traditional schools tend to frustrate creativity and growth among many participants. Many students have claimed their education to be irrelevant and useless. Many educators claim that, although the traditional philosophy of education is rooted in the democratic ideal, the practice and theory of the educational system is not democratic.

There are large numbers of educators who strongly believe that the relationship which develops between the teacher and student is crucial. This relationship can affect if, and what, the student learns. How this crucial relationship develops was given careful consideration.

In response to a need for relevant and useful education, the alternative education movement has developed. All students deserve to be offered a variety of learning environments, of curricula, and teaching styles. This can best be achieved through alternative programming.

Of the studies reviewed, many revealed that one of the major differences between alternative and traditional schools lies in the teacher-student relationship. Most alternative educators believe the student-teacher relationship is as important as the curriculum.

One approach this author felt was relevant in achieving productive relationships has its roots in Barnes' Theory of Democratic Processes in Classrooms. His "Other Direction" seemed appropriate in developing a conceptual framework on which alternative education can be built. The process is broken into steps labeled 1) Contact, 2) Consult, 3) Find, 4) Share, and 5) Accompany. This writer developed a framework from these categories.

Contact is the process where the teacher makes the introductory move to form a relationship with the student. Within this process are 1) Observe, 2) Inform, 3) Accept, and 4) Choice.

Within the initial stage of Contact, listening might be the most basic and necessary condition in developing an open and trusting relationship. In listening, the teacher must not only hear words, but carefully observe the student's reactions, feelings, and meanings. Students also need to be involved in a process called Inform. This is how they will learn "how things are done." For a trusting relationship to occur, there needs to be an ambience of acceptance. The teacher sets the climate for Accept by both modeling the behavior and assisting the students in being accepting of others. The concept of Choice allows for each person to assume individual responsibility for self. By being respected enough to make their own choices, students will take responsibility for these choices.

After contact has been made, Consult comes into play. Consult is making the effort, through interaction, to learn about the other. The primary goal of Consult is to determine how the student feels or sees things. Certain behaviors take place during Consult. These are 1) Question, 2) Listen, 3) Concern, and 4) Choice.

For the initial dialogue to take place, the teacher must engage in Question. This entails asking the student about himself. After Question, the teacher must listen to the student's view of reality. If the teacher does not understand, he must revert to Question. During this interaction, there must be concern. Teachers who want to make genuine contact with students must show and feel warmth and concern. While consulting, teacher and student can learn to trust each other, and thus allow the student to make his own choices. The purpose of Consult is for the student to be presented with and discover unlimited choices.

The third step in this framework is an extension of Consult. It is called Find. Discovering the other person's needs, interests, and concerns is called Find. This is important as, whenever an interest is kindled, learning will take place. Find incorporates 1) Discover and 2) Identify Interest.

Students need to feel they have a part in their education process. By working with them democratically, they will, in fact, discover for themselves where their interests lie. Many times, students are never questioned on where their interests lie. Before further advancement in the theory of personal processes can be attained, the interests must be clarified. Miscommunication should be avoided. Frustrations and conflict will be avoided in the process if teacher and student

clarify and identify the interest they are going to seek. Once interests are discovered, studied, and identified, participants can move on to the next category, Share.

Share is the stage where Contact is established, Consult has discovered interests, and interaction through these interests is occurring. Participants provide, receive, and learn. Ideas develop and mesh. Involved within this process of Share are 1) Clarify Desired Outcome, 2) Consider Choices, 3) Plan of Action, 4) Ownership, 5) Accept, and 6) Observe.

After finding and clarifying interests, the next step is, "So what?" Student and teacher need to figure out, based on the discovered interest, in which direction to pursue it. After a direction is decided, choices must be considered. In this step, participants contribute, share, present, and discover choices, based on the desired outcome. After consideration of choices, student and teacher need to focus in on a particular plan of action on which they can achieve their goal. Relationships become closer as plans take shape. While working in partnership, the student shares responsibility for his education. Education changes from being something done "to" a student to something the student does "for" himself. Thus, a sense of ownership appears. As in all phases of the process, Accept and Observe must be continued. Once Share has been reached, Accompany may occur.

The student must make his own decisions, and do his own learning. Yet, with the process of democratic learning, the teacher accompanies others by offering understanding, guidance, and assistance

where needed. Actions within this category include 1) Doing It, 2) Question, 3) Observe, 4) Reflect, and 5) Accept.

The student, if he chooses to, learns. The teacher assists, but the student does the doing. The student needs to follow through in his interest by doing it. The teacher must also do it by accompanying the student and not leaving him stranded. While involved in accompaniment, the teacher questions the student and his progress. In Question, the teacher solidifies the learning. Questions are based on careful listening. As well as listen, the teacher must observe the student and his learning. Through Question and Observe, the teacher will know when the student needs support. Reflect is the considerations and contemplations of the participants in their pursuit of knowledge. It includes reinforcement and evaluation. Reflect helps cement a solid, trusting relationship. Acceptance is a task everyone is engaged in. All people desire to be accepted as individuals. When a student has experienced mutual acceptance, he can then be allowed to be himself. The acceptance of self and all it entails is an example of the well-educated person. This is the goal of the process of developing personal relationships within the alternative school.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators. 1981. Creative Ideas for Small Schools. Arlington, Virginia.
- Abram, Marcie J., and Robert A. Cobb. 1984. A Survey of Recent Drop-Outs Concerning Motivation for Leaving School, Future Educational Plans, and Family History. Bowling Green, Kentucky: College of Education.
- Ahlstrom, Winston, and Robert Havighurst. 1971. Four Hundred Losers: Delinquent Boys in High School. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Allen, Paul M., William D. Barnes, Jerald L. Reece, and E. Wayne Roberson. 1970. Teacher Self-Appraisal: A Way of Looking over Your Own Shoulder. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones.
- Amidon, Edmond J., and Ned A. Flanders. 1967. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis: Association for Productive Teaching.
- Anderson, Thomas Martin. 1983. "Student and Instructor Perceptions of Social-Educational Relationships in a Public Alternative School Program." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Archambault, Phillip. 1972. "Patterns of Open and Closed Schools." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Arnove, Robert F., and Toby Strout. 1978. Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 1972. Schools in Search of Meaning. Washington, D.C.
- Auden, W.H. 1952. The Living Thoughts of Kierkegaard. New York: David McKay Company.
- Bandura, A., and R.H. Walters. 1964. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Barnes, William D., and Clyde D. Tidwell. 1974a. "Personal Processes in Learning." Unpublished paper, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Barnes, William D., and Clyde D. Tidwell. 1974b. "A Theory of Democratic Learning Environments." Unpublished paper, University of Arizona, Tucson.

- Barnes, William D. 1977. Democratic Classrooms: Theory and Behavior. Tucson: Roadrunner Technical Publications.
- Bateson, John David. 1981. "Changes in Student-Teacher Perceptions Following a Residential Outdoor Program." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Bernard, Harold W., and Wesley C. Huckins. 1974. Humanism in the Classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bills, Robert E. 1952. "An Investigation of Student-Centered Teaching." Journal of Educational Research, 46(Dec):313-320.
- Bishop, Towne Charles. 1972. "Verbal Patterns of an Informal Group which Employs Democratic Processes." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Blackham, H.J. 1959. Six Existentialist Thinkers. New York: Harper and Row.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Methods. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Bogdan, Robert C., and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1982. Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bremer, John, and Michael von Moschzisker. 1971. The School without Walls: Philadelphia's Parkway Program. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Brewer, David L., Pearl M. Chandler, and Clyde D. Tidwell. 1983. "Social Empowerment: An Alternative to Habermas' Practical Cognitive Interest." Unpublished paper, Tucson, Arizona.
- Brewer, David L., and Clyde D. Tidwell. 1977. "Relationships in Rational Society." Unpublished paper, Tucson, Arizona.
- Bridges, Harold D. 1973. Human Relations at Work. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Broad, Lynn. 1977. Alternative Schools: Why, What, Where, and How Much. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.
- Brown, Georgi I. 1971. Home Teaching: An Introduction to Confluent Education. New York: Esalen Publications, Viking Press.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1964. "The Act of Discovery." In The Revolution in the Schools, Ronald Gross and Judith Murphy (eds.), pp. 165-166. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

- Bruyn, Severyn. 1966. The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Buber, Martin. 1953. I and Thou. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Buber, Martin. 1965. Between Man and Man. New York: Macmillan.
- Butts, R. Freeman. 1961. "Education for Freedom." In Philosophies of Education, Philip H. Phenix (ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Cardwell, G.R. 1976. "Adapted Outward Bound Programs: An Alternative for Corrections." Paper presented to Atlantic Provinces Criminology and Corrections Association Conference.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1979. Giving Youth a Better Chance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carter, James D. 1980. "A Comparative Study of Two Training Programs in Florida for Delinquent Youth: Echard Wilderness Camping and State Training Schools." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Cervantes, Lucias. 1966. The Dropouts: Causes and Cures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Chaitanya, Krishna. 1978. The Sociology of Freedom. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Chanan, Gabriel, and Linda Gilchrist. 1974. What School Is For. New York: Praeger.
- Chandler, Pearlle Mae Price. 1983. "A Preparation Program for Alternative School Teachers." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Cherry, Colin. 1967. On Human Communication. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Child, Irvin L. 1973. Humanistic Psychology and the Research Tradition: Their Several Virtues. New York: Wiley.
- Clark, Donald H., and Asya L. Kadis. 1971. Humanistic Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Cogan, Morris. 1958. "The Behavior of Teachers and the Productive Behaviors of Their Pupils: I. Perception Analysis." Journal of Experimental Education, 27(Dec):89-105.
- Coleman, James S. 1972. "The Children Have Outgrown the Schools." Psychology Today, 21(Feb):92-105.

- Coltrin, Gene Stephen. 1974. "Utilization of the Scientific Method and Democratic Processes in a High School Introductory Chemistry Course." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Combs, Arthur W. 1965. The Professional Education of Teachers: A Perceptual View of Teacher Preparation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Combs, Arthur W. 1979. Myths in Education: Beliefs that Hinder Progress and Their Alternatives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Combs, Arthur W. (ed.). 1962. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Combs, Arthur W., Donald L. Avila, and William W. Purkey. 1971. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Combs, Arthur W., Anne Cohen Richards, and Fred Richards. 1949. Perceptual Psychology: A Humanistic Approach to the Study of Persons. New York: Harper and Row.
- Copen, Peter. 1980. Walkabout: An Educational Experience. Yorktown Heights, New York: Board of Cooperative Educational Services.
- Copen, Peter, and Eugene Lebowhl. 1984. "The Rites of Passage for Walkabout." Phi Delta Kappan, 65(May):602-603.
- Corey, Gerald F. 1973. Teachers Can Make a Difference. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Crary, Ryland W. 1969. Humanizing the School. New York: Howard Knopf.
- Cronbach, Lee J. 1963. Educational Psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Cusick, Philip A. 1973. Inside High School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Daunie, R.S., Eileen M. Loudfoot, and Elizabeth Telfer. 1974. Education and Personal Relationships. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Davidson, H.H., and G. Lang. 1960. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teacher's Feelings toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, 29:107-118.

- Dawson, Rob. 1978. "Staff Development: Developing a Top-Notch Staff in an Outdoor Wilderness Program Is Similar to Building an Orchestra." Paper presented at the Annual Conference for Experiential Educators, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Dennis, Lawrence J., and William Edward Eaton. 1980. George S. Counts: Educator for a New Age. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dennison, George. 1969. The Lives of Children. New York: Random House.
- DeTurk, Phillip H. 1974. P.S. 2001: The Story of the Pasadena Alternative School. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.
- DeTurk, Phillip, and Robert Mackin. 1974. Alternative School Development: A Guide for Practitioners. Durham, New Hampshire: New England Program in Teacher Education.
- Dewey, John. 1954. The Public and Its Problems. Chicago: Swallow Press.
- Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, John. 1963. Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books.
- Dewey, John. 1966. Democracy in Education. New York: The Free Press.
- Dewey, John. 1968. "My Pedagogic Creed." In Models of Man: Explorations in the Western Educational Tradition, Paul Nash (ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Dickinson, Richard Duane. 1979. "A Study to Determine Self-Concept Change through a Program of Wilderness Skill Development." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley.
- Duke, Daniel Linden. 1978. The Transformation of the School: The Emergence of Contemporary Alternative Schools in the United States. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Elliott, Delbert S., and Harwin L. Voss. 1974. Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington, Kentucky: Heath.
- Erickson, Erik H. 1963. Childhood Society. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Erickson, Erik H. 1968. Identity: Youth in Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Fantini, Mario D. 1962. "Open and Closed Classrooms." The Clearing House, 37(Oct):151-154.
- Fantini, Mario D. 1973. Public Schools of Choice. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Fantini, Mario D. (ed.). 1976. Alternative Education. New York: Anchor Books.
- Fantini, Mario D., and Gerald Wein. 1968. The Disadvantaged Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row.
- Farber, Jerry. 1970. The Student as Nigger. New York: Pocket Books.
- Fitch, Stanley K. 1976. Insights into Behavior. Boston: Holbrook Press.
- Fitts, William. 1971. The Self-Concept and Self-Actualization. Nashville, Tennessee: The Dade Wallace Center.
- Friedman, Maurice. 1974. The Hidden Human Image. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Fromm, Erich. 1947. Man for Himself. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fromm, Erich. 1955. The Sane Society. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett.
- Fromm, Erich. 1965. Escape from Freedom. New York: Avon Books.
- Fromm, Erich. 1967. Socialist Humanism London: The Penguin Press.
- Gaylin, Willard. 1976. Caring. New York: Alfred H. Knopf.
- Gefke, Pamela Kaye. 1972. "Student Behavior Patterns in a Democratic Processes Classroom." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Germani, Gino. 1980. Marginality. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- Gibbons, Maurice. 1984. "Walkabout Ten Years Later: Searching for a Renewed Vision of Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 65(May):593-596.
- Gibson, Eleanor. 1969. Principles of Perceptual Learning and Development. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Ginott, Haim Ajim. 1965. Between Parent and Child. New York: Macmillan.

- Glaser, David. 1971. Social Deviance Chicago: Markham.
- Glaser, William. 1969. Schools without Failure. New York: Harper and Row.
- Glatthorn, A. Allen. 1975. Alternatives in Education: Schools and Programs New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Godfrey, Robert John. 1972. "A Model for Educational Change and Development." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley.
- Gold, Martin. 1978. "Scholastic Expenses, Self-Esteem, and Delinquent Behavior: A Theory for Alternative Schools." Crime and Delinquency, 24:290-308.
- Good, Thomas L., Bruce J. Biddle, and Jere E. Brophy. 1975. Teachers Make a Difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gooding, C.J. 1964. "An Observation and Analysis of Perceptual Organization of Effective Teachers." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Goodlad, John. 1975. The Conventional and the Alternative in Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.
- Goodlad, John I. 1983. "A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses." Phi Delta Kappan, 7(March):467-468.
- Goodman, Paul, et al. 1970. Summerhill: For and Against. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.
- Grauband, Allen. 1972. Free the Children: Radical Reform and the Free School Movement. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gross, Ronald, and Judith Murphy. 1964. The Revolution in the Schools. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Hall, Alene Winifred. 1979. "Student Perceptions of Changes in Self during an Alternative Secondary School Process." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Hamachek, Don E. 1971. Encounters with the Self. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hartley, Eugene L., and Ruth E. Hartley. 1952. Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hechinger, Fred, et al. 1970. Summerhill: For and Against. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc.

- Herndon, James. 1965. The Way It Spozed To Be. New York: Bantam Books.
- Herndon, James. 1971. How To Survive in Your Native Land. New York: Bantam Books.
- Hiltner, Seward. 1959. Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abington Press.
- Holt, John. 1964. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing.
- Holt, John. 1969. The Under-Achieving School. New York: Dell.
- Holt, John. 1972. Freedom and Beyond. New York: Dell.
- Hopkins, L. Thomas. 1964. "The Authoritarian Group." In Perspectives on Group Process, C. Gratton Kemp (ed.), pp. 56-58. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Howe, Ruel L. 1963. The Miracle of Dialogue New York: The Seaburg Press.
- Ihde, Don, and Richard M. Zaner. 1977. Interdisciplinary Phenomenology. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Illich, Ivan. 1971. Deschooling Society New York: Harper and Row.
- Jourard, Sidney M. 1968. Disclosing Man to Himself. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Jung, C.G. 1954. Psychology and Education. New York: Princeton University Press.
- Kaplan, William. 1968. Rebellion Against Authority in High Schools. Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Kelley, Earl C. 1962a. In Defense of Youth. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kelley, Earl C. 1962b. "The Fully Functioning Self." In Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education, Arthur W. Combs (ed.). Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kline, Lloyd W. 1971. Education and the Personal Quest. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Kohl, Herbert. 1967. 36 Children. New York: New American Library.
- Kohl, Herbert. 1969. The Open Classroom. New York: Random House.

- Kohl, Herbert. 1978. "Public Education Must Be Saved Even from Itself." Los Angeles Times, October 15, Part VI, p. 3.
- Kozol, Jonathan. 1972. Free Schools. New York: Bantam.
- Kruger, Dreyer. 1979. An Introduction to Phenomenological Psychology. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- LaBenne, Wallace F., and Bert I. Greene (eds.). 1969. Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear.
- Laing, R. D. 1967. Politics of Experience. New York: Pantheon.
- Laing, R. D. 1969. The Divided Self. Baltimore: Penguin Press.
- Laing, R. D., H. Phillipson, and A. R. Lee. 1966. Interpersonal Perception. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Landis, Paul. 1959. Social Problems. New York: J. B. Lippincott.
- Leiweke, John Tracey. 1976. "The Influence of the Twenty-Four Day Outward Bound Experience in Self-Actualization." Ph.D. Dissertation, St. Louis University, Missouri.
- Lembo, John M. 1969. The Psychology of Effective Classroom Instruction. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- LeShan, Eda J., et al. 1970. Summerhill: For and Against. New York: Hart Publishing Company.
- Levinger, George, and Harold L. Raush. 1977. Close Relationships: Perspectives on the Meaning of Intimacy. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lewis, Anne. 1981. Creative Ideas for Small Schools. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1959. Five Families. New York: Basic Books.
- MacCracken, Mary. 1975. A Circle of Children. New York: The New American Library, Inc.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1959. New Knowledge in Human Values. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1968. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Maslow, Abraham H. 1971. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Viking Press.

- Maslow, Abraham H. 1976. Motivation and Personality. New York: Penguin.
- Matthai, Robert A. 1973. "The Effect of Outward Bound on Sense of Cooperation." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- May, Rollo. 1953. Man's Search for Himself. New York: Dell.
- McIver, Robert M., and Charles H. Page. 1953. Society: An Introductory Analysis. New York: Rinehart and Co.
- McMurrin, Sterling. 1954. The Patterns of Our Religious Faiths. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- McPartland, James M., and Edward L. McDill (eds.). 1977. Violence in Schools: Perspectives, Programs, and Positions. Lexington, Kentucky: Heath.
- Mead, G. H. 1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Milgram, Stanley. 1969. Obedience to Authority. New York: Harper and Row.
- Miller, John P. 1976. Humanizing the Classroom. New York: Praeger.
- Miller, William C. 1970. "Using Equipment, Materials, and Facilities to Develop Human Capabilities." In To Nurture Humaneness, Arthur W. Combs (ed.), pp. 155-164. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and National Education Association.
- Milner, Don. 1980. "A Study of Perceptual Patterns of Youth-in-Trouble Regarding Personal Relationships in the School and the Home." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Montagu, Ashley. 1962. The Humanization of Man. New York: Grove Press.
- Morris, Van Cleve. 1966. Existentialism in Education: What It Means. New York: Harper and Row.
- Moustakas, Clark. 1966. The Authentic Teacher. Boston: Howard W. Doyle.
- Moustakas, Clark E., and Cereta Perry. 1973. Learning To Be Free. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Murphy, Edward J. 1976. "Self-Concept Changes in Low Socio-Economic Children as a Function of Decentralized, Residential Camping Experiences." Ph.D. Dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Neill, Alexander S. 1960. Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart.
- Nevill, Dorothy. 1977. Humanistic Psychology: New Frontiers. New York: Gardner Press.
- Nixon, Robert E. 1968. The Art of Growing. New York: Random House.
- Noble, Eli Sidney. 1981. "Assessment of a College Wrestling Team Organized under a Theory of Personal Processes." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Nye, Robert Patterson. 1975. "The Influence of an Outward Bound Program on the Self-Concept of the Participants." Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Parsons, Cynthia. 1984. "National Service for All." Phi Delta Kappan, 65(June):688-689.
- Patterson, C. H. 1973. Humanistic Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Perls, Frederick, Ralph E. Hefferline, and Paul Goodman. 1951. Gestalt Therapy. New York: Dell.
- Peters, Herman J., and Gail F. Farwell. 1959. Guidance: A Developmental Approach. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. 1984. In Search of Excellence. New York: Warner Books.
- Phenix, Philip H. (ed.). 1961. Philosophies of Education. New York: Wiley.
- Piaget, Jean. 1976. To Understand Is To Invent: The Future of Education. Dallas: Penguin Books.
- Porter, William W. 1975. "The Development and Evaluation of the Wilderness Experience Program." Denver, Colorado.
- Portuges, S., and N. Feshbach. 1968. "The Effects of Teacher's Reinforcement Style upon Imitative Behavior of Children." Paper presented at meeting of American Education Research Association, Chicago, February.

- Postman, Neil, and Charles Weingartner. 1969. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Postman, Neil, and Charles Weingartner. 1973. The School Book for People Who Want To Know What All the Hollering Is About. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Potts, John. 1985. Personal interview. May 2.
- Purkey, William W. 1970. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Raths, Louis E., Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. 1966. Values and Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Ray, Willis E. 1961. "Pupil Discovery vs. Direct Instruction." The Journal of Experimental Education, 29(March):271-300.
- Raywid, Mary Anne. 1983. "The First Decade of Public School Alternatives." Phi Delta Kappan, 8(April):551-554.
- Reich, Charles. 1970. The Greening of America. New York: Random House.
- Reichle, Alison Lea. 1978. "Student Perceptions of Student-Teacher Relationships in the Learning Process." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Reik, Theodor. 1949. Listening with the Third Ear. New York: Farrar, Straus.
- Reimer, Everett. 1972. School Is Dead: Alternatives in Education. New York: Anchor Books.
- Reisman, David. 1966. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rhoades, John Stewart. 1972. "The Problem of Individual Change in Outward Bound: An Application of Change and Transfer Theory." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Rhoton, L. Dow. 1985. Personal interview. January.
- Riley, Matilda White. 1963. Sociological Research: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Riordan, Robert C. 1972. Alternative Schools in Action. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Robischon, Thomas G., Jerome Rabow, and Janet Schmidt. 1975. Cracks in the Classroom Wall. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear.

- Rogers, Carl R. 1961. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, Carl R. 1969. Freedom To Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rogers, Carl R. 1977. Carl Rogers on Personal Power. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Rogers, Carl R. 1980. A Way of Being. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1960. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Ross, D. 1966. "Relationship between Dependency, Intentional Learning, and Incidental Learning in Pre-School Children." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4:374-381.
- Roszak, Theodore. 1969. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City, New York.
- Sarason, Seymour B. 1971. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schneideman, Rose. 1945. Democratic Education in Practice. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Schulze, Joseph R. 1970. Evaluation of the Effects of Outward Bound Training upon Dartmouth College Students, and New Hampshire Secondary School Students. Dartmouth: Outward Bound Center.
- Schutz, Alfred. 1970. On Phenomenology and Social Relations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shostrom, Everett. 1966. Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego: Individual Testing Service.
- Silberman, Charles E. 1970. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.
- Simmons, Jerry L. 1969. Deviants. Santa Barbara, California: University of California Press.
- Siner, Pat D. 1985. Personal interview. May.
- Smith, Mary Anne Wakefield. 1971. "An Investigation of the Effects of an Outward Bound Experience on Selected Personality Factors and Behavior of High School Juniors." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

- Smith, Mortimer. 1976. "C.B.E. View the Alternatives." In Alternative Education, Mario Fantini (ed.). New York: Anchor Books.
- Smith, Vernon. 1974. Alternative Schools: The Development of Options in Public Education. Professional Educators Publications, Inc.
- Smith, Vernon. 1976. Alternatives in Education: Freedom to Choose. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Smith, Vernon, Robert Barr, and Daniel Burke. 1976. "Alternatives in Education: Freedom to Choose." Phi Delta Kappan.
- Smith, Thomas V., and Edward C. Lindeman. 1961. A Democratic Way of Life. New York: New American Library.
- Snitzer, Herb. 1972. Today Is for Children--Numbers Can Wait. New York: Macmillan.
- Snow, Richard E. 1982. Intelligence, Motivation, and Academic Work. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Spears, Harold. 1951. Principles of Teaching. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Sterman, Albert. 1976. "Student Perceptions of Democratic/Non-Democratic Teacher Behavior in the Classroom." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Stonequist, Evett Y. 1937. The Marginal Man. New York: Scribner's Press.
- Stipek, Deborah. 1982. Motivating Students to Learn: A Lifelong Perspective. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Stoughton, Charles. 1976. A Study of Arizona High School Dropouts. Tucson: North Central Accreditation Office.
- Strauss, Anselm L. 1959. Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Stremba, Robert Henry. 1972. "A Study of the Relationship between Participation in an Outward Bound Program and Changes in Self-Esteem and Locus of Control." Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University.
- Supranovich, Beth Bond. 1982. "Differential Staffing Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan, 64(September):20-21.

- Tidwell, Clyde D. 1971. "Teacher Behavior and Democratic Processes." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Tillich, Paul. 1952. The Courage To Be. London: Yale University Press.
- Trujillo, Avelina. 1982. "The Significance of Teacher-Student Relationships as Perceived by Mexican-American Leaders." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Trump, J. Lloyd. 1977. A School for Everyone. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Tyler, Ralph W. 1983. "A Place Called School." Phi Delta Kappan, 64(March):463-464.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 1980. "Prevention of Delinquency through Alternative Education." Program announcement, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C.
- Vogel, Robert Mark. 1979. "The Effects of Project Use Training (Adventure Training) on the Participants' Self-Actualization and Self-Perception of Personal Change." Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Waller, Willard. 1967. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Watson, Douglas. 1972. Alternative Schools: Pioneering Districts Create Options for Students. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association.
- Wees, W. R. 1971. Nobody Can Teach Anyone Anything. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Weinberg, Carl. 1975. Education Is a Shuck: How the Education System Is Failing Our Children. New York: William Morrow.
- Weinstein, Gerald, and Mario Fantini (eds.). 1970. Towards Humanistic Education: A Curriculum of Effect. New York: Praeger.
- Wetmore, Reagh Clinton. 1972. "The Influence of Outward Bound School Experience on the Self-Concept of Adolescent Boys." Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University, Massachusetts.
- White, Ralph K., and Ronald O. Lippitt. 1960. Accuracy and Democracy. New York: Harper and Row.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. 1963. The Aims of Education. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd.

- Whyte, William F. 1966. Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilde, Lois. 1984. "Patterns of Personal Relationships in Investigations with Democratic Processes in Classrooms." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Wilhelms, Fred T. 1967. Evaluation as Feedback and Guide. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wilson, Renate. 1981. Inside Outward Bound. Charlotte, North Carolina: The East Woods Press.
- Wilson, Thomas C. 1977. "Improving the Large Goals of Education." NASSP Bulletin, March:95-107.
- Winkie, Philip Allen. 1976. "The Effects of an Outward Bound School Experience on Levels of Moral Judgment and Self-Concept." Ph.D. Dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Winn, Ralph B. (ed.). 1959. John Dewey: Dictionary of Education. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Wynne, John P. 1963. Theories of Education. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Young, Kimball. 1942. Sociology. New York: American Book Co.
- Zunin, Leonard, and Natalie Zunin. 1972. Contact: The First Four Minutes. Los Angeles: Nash.