DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 876 SP 004 613

AUTHOR Cline, Marvin D.; And Others
TITLE Observers in the Classroom. A Case Study of an Innovative Program.
INSTITUTION Boston Univ., Mass. Headstart Evaluation and Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Preschool Teachers, *Role Perception, Staff Role, *Supervisors, *Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted (as one aspect of an intervention program in Head Start classes) to explore the consequences of the interjection of the observer into the classroom, with particular emphasis on the teacher's reactions to this attempt to supply a dimension of understanding about the classroom to supplement his own perspective. In a case study approach, four teachers were selected on the grounds of their divergent styles and background. Procedures included observation of teachers' styles (using Beller scales to determine the sensitivity of the teacher to the psychological and interpersonal needs of children in the classroom) and interviews with teachers and observers on the nature of interaction between teachers and observers. Conclusions drawn from the four case studies: Each teacher resisted the activities of the observer and established barriers to the utilization of the observers as a source of information about the classroom. In her own way, each teacher was able to so vastly delimit the activities of the observer that few meaningful interactions between teacher and observer occurred. Unaware of the issues which their presence raised for teachers, observers were at a disadvantage in their capacity to contribute to the educational issues of the classroom. By retaining her authority over the classroom, the teacher was able to determine the conditions which could not be challenged, changed, or expanded by the observer. (Author/JS)

Special Education Department
School of Education
Boston University

OBSERVERS IN THE CLASSROOM

A CASE STUDY OF AN INNOVATIVE PROGRAM

Research report of the Boston University Head Start
Evaluation and Research Center

Marvin D. Cline, Cindy M. Blakely
Karen Saaz

Research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C., 20506. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and should not be construed as representing the opinion or policy of any agency of the United States Government.

Contract No: OEO 4116

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The funding for the activity of the Boston University Head Start Evaluation and Research Center (BUER) called for an interventional program, including testing of children, interviewing of parents and observation of classes, and a separate research program which, in general was not to be connected with the intervention program. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center interventions were part of the "evaluation" responsibility of each Center. BUER opted to direct part of its research efforts to its interventional program, which would serve the dual purpose of adding substantially to the formal evaluation program and generating research in a setting which was accessible and for which additional data were available.

The interventional program is described in some detail in the final report (F. Garfunkel, Pre-School Education and Poverty: The Distance In Between; Boston University School of Education, 1970.) The open, innovative character of that intervention called for very specific attention to how individuals were affected by being part of it. The research reported herein serves that purpose.

Statement Of The Problem

Although the primary goal of the overall intervention project was to create a broader educational unit than that which ordinarily is found in traditional nursery schools, this evaluation effort focused on a much more restricted aspect of the total project. We were interested simply in the consequences for the teacher of the addition of several kinds of services to her normal classroom equipment. It is true that some of the "equipment" was designed to accomplish more than an increase in the ability of the teacher to handle her chores. In the case of the interjection of a new role (with new functions and new personnel to perform that role) called an observer, there is a clear suggestion that the teacher's role as the decision-maker in the daily pattern of interactions with each child was to be manipulated. The observer in the classroom would serve not simply as a source of extra information not easily available to the teacher, but the observer would also be a significant commentator on the events of the classroom. To serve, in the classical Greek sense, as the chorus, is to create a wider base in personnel as well as in information in dealing with the classroom situation. The extra services made available to the teacher are broadly interpreted. The goal of the present investigation is to explore some of the consequences of the interjection of the observer role into the classroom, with particular emphasis on the teacher's reactions to this kind of innovation.

There are two aspects of this observer-teacher process which might meaningfully determine its direction. The first is the teacher and all of the properties which she brings to the classroom. The second, of course, is

the observer. Consider, first the teacher. Clearly, the interjection of another person into the classroom is subject to several different interpretations by the teacher. This might appear to be a threat to her in the form of an implied personal criticism, or an explicit critique of the role which she plays. On the other hand, observers might be seen as serving the needs of the parents and the community in the form of community controlled monitors of the program, or simply as an expression of the need to provide employment for community people. Finally, a teacher might be aware of some of the lacks in the traditional form of nursery school organization, and might feel attracted to the notion of innovation in this area. Clearly, these alternate perceptions are not mutually exclusive, and they are a function of the teacher's sense of her own skills, the demands of the classroom, her estimate of the potential worth of the particular observers utilized in the present program and her participation in a program emphasizing parent-community involvement. We suspect, although we cannot offer any specific hypotheses, that teacher skill and teacher awareness of the needs of the classroom would be manifest in her style of teaching which in turn would be related to her expectations of the value of the observer role in her classroom. Consequently, we shall be interested in examining the style of teaching in relation to attitudes toward observers in general and toward the specific observers of this project in particular.

Consider the observer, from the teacher's point of view. Some teachers may recognize the need for the presence of such a new role in the classroom, and some may not. Such a recognition is likely to facilitate a successful relationship with the observer at least such a recognition is

likely to motivate the teacher to attempt a positive relationship, and to explore the possible advantages of an observer in the classroom. On the other hand, a teacher who has not become sensitive to the functional dimensions which an observer might add to the classroom, might tend to feel the presence of an observer as an imposition. It is a short step from this to a sense of suspicion and hostility directed to the observer. Further, if the role of the observer is carefully spelled out, so that the teacher may develop a set of expectations and strategies before the new process begins, then the interaction between the two in the classroom may be smooth and rational. Finally, if the observer appears to the teacher to have the skills of interest, and appears to have a common rather than antithetical purpose, then the teacher may be prepared to adjust her mode of behavior in the give and take of the interaction. In other words, the examination of this issue requires that we understand the nature of the teacher qua teacher, and the properties of the observer as the teacher perceives them. It is to this that we now turn.

It is not possible to establish an experimental design to study this problem because the independent variables, teacher and observer properties, are fixed and not subject to manipulation. In order to deal with the matter properly, it is necessary to have a large pool of teachers and observers from which a sample of widely ranging types of people can be drawn. This did not exist. For a variety of reasons having to do with the administration of the project, only a small group of 5 - 6 teachers was available for the study. The decision to focus on the most divergent group of four teachers using a case study approach rather than an experimental design was, therefore, inevitable.

It is clear that in abandoning the search for causes, we are adopting a strictly descriptive approach in which our aim is to adequately describe four different kinds of teachers interacting with four different kinds of observational situations. We cannot be sure why these teachers reacted to the observers in the manner they did. We cannot be certain that the judgments each teacher formed were the results of other factors in her history or current classroom situation. We would simply attempt to describe four case histories in order to cast some light on the observational process and to prepare the ground for more systematic research in this area.

It should be clear that in adopting a descriptive approach to the problem, we are also recognizing the impracticality of generating hypotheses about the variables of interest. The major reason for the lack of specific hypotheses is that we did not know the variables with which we would be dealing. It is not possible to know the nature of the teachers until after they have been examined in some detail. Since there is no opportunity to sample teachers, we must be content with those we have selected before we knew the full nature of their characteristics. In order to be reasonably sure that we would have the most divergent group of teachers with whom to work, careful consideration was given to the recommendations of the supervisors of the teaching staff (see below). These supervisors were asked to select the teachers on the grounds of their divergent styles and background. We feel, in retrospect, that this goal was accomplished, although we are not confident that the differences among these teachers, as the supervisors saw them, were in fact the differences with which we worked. The teachers were different to be sure, but we did not

feel confident in building hypotheses or expectations based upon the nature of the differences as identified by the supervisors. With four rather different kinds of teachers available, we were then in a position to examine the teacher-observer interaction process. The next task was to decide on the variables which were to constitute the basis for the examination of this process. Clearly we are approximating, at this point, the hypotheses which we are using to guide our work.

In order to properly examine the style of the teacher, or for that matter, any other teacher, it is necessary to specify those aspects of style which are relevant to the problem at hand. There are many aspects to style which may not be relevant and which ought not to clutter up the data collecting process. On the other hand there are many aspects of style which are relevant to a teacher's approach to the presence of an observer in the classroom, but which cannot be examined in any given project. To select several dimensions of interest and examine them seems wiser than to broaden the search and attempt an omnibus, shotgun strategy. Consequently, we have focused on a few narrow dimensions of the teacher which we felt would yield useful information in describing the teacher response to observers.

The major aspect in which we are interested is the sensitivity of the teacher to the psychological and interpersonal needs of the children in the classroom. We reasoned that a teacher who is sensitive to these aspects of a child will probably be seeking, in some manner, to broaden the information available to her on each child. Further, she will be open to this kind of information when it is offered to her and will be discriminating in its use.

Thus, she will be able to state the kinds of data she needs about her children, who the problem children are in the classroom, and what the strategies are with which she would like to approach each child. She would, in other words, have what we have termed, a clinical orientation in her teaching. It is not clear whether there should be a high correlation between teacher sensitivity to child needs and a clinical orientation, but it is likely that there is a positive relation between the two. In any case, it seemed reasonable to assume that teachers who differed on these two dimensions would have different reactions and expectations of a feedback system in which information derived by an external observer would be supplied to her with the intent of influencing her manner of teaching. The sensitive teacher would be aware of the need for information, and the clinically oriented teacher would be interested in or at least open to several sources of information, including observers. Teachers who were less sensitive or not clinically oriented, would respond to observers in a considerably more hostile or suspicious manner.

Since it is not possible to establish meaningful variation in the sensitivity or clinical orientation of the several teachers, it is not possible to test hypotheses such as these. However, if we looked for teachers who were at least different from each other in these dimensions and could substantiate the nature of their differences, it would then be possible to examine their reactions to observers in the context of such styles. Our task was, therefore, to establish some measure of the sensitivity of the teacher to the needs of the children, the nature of her openess to clinical information about children, and her understanding, use, and evaluation of the system of observers as provided

by this project.

The Measure

In order to estimate the sensitivity of the teacher to the needs of her children, it was decided to focus on a single, albeit central, aspect of young children's needs, viz., dependency on others. At the same time, in order to reach some ofthe more difficult tasks facing a teacher in dealing with these needs, it was also decided to further examine those situations in which some children find it difficult to express those dependency needs. This is a critical problem of many children, and very likely a problem faced to some degree by all children. It appears to be a rather typical issue faced by teachers of nursery school age children, accordingly, one that would provide an opportunity to examine the teachers in this project. A consideration of the literature in dependency and dependency conflict indicated that the scales developed by Beller ( ) for the measurement of these dimensions were directly related to the task at hand. These are observational scales designed to estimate the extent to which a child is dependent upon the teacher, the extent to which the dependency represents a conflict situation for the child, and the nature of the teacher's response to the direct or indirect (conflicted) expression of the child's dependency needs. The scales are easily used in that they have explicit behavioral referents for both dependent behavior and conflicted dependent behavior. They have been used extensively in previous work, and can achieve acceptable levels of inter-judge reliability (see below).

In addition to the extensive observations of each teacher and

and her classroom, several interview schedules were devised for administration to the teachers and aides. As reported below, each teacher and aide was interviewed for a total of several hours on open end questions. The interviews were designed to open a broad range of topics for the teacher, with a general focus on the issues described above. Finally, each teacher was asked to keep a log (devised by the evaluation staff) of her contacts with the services available through the project. The log covered a selected sample of time taken to be representative of the time spent on the total project.

Description Of The Program

The intervention program is a complex sum of many services and people. It is not our purpose to describe here the program in detail (for this the reader may refer to the evaluation report), but rather to give a brief overview of some of the many services available to the teachers on whom our research report is focused. While the Intervention Program served both the teacher and the parent, we are concerned here only with enumerating the services made available to the teacher.

Essentially the program involved six distinct service areas. The central service of the intervention program was that of the tester observers. This area of the program is described in detail elsewhere in this report.

The second major area of service was the social services. In this area were included the neighborhood worker and various services of SNAP (South End Action Program). The most frequently used service in the project was the department of Social Services.

The third area of support was the diagnostic team consisting of several different people. The teacher could ask this service to observe any of her children or the team could be asked by the parent to observe a child. Furthermore, the team or any member of it might go to a classroom on its own initiative or might have a child referred to it by the neighborhood worker or the educational consultant. A psychiatrist, a psychologist, a neighborhood worker and a community person who was also an observer and an educational consultant.

The educational consultants made up the fourth area of support. One of them worked directly with the teachers to act both as supervisor and as a liason with the Boston University staff. The other, a Boston University consultant, was available for consultation regarding educational processes.

The Boston University administration made up another comprehensive service area. The Director and Assistant Director were available for questions or suggestions on almost any element of the program. Two other specialists were also available during most of the year and frequently visited classrooms to talk with teachers and help arrange parent meetings.

The last area of support was audio-visual equipment. Tape recorders and video tapes were available should the teacher desire them. A trained photographer was available to film a classroom or individual children for any purpose which the teacher might wish.

The above mentioned areas only briefly describe the services available to the teachers. (A great deal more is included in these areas than we have

mentioned above.)

Procedures

Four teachers were selected for observation on recommendation of the supervisory staff. Informal observations of the classrooms and consideration of the aides involved in the project also contributed to the selection. The aim of the selection procedure was to acquire four rather divergent teachers in style, orientation toward children, and openess to the innovative nature of the project. We cannot be sure that these aims were achieved, of course, but we do feel confident in retrospect, that the teachers selected did represent diverse styles. Although some comparisons among the teachers are made in the subsequent analyses, the attempt was to consider each teacher as a separate sample. Since it was not clear how stable the aide assignment to each teacher was, the final selection was not made until the project was two months under way. This allowed for adjustments and adaptations to be accomplished and for the evaluation team to become familiar with the teachers and other staff. The reverse, the willingness of the teachers to allow the observers and other evaluation staff into the classrooms was hastened by this period of adaptation.

Interviews with the observers on their role in the classroom was carried out during the middle of the school year by members of the evaluation staff. The teachers were interviewd during the spring. Observations were started in the middle of the school year after selection and training of the observers. Revisions of the Beller scales were also carried out in

consultation with Professor Beller who also aided in the training of the observers.

Seven observers were trained to use the Beller scale by doing classroom observations, viewing films, coding their observations and dicussing their reactions. After the training sessions, each observer was sent into the classrooms each day to observe three children. No more than two observers were present in any classroom on any one day. Each child was observed for twenty minutes on each of eight observation days. A rotation system was established that was intended to offer the maximum number of different observers to observe any one child. Since there was a fairly high degree of absenteeism among the children, there were several children who were not observed for the full eight sessions. Any child who was observed for less than four sessions was dropped from the sample after observations had been completed.

Each observer coded her own data as she went along, and two independent coders coded the data at a later time. Thus three independent observers coded each sequence. Intercoder agreement was checked and found to be high. (90% agreement across all coders).

Results

We shall report the results by instrument, with a summary statement at the end of he report. To set the stage, the first data to be reported will be the observational data dealing with dependency behavior in the classroom. Next, the teachers' and observers' views of the observational process will be presented followed by a report of the in-depth interviews with the teachers orientation and reactions to the project. Finally, we shall report a summary and offer some conclusions on the operation of the project.

Academic and Professional Sketch of the Four Teachers

Teacher A has a degree in early childhood education and is working on a Master's Degree in that field. She worked for several years as a nursery school teacher and for the past two years has been a Head Start teacher.

Teacher B received a degree in fine arts from a local university and has had no formal training as a nursery school teacher. This is her first job working with young children.

Teacher C is a young Chinese woman with a degree in early childhood education from a local private teachers' college. She is working on a Master's Degree in early childhood and has taught nursery school for several years. This is her second year as a Head Start teacher. The class she teaches is located in the Chinese section of the city, housed in the church where her father-in law is the minister. She is a long time resident of the local Chinese community.

Teacher D, the only Negro teacher in this group was trained as an elementary school teacher in Mississippi. She graduated in 1967, got married to a pre-med student and had a child. In the fall of 1968 her husband was accepted in a local medical school. Teacher D arrived in Boston with her husband in the fall of 1968, and took her first teaching job since graduation. She has never worked with preschool children before employment with Head Start, and has never before been responsible for a classroom.

Teacher Responses to Children's Dependency Needs.

The primary focus of this study was the behavior of the teachers rather than the behavior of the children. The aim was to establish the style

of each teacher in respect to a specific set of dimensions in order to understand her reaction to the intervention program. We cannot draw causal conclusions from these data in the sense of statements about the source of children's behavior, or the reasons for the teacher's behavior. We can only describe the behavioral matrix of the classroom in respect to the dependency data as a setting for the understanding of the teacher's response to the program.

In order to accomplish this goal, the dependency behavior of all the children observed in each class were considered as a unit. The essential nature of the analyses was a measure of the rate of various responses given by the teacher to various kinds of child behavior. We were also interested in the rate at which various kinds of behaviors were directed at the teachers by different kinds of children. In this sense, children are defined as high or low dependency children, high or low conflicted children, high or low verbal children. These definitions are based upon the median split of the total distribution of all children in all four classrooms on each of the scores in question. Analyses such as these, while focusing primarily on intra-teacher data would also allow for some inter-teacher comparisons. We are aware of the tenuousness of such comparisons between teachers, and will make only those which appear to be justified by the data. Once again, the aim of these analyses is to be able to establish an understanding of the teacher in order to understand her manner of dealing with the requirements of the program.

The first set of analyses will be those of each teacher separately. Following that we shall report a comparison between teachers.

Dependency and dependency conflict: operational definitions.

In the context of the present study, children differ in the extent to which they are dependent and in the extent to which they are conflicted about their need to be dependent. The Dependency/dependency conflict scales are designed to measure both of these aspects of children's needs. Dependency refers to the need of a child for help, support, or succorance from an adult (in this case, the teacher or teacher aide). Dependency conflict refers to the ability to make the dependency need clear to the teacher, on the one hand, and the ability to accept the support given by the teacher, on the other. A conflicted child is defined as one who is either indirect in his request for support or who is inconsistent in his response to the support when it is offered (i.e., the support is not accepted by the child).

The unit of analysis of dependency conflict is a three step sequence as recorded by an observer. The first step is the child's request for help. The second step is the teacher's reaction to that request. The third step is the child's reaction to the teacher's response. A child is scored as conflicted over his dependency needs if his request (step 1) is indirect or his reaction to the teacher (step 3) is inconsistent. Thus, a child is indirect if, for example, he whines without going directly to the teacher for help, runs away while the teacher is reaching for him, or climbs too high on the jungle gym. Alternatively, a child who climbs on the teacher's lap and asks for something, or who says "I need..." or "I want..." is directly expressing his dependency (and scored accordingly) and is not conflicted at that moment over his dependency need. A child who ignores or rejects the teacher's help (step 3) when it is offered, or who interferes with the help, is inconsistent and is scored as conflicted in that sequence.

The coded data were summarized across teacher and child separately. A verbal score for each child was found by determining the percentage of the child's requests which were verbal. A dependency score for each child was found by dividing his total number of requests by the number of times he had been observed. The dependency conflict score consisted of the number of requests in which a child had been inconsistent or indirect divided by his total requests.

For the teachers, we determined the number of dependency requests directed to them, the number of conflicted requests directed to them and the number of verbal requests they received. These are the scores used in the analyses of the data.

Teacher A

In this classroom the teacher received almost twice as many dependency requests (228.5) than did the aide (128), and more children directed a majority of their dependency requests to the teacher than to the aide ($P<.035$ Binomial test). While both the teacher and the aide received a majority of their dependency requests from high dependent children, the teacher tended to receive a higher proportion of dependency requests from this group. ($x^2= 2.88$, $P<.10$ (1d.f.) Table 1. That is, the children who repeatedly make dependency demands are more likely to direct them to the teacher than to the aide in this classroom. Moreover, the fact that a greater proportion of the teacher's requests are verbal while a greater proportion of the aides requests are non-verbal indicates that in interactions with the teacher the children are more articulate in expressing their dependency needs ($x^2=5.0$, $P<.05$/1d.f.) Table 2. This in conjunction with the earlier mentioned fact that the teacher received a great number of dependency requests from the children, suggests that her competence in handling the dependency needs of the children does encourage them to seek adult help when it is needed. The large number of requests directed to the aide indicates that she, too, is an acceptable person to the children.

There is a trend for the teacher to receive a greater proportion of her dependency requests from high conflicted children than for the aide. ($x^2=3.37$, $P<.10$/1d.f.) Table 3. Thus both the teacher and the aide received most of their dependency requests from high dependent, high conflicted children but in each case there was a trend for the teacher to receive a greater proportion of her dependency requests from this group than does the aide. Three of the four

high dependent children are also the high conflicted children, so that these three represent a group making the most frequent demands, to the teacher and to the aide.

While both the teacher and the aide received a higher proportion of conflicted requests from high conflicted children, there was a trend for the teacher to have a significantly higher proportion from this group. ($x^2=3.3$. $P<.10$ d.f. Table 4. This is to be expected since the category of high dependent, high conflicted form a real group in this classroom. On the other hand, the highest proportion of the teacher's total dependency requests were nonconflicted while the highest proportion of the aide's dependency requests were conflicted. ($x^2=5.67$, $P<.02$/12.d.f.)Table 5.

Teacher B

In this classroom the children made more dependency requests (131) of the teacher than of the aide (81), and more children directed a majority of their requests to the teacher than the aide ($P>.145$) Binomial test). However, high and low dependent children did not differentiate between the teacher and the aide in expressing their dependency needs. Dependency requests were produced primarily by high dependent children (151-78) and these requests are made in equal proportion to this teacher and her aide. Thus the children who had frequent dependency demands saw the teacher and the aide as equally reliable sources of help and support. Moreover, children who easily verbalize their dependency needs appear to divide their requests equally across the teacher and aide in this classroom ($x^2=.9$)

Both the teacher and the aide received the greatest proportion of their dependency requests from low conflicted children. (123-89 requests). Hence, both the teacher and the aide received most of their dependency requests from high dependent but low conflicted children. Moreover, since both the teacher and the aide were receiving more dependency requests from low conflicted children, it follows that the three high conflicted children were having difficulty in expressing their dependency needs to either teacher or aide. In addition, there was no significant difference between the teacher and the aide in either the number of conflicted versus nonconflicted requests (x^2=1.9, P>.20), Table 6, they received, or the type of child (high or low conflicted) from whom they received conflicted requests. That is, in this classroom the teacher is no better than the aide in resolving conflicted dependency requests for either her total class or for those children who are highly conflicted. Also, the children who, across the whole sample of four classes, have the highest dependency conflict scores, are in this class.

Teacher C

In this class there were three aides at various times rather than one as in the other classes. Since one of the aides received many more dependency requests from the children than did the other aides, the statistical analyses were often run twice - once between the teacher and all the aides as a group and once between the teacher and this particular aide. When this was done, it is noted in the reporting of the results.

In this classroom the teacher received fewer dependency requests (48)

than did either the three aides as a group (144) or the one aide mentioned above (88). Table 7. A major factor accounting for the very low number of dependency requests received by the teacher is that she was often absent from the classroom due to illnes. While the dependency requests received by the teacher are almost equally divided between high and low dependent children, one aide received three times as many requests from high dependent children. (x^2=7.12, P<.01 / 1d.f.) Table 7. This suggests that the children who consistently needed adult help or support directed their requests to that adult figure who was, at minimum, the most stable one in the environment. It remains unclear why this particular aide rather than one of the other aides was the object of interest for the children in this class.

In the case of the teacher and the aide, an equal percentage of verbal and non-verbal requests were directed to them.

Both the teacher and the aide tended to receive a majority of their dependency requests from high conflicted children than from low conflicted children (x^2=2.64 P<.20 / 1d.f.) Table 8. The teacher received most of her dependency requests from high conflicted, low dependent children rather than from high conflicted, high dependent children. The aide, on the other hand, received most of her dependency requests from high conflicted, high dependent children. (x^2=7.12 P<.01/1d.f.) Table 9. While both the teacher and the aide received dependency requests from children who frequently make demands for help or support from an adult and have difficulty in expressing this need (and hence are conflicted), the teac her's requests also come from the child who rarely seeks adult help yet is conflicted in doing so. This last fact is consistent with the

the earlier statement that low dependent children are equally likely to direct their dependency requests to the teacher or the aide whereas the high dependent child is much more likely to direct his request to the aide. (Table 1)

Both the teacher and the aide received a higher proportion of nonconflicted rather than conflicted requests although the proportion tends to be higher in this direction in the case of the aide. This indicates that whereas both the teacher and the aide reduced conflict in their interactions with the children, the aide was somewhat more successful than the teacher.

Teacher D

In this classroom the teacher received more dependency requests (89.5) than does the aide (14.5). The fact that the size of the experimental sample in this class is half that which it is in the other classes does have some affect on the teacher's and aide's low rate of dependency requests. Since the aide was regularly present, it seems that in this classroom the teacher shouldered a much greater proportion of the dependency demands of the children. However, the teacher received a higher proportion of dependency requests from high dependent children and the aide a higher proportion of dependency requests from low dependent children. (x^2 3.90 p = .05/1 df) Table 9. On the other hand the children were equally verbal in the requests directed to teacher and aide.

The teacher received the greatest proportion of her dependency requests from low conflicted children whereas the aide received the greatest proportion of her dependency requests from high conflicted children (x=3.80, p .05/1d.f Table 10. Thus the teacher received most of her dependency requests from high

dependent but low conflicted children whereas the aide received most of her dependency requests from low dependent but high conflicted children.

In a median split of the total population of children from all four classrooms on the dimension of dependency conflict, all children in Teacher D's class were above the median. All the children in this class directed more of their conflicted requests to the teacher than to the aide.

Table 1: TEACHER A - Dependency Requests from High and Low Dependency Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of dependency. Requests from High Dependency Children	161.5 / 168.5	90.5 / 83.5	252
No. of dependency Requests from Low Dependency children	67.0 / 60	37.5 / 44.5	104.5
Total	228.5	128	356.5

$x^2 = 2.88$ (p 7.10 for 1 df)

Table 2: TEACHER A - Rate of Verbal vs. Non-verbal Dependency Requests directed to Teacher and Aide.

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of Verbal Dependency Requests	128	56	184
No. of Non-Verbal Dependency Requests	100.5	72	172.5
	228.5	128	356.5

x^2 - 5.0 ($p < .05$ w/ 1 df)

Table 3.: TEACHER A - Rate of Dependency Requests from High and Low Conflict Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No of dependency requests from high conflicted children	145.5 153.5	81.5 73.5	227.0
No. of dependency requests from low conflict children	83.0 75	46.5 54.5	129.5
Total	228.5	128.0	356.5

$X^2 = 3.37$ ($p < .10$ w/ 1df)

Table 4: TEACHER A - Conflicted Requests from High and Low Conflicted Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No of conflicted requests from high conflicted children	10.8 76	48.2 43	119
No of conf req. from low Conflicted children	28.2 23	19.3 24.5	47.5
Total	99	67.5	166.5

$\chi^2 = 3.303$ ($p < .10$ w/ 1df)

Table 5: TEACHER A - Rate of Conflicted vs Non conflicted Requests to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of Conflicted Requests	110.04 99	66.46 77.5	176.5
No. of Non-conflicted requests	118.46 129.5	71.54 60.5	190
Total	228.5	138.0	366.5

$x^2 = 5.675$ ($p < .02$ 2/ 1df)

Table 6 : TEACHER B - Number of Conflicted Requests Directed to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of Conflicted requests	67.97 63	42.03 47	110
No. of Non-Conflict Requests	63.03 68	38.97 34	102
Total	131	81	212

$x^2 = 1.977$, $p < .20$

Table 7: TEACHER C - Dependency Requests from High and Low Dependent Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of dep. req. from high dep. children	32.1 25	58.9 66	91
No. of dep. req. from low dep. children	15.9 23	29.1 22	45
Total	48	88	136

$P < .01$

Table 8 : TEACHER C - Number of Dependency Requests From High and Low Conflicted Children

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of Req. from high conflicted children	33.18 2.29	60.82 5.65	94
No. of Requests from low conflicted children	14.82 19	27.18 23	42
Total	48	88	136

$P > .20$

Table 9: TEACHER C - Dependency Requests From High and Low Dependent Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of dependency requests from high dependent children	32.1 25	58.9 66	91
No. of dependency requests from low dependent children	15.9 23	29.1 22	45
Total	48	88	136

$x^2 = 7.12$ ($P < 7.01$ w/ 1df)

Table 9: TEACHER D - Number of Dependency Requests From High and Low Dependency Children to Teacher and to Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No. of Dependency Requests from High Dependency Children	57.7* **61	9.3 6	67.0
No. of Dependency Requests from Low Dependency Children	31.8 28.5	52 8.5	37.0
Total	89.5	14.5	104

* expected frequency
** observed frequency

$\chi^2 = 3.90$ ($p < .05$ 1 d.f.)

Table 10: TEACHER D - Number of Dependency Requests from High and Low Conflicted Children to Teacher and Aide

	Teacher	Aide	Total
No of Dependency Requests from High Conflict Children	31.8 28.5	5.2 8.5	37.0
No. of Dependency Requests from low conflict children	57.7 61	9.3 6	67.0
Total	89.5	14.5	104

$x^2 = 3.80$ ($p = .05$ / 1 d.f.

Between Teacher Comparisons

The first comparison of interest among the four teachers is the rate at which the children in their classes directed dependency requests to them. A Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance of ranks was carried out on these data. ($H=11.44/3$ df, $p > .01$) Table 11. This indicates that the teachers were indeed different in respect to the rates at which they had dependency requests directed at them. Teacher A had the highest rate, Teacher B the next, and Teacher C along with Teacher D the lowest.

A factor which must be kept in mind with respect to these data is that the rate of dependency requests is tied to the rate of requests directed to the aide in the classroom. This factor accounts for the low position of Teacher C in this rank order. She was out of the classroom to such an extent that her aide became the most important figure to the children . However, Teacher C did not lose her status in the eyes of the children. If she had been in the classroom more often and received the same proportion of dependency requests, she would have changed her status with respect to her aide and would have been in a much higher position in the rank order of the four teachers. Whereas the analysis presented above is an indication of the openess of the teacher to the dependency needs of the children, this measure underestimates the true openess of Teacher C to a greater extent than it does the other teachers.

Although the rank order of dependency conflict scores in each classroom is consistent with the data presented above on the openess to the dependency needs of the children (i.e., Teachers A and C had the lowest rates

of conflicted behavior in their classrooms, and Teachers B and D had the highest rates), this order did not quite reach significance (Kruskall-Wallis H=5.41/3 df, p .20). Table 12.

With respect to non-responding or not noticing dependency requests, a significant rank order of the four teachers is apparent. Teachers B and D have the highest rate of non-responding to dependency requests and Teachers A and C have the lowest (H=8.27/ 3 df, $p<.05$) Table 13.

Finally, there is a trend in the rank positions of the four teachers in the proportion of positive responses given to dependency requests, although the trend does not quite reach significance (H=6.5/3 df, $p>.05$) Table 14. Once again, of the responses given to dependency requests, Teacher A and C have the highest proportion of positive responses and Teacher's B and D have the lowest rank proportion.

TABLE 11 K - W ANOVA, RATES OF DEPENDENCY REQUESTS DIRECTED TO TEACHERS (IN RANKS, HIGHER RANK = MORE REQUESTS)

Teacher	Mean Rank
A	21.5
B	14.3
C	10.3
D	11.0

H = 11.44 / 3d.f. $p > .01$

TABLE 12 K - W ANOVA, DEPENDENCY CONFLICT IN 4 CLASSES (IN RANKS, HIGHER RANK = HIGHER CONFLICT)

Teacher	Mean Rank
A	11.1
B	16.5
C	10.3
D	19.7

H = 5.41, 3 d.f. $p > .20$

TABLE 13 K - W ANOVA, NON-RESPONSE TO DEPENDENCY REQUESTS IN FOUR CLASSES (IN RANKS, LOWER RANK = HIGHER RESPONSE)

Teacher	Mean Rank
A	2.5
B	14.5
C	7
D	14.4

H = 8.27 / 3d.f. $p < .05$

TABLE 14 K - W ANOVA, POSITIVE RESPONSES (IN RANKS, HIGHER RANK = MORE POSITIVE RESPONSES)

Teacher	Mean Rank
A	18.1
B	11.1
C	15.1
D	8.0

H = 6.5 / 3 d.f., $p > .05$

SUMMARY

Teacher A

This teacher received a greater number of dependency requests by far than did her colleagues. Along with C she received the smallest number of conflicted requests and had a lower proportion of negative behavior present in her classroom. She tended to make fewer ignoring responses and more positive responses to initations than did the other teachers.

Teacher B

Teacher B received the second highest proportion of dependency requests from her children, but had a high proportion of negative behavior and conflicted behavior in her classroom. She tended to ignore requests more frequently, and tended to make fewer positive responses than did Teachers A and C.

Teacher C

This teacher received the third fewest dependency requests. She, however, made more positive responses and less frequently ignored requests than did B or D. She also had less negative and less conflicted behavior present in her classroom than did Teachers B and D.

Teacher D

This teacher received fewer dependency requests than all the other teachers and tended to ignore requests more often than did the other teachers. She also had a relatively high proportion of negative behavior and conflicted behavior in her classroom. She made fewer positive responses than Teachers A and C.

Observer's View Of The Observation Process

Observers were expected to carry out two functions in the classroom: testing the children for the national evaluation effort and observing/interacting with the teacher of the classroom. The first function was well defined. The second function represents the activities of major interest here.

All six of the observers were from the local community and most had become involved through one of the Churches which acted as a Headstart Center or through their own children's attending Headstart. Three observers had, at some earlier point, some classroom (non-observational) experience. Of the six regular observers who continued through the entire Headstart year, only one had had experience with observational techniques before this year. She had used the Kansas Interaction Scale. In addition she, as well as another observer had done training on the CRB, an observation technique which had been developed at BU and was to be used during the Headstart year. Also, over the summer, several of the observers worked in the diagnostic clinic and in this way gained some familiarity with observation. Since only one observer had had substantive observational experience, it is safe to assume that the observers knew little about this process and were entering the program essentially with a tabula rasa. What then were the determinants of how an observer established her role in regard to the program?

Of the many factors, one of the most important was the discussions between the observers and the administrators of the program. In the Fall, with the onset of regular Headstart classes, the observers began an intensive training program where they met, observed films, discussed the roles which an observer

might play, and practiced some observation in the classroom. During this time, most of the observers were quite vague about what role they were to play. Much discussion revolved around how the observers perceived their roles. Although the administration and observer trainers encouraged the observers to develop their personal perception of their role, little direction was given to them in this area.

The research staff attended several meetings during this initial training period and found that the observers were expected to develop their own roles in regard to the teachers. Questions from the observers to the administration concerning what was appropriate, required, or desired of them were thrown back to the observers to answer. Since most of the observers had no experience in this field, the task of constructing a role was a difficult one. Hence it is not surprising that the task of defining their roles as observers diminished and they began to concentrate on their roles as testers. This shift was enhanced by the training in testing which they underwent at the same time as they searched for a definition of their roles.

The conflict between the tester and observer roles is central to the understanding of the observer's perception of their roles. How the perceptions of their roles changed throughout the year varied to some degree according to their own personalities and with the styles and personalities of the teachers to whose classrooms they were assigned. The purpose of this section is to present a picture of the changing role perceptions of the observers and some factors which might have influenced this change.

In the beginning of the Headstart year, the observers met with the

teachers in a group. Some of the observers indicated beforehand that they were apprehensive about the teachers accepting them. This was born out by statements by several of the teachers who were uncertain about the idea of having a regular observer present in the classroom. The project staff attempted to calm the teachers' fears by explaining that the observers were not evaluators, nor were they to tell the teachers what to do. At this point neither the observers nor the teachers had a clear idea of what the observers were going to do. Most of the observers mentioned that at their first meeting with the teachers, the teachers did not understand that the observers were going to be present to aid the teachers, but rather conceived of the observer either as merely a tester or in a more hostile manner as a spy or evaluator. The observers all mentioned that this attitude underwent a change during the course of the year.

The observers did not begin actual work in the classroom until considerably later than had been planned. A lengthy training period and problems in getting parent permission slips for testing signed meant that observers did not begin regular classroom observation until the program was well underway. It was necessary because of the delays in the testing schedule for the observers to begin testing immediately. The observers therefore had little time to be involved in their assigned classroom for the purpose of getting to know the teacher. Due to this initial period of extended testing, it undoubtedly became difficult for the observers and for the teachers to conceive of the observers in other than a testing role.

From the responses of the observers to the questionnaire, some

understanding emerges of what the observers conceived of as possible alternatives to the roles they actually played during the year. In their descriptions o f the possible functions they could perform, all observers emphasized the activity of feedback to the teacher and, in some cases, to the parents. Most of the observers felt that if they were on their own they would observe, watch for problems, and discuss these problems with the teachers. The kinds of problems and how they could helpfully be discussed with the teachers was not mentioned. In actuality the feedback that did occur was primarily confined to the results of testing. Most of the observers said they gave feedback only after testing was completed (i.e. once after the pre-tests and once after the posttests). A few of the observers seem to have given feedback after bringing a child back into the class after testing or after general observations, but these were usually brief and casual. In describing an ideal situation, all observers suggested the importance of much more frequent feedback than had actually occurred during the year. Moreover, all of the observer feedback was oriented to the performance of the individual children. There was no feedback concerning the teacher or aide's styles or their management of the classroom.

The observers felt that it was important to aid the teacher in any way that might help her. Given this attitude, it is understandable that the role of teacher's assistant which is a relatively easy conception of the role of a second person in the classroom was mentioned by all observers. They all remarked that they would like to interact with the class and become a part of the classroom situation. Only one observer went into detail about what she would do on her own. This observer felt that she would watch the

children's interaction with each other to determine if any child seemed to need extra attention. She would also observe the teacher's style to see whether she could suggest improvements. In addition, she mentioned gathering some information on the child's home life to help explain behavior problems.

In general, the observers projections of the roles they might perform differed greatly from the functions they actually had performed. They preferred a shift of emphasis in the direction not only of increased feedback, but also in decreased testing. Very few of the observers mentioned that they would test the children if given a choice. When asked if there was any value to testing, all agreed it gave the teacher information about the child's strengths and weaknesses. Despite this, only one observer mentioned testing as a component of an ideal role. Clearly, they preferred to perform activities in the classroom which might go well beyond testing and housekeeping functions. It is also clear that these other activities are only dimly and grossly perceived by these observers. Few observers were able to articulate any of these non-testing activities even as late as 6 months into the program. For those who were able to conceive of their roles in a broader sense than testing children and rating teachers, they tended to see themselves as social service workers who refer the children to appropriate agencies. This function in fact existed in the intervention program, and, hence, its use became apparent to the observers

In summary, most of the observers conceptions of their roles did

broaden somewhat in the course of the year. At the onset of the program and for several months thereafter, the observers were essentially testers. Toward the end of the program, they began to perform as aides to the teachers, to do a few general observations at the request of some teachers, and to give test feedback to teachers and parents. The goals of the administration with respect to the observational component were never clearly articulated, never really understood by the people functioning as observers, and hence, never realized during the course of the program.

The Teacher's View of The Observation Process

During April each of the four case-study teachers was interviewed concerning their experiences during the Headstart year with the observational component of the intervention program. (See Appendix for a copy of the interview schedule used). The interview was conducted by a member of the research team and took approximately one hour. No one was present other than the teacher and the researcher. The following discussion is based on information gathered during these conversations.

Three of the teachers (B, C, and D,) had no previous experience with an observer in the classroom. Thus, for the, having an observer in the classroom was a new and unknown educational component. The fourth teacher, A, had had, during the previous year, an observer working with her in the classroom. In spite of this, she too began the year with a need to not only articulate her own uses of an observer, but also for the observers to define concretely and specifically the

roles.

All teachers claim that at the time of hiring, they were unaware that teaching for Headstart in the South End of Boston involved them in an experimental project headed by the Boston University Evaluation and Research Center. This information was presented to the teachers by the educational supervisor during the first month or so after the teaching program had gotten underway. A large part of the content of the experimental BU intervention program, as recalled by the teachers, was a testing program. Children would be taken out of the classroom and be individually tested. In retrospect, only one teacher remembered being informed of the observational aspect of the project, and she had gained some familiarity with this notion by having had an observer in her classroom during the previous year.

During this initial period of a few months there were several meetings between the teachers and observers in an effort to arrive at some mutual definition of the roles the observers could have in each of the classrooms. Each group looked to the other for a specification of the functions of an observer.

These discussions diminished as the observers became progressively involved in their roles as testers (see previous section for an account of these discussions from the observers' point of view). Reviewing the events of the year, the teachers were able to characterize the unsuccessful efforts of the BU observational-intervention team in the following ways

The intervention staff repeatedly made the point at observers' meetings that the observers were free to define their functions and goals in whatever way they chose. This became an essential component of the definition of the observer role and one that led to confusion and, perhaps, evolution of the notion of observer. Teacher B, who was relatively inexperienced, was, she explained, totally occupied in the first few months with learning the fundamentals of teaching. She stated that because of this inexperience she felt that she could not be expected to tackle the more sophisticated notion of having an observer - a 'third eye'- in her classroom. Being new to teaching and its demands unknown to her, she found it impossible to project in what someone else, an observer, might service those unknown needs and demands. On the other hand, Teacher A, who had taught before and had had an observer in her classroom, explained that one could not expect the teachers to initiate interaction with observers or to think about ways of improving the classroom by expanding the educational unit to include an observer because the teachers simply had too much else to do. If the observer was to become an integral part of the classroom, she felt his participation in it had to be clearly specified in the organization of the intervention program.

In all cases, the observers concentrated most of their energies on being testers. It was through this function that most of the interaction between the teachers and the observation team developed. The specific activities of the observer in the classroom were testing the children, using the CRB observation scales, giving feedback to the teachers about their

children's performance on given tests, and, in some cases, playing with the children (i.e., serving as an aide). This pre-testing period stretched out over five or six months. In most cases conversations between the observer and teacher occurred after testing sessions and were limited to observer's delineating a few academic skills (e.g. knowledge of colors) in which a particular child was deficient. Substantial feedback of either a testing or observational nature was not encouraged by the teachers nor, for a long time, promoted by the observers. There are probably many reasons for this. Two reasons stand out as characterizing two different, but prototype, teachers in this kind of setting. Teacher A, a relatively experienced and mature teacher, suggested that she did not request feedback from the testers since she did not have any reason to respect their judgment of child behavior and performance. This issue of the Headstart teacher and hence a quasi-professional versus the observer, usually a community person, and the lack of mutual respect for each other's competence to promote educational dialogues reappeared again and again throughout the year. On the other hand, feedback was thwarted by some of the teachers because, they claimed, they doubted the validity of the tests used. In some cases, such as a Chinese classroom in which many children had only minimal English, this presented a real barrier. In other cases, however, it seemed to be fear of being evaluated rather than concern for a truer evaluation of the child. For a substantial dialogue or feedback to have taken place requires that the teacher feel secure enough about her teaching abilities to be open to negative criticism. For three of our teachers this was

not the case. Moreover, it requires that the observers feel sufficiently competent in their jobs to offer the negative criticism.

While feedback from the observer to the teacher was restricted, all four teachers viewed feedback as one of the primary functions of the observer. In fact, feedback was considered to be not only a primary function but also a primary responsibility of the observer. During the course of the year these teachers came to believe that unless the particular kinds of intervention offered by the program had definite benefit to them, it was not to be conducte. The kind of feedback the teachers were interested in was information about the children, primarily testing information and not about themselves as teachers. Comments were made such as "I learn things the children dislike or don't know", "feedback gives me additional information about the children", and "the whole purpose of testing is feedback". The teachers varied both in how often they wanted feedback to occur (from each time the observer came to once a month) and in what form (informal meetings or written reports).

When asked about the kind of observer the teachers would like to have regularly in their classrooms, all four teachers mentioned observers who were well trained in the observation of children. The type of training that each of the four teachers found desirable was somewhat different. Teacher C wanted academic training, that is, a person who was familiar with child psychology and perhaps even a psychologist. Teacher A considered training and experience as a teacher essential for an observer who was to evaluate classroom processes. On the

other hand, Teachers B and D, emphasized that the observer should be a community person ("since the children are from the community", "because the primary goal of the program is community participation") and should have had previous experience with children.

These varying viewpoints suggest the different problems that each of the four teachers found central to their interactions with the observers during the year. Teacher C wanted an observer who would be able to diagnose certain emotional problems in the children. She felt that this additional knowledge would enable her to interact more senstitively with the children in her class. In contrast, Teacher A found it difficult to accept judgments about teaching and children from a person who did not have first-hand experience. She regarded her relationship with an observer as central to the roles an observer could play in her classroom. In Teacher B's case, her repeated comments that the observer "should be willing to talk with her about how he could be useful to her" suggests that she, as a teacher, did not feel that she had sufficient authority and control in the evolution of the observer's function and role in her classroom.

Teacher D stated that she was completely satisfied with the current observer program and suggested no changes. Teacher B also had very limited suggestions. She recommended structural changes (for example, a shorter testing period, advance notification of the observer's visits etc.) and that the observer get to know the children better by spending more time in the classroom, participating and observing. Only Teacher A recognized the potential of an

observer as a critical eye, not only of the children but of the teacher herself. She expressed this recognition in her emphasis on the experience and ability of the observer in working with children. In the remaining cases the hypothetical roles of the observers were restricted to handling particular problem children, such as children with academic deficiencies or emotional difficulties. Thus, at best, the hypothetical roles of the observer would be focused on particular children in the classroom and not on the educational unit of children plus teacher. It appears not to have occurred to these teachers that observers might play a valuable role in the structuring and manipulation of the class as a whole. Perhaps this reflects the lack of awareness on the part of the teachers themselves of these critical dimensions of their work. Clearly, whatever the reason, the observers did not speak to this issue, and perhaps were unaware of it themselves.

The Teacher's Response To The Intervention Program

In order to examine the general approach each of the experimental teachers took to the intervention program, interviews were conducted. The structure of the interview was designed to be as open-ended as possible in order to reduce the impact of the sensitivity of the topics to be covered. We wished to examin each teacher's use of the facilities of the program in order to assess her openess to experimental manipulation of her work. Since the teacher's interpretation of these facilities can easily be that the program is a threat to her independence or a critical statement of her skill as a teacher, it is clear that an interview on this topic may be quite reactive. Consequently, it was decided that an open-ended interview is the best approach to this set of information.

The issues to be covered in the interview are as follows:

1. Teacher's view of the overall projects: what is the purpose of the project; what are the components of the project; what are the strengths and weaknesses of the project?

2. Teacher's use of and participation in the parent involvement program: judgments of the program, componants of the program, strengths and weaknesses of the program? To what extent has the parent program served her particular needs; to what extent has she served the needs of the parents?

3. Teacher's use of the diagnostic services: what are the diagnostic services; who are the diagnosticians; who are the children involved in the diagnostic work; what was the mechanism by which this occurred? How did the teacher use this material from the diagnostic team; how would she

like to be able to use the material, who else in her classroom would she like to have diagnostic work done to, why? How can a teacher use this kind of material, of what value is it to the classroom teacher, give an example?

4. Teacher's use of video-taping and tape recorders: Was any video taping done in the classroom: who was taped (a specific child; a group of children the whole class, the teacher); who made the decision for taping, why? How was the tape used; what specific classroom needs did the tape satisfy, what general needs of the teacher on the children did the tape satisfy, who else might be taped if the video technician returned; what else might the tape be used for; how would you assess its value?

5. Teacher's involvement with the observer: What is the teacher's view of the observer's function and role; is there any distinction in the teacher's perception between the observer as a tester of children and the observer as a reflector of the events in the classroom; what value in general might such observers have to the operation of a Head Start program; of what values might such observers be to the particular classroom problems of the particular teachers (give example); what observer functions did the observer in fact carry out in the particular classroom, with what value and results?; how might observers function to make maximum impact on the teacher, classroom, and child; how big an effect might observers have under maximum conditions (give an example); has the teacher had any interaction with the observer on classroom observation; what was the nature of the contact; how valuable was the contact; how might it be improved?

These topics, in roughly the order described above, were covered in a one and one half hour interview with each teacher. The variations in order resulted from the teacher's use of the open-end questioning such that she was able to move from one topic to the next as she saw fit. The interviewer's task was to see to it that each topic was covered, and he had the option of raising a set of questions at any point in the interview during which it seemed appropriate to do so.

Before reporting the responses for each teacher, it must be mentioned that the last topic: observer feedback to the teacher on classroom observations was provided to only two teachers. The instrument used for feedback purpose was the CRB, an observational schedule developed for this purpose by the project staff and described elsewhere in this report. The feedback sessions were experimental in nature since the CRB was not yet fully established as reliable, and since the appropriate procedures for feedback (including the question of whether it was to be the observer of a member of the professional staff who was to lead the session) were not finally decided upon. Consequently, this topic was discussed in hypothetical form with the teachers in the interview. The value of feedback to the teacher could not be directly examined in this interview.

Teacher A

This teacher had a very difficult time in characterizing or describing the intervention program. What portions of the program were standard parts of the Head Start service, and which were the contribution of the experimental

intervention program were not at all clear in the mind. The only aspect of the program which seemed to be identified as unique was the Diagnostic Team (a group of floating clinicians who were interested in identifying behavior problems and making recommendations for referring such children to appropriate clinics. This team had been established prior to the current intervention program and was continued as one of the services supplied by the project staff. This team and its services are more fully described elsewhere in this report.) Teacher A was able to identify this service since the psychiatric member of the diagnostic team had visited her classroom and spent several profitable (as described by the teacher) meetings discussing his observation. She requested that the psychiatrist return to her class, and she was able to report several specific problems to which she asked him to speak. She was able to describe particular children about whom she wished the psychiatrist's judgment, not because she felt the children were in need of therapy, but because she was unsure of the strength of certain of their needs or the probable effectiveness of certain techniques which she intended to apply to those children. She felt that it would be profitable to have the psychiatrist interact with the children in the classroom because she felt that this was an appropriate manner of examining their psychic organization. On the other hand, when asked if the observer could contribute to this function of diagnosis, she was emphatic that the untrained observers who were a part of this project could not accomplish the task. Her image of an ideal utilization of this service of the project was to have several of the diagnostic team examine her class using observational and participative observational techniques, and lead a discussion on their findings among the Head Start teachers as a group. In other words, she indicated

Turning to a discussion of video taping and the use of other such techniques for recording the content of her class, Teacher A indicated that indeed her class had been video-taped, and that she could like more of this. However, she was concerned that the tapes could be used as a means of criticizing her, and that many teachers would object to indiscriminate use of taping on these grounds. She felt that she could tolerate such criticism, but that she would rather help plan activity to maximize its benefits to her instead of simply allowing a cameraman into the classroom. She had some specific notions about the taping, particularly in respect to selected children. She saw the taping as a means of providing data on children at times when she could not observe them. However, she felt that tapes are too "neutral", and that in fact such data might be more meaningfully supplied by trained observers. This appeared to be the only context in which she spontaneously suggested a valued function for the observers. She didn't mind her behavior being recorded when interacting with children, but she insisted that this be planned in advance. She appeared to be saying that the use of either tapes or observers can have value if the issues, people, and conditions of the observing/recording have a well defined purpose. As a teacher in the classroom, it was important to her to be a part of that planning activity.

Involvement with parents was seen by Teacher A as a means of increasing her knowledge of the child. Consequently, she felt that a great deal of the information she needed could be supplied by the neighborhood workers. Unfortunately, she did not have confidence in the skill of these workers, but she did feel that they had supplied enough information to allow her to deal effectively with her children. She did not feel strongly about her responsibility to broaden

the parents' involvement in the Head Start program as a means of altering the children's development or of altering the parents' skill. While agreeing that these were admirable goals and that increased parent involvement might increase the possibility of reaching those goals, she felt that her primary task was as a teacher to the children rather than as a worker with the parents. To learn of the child's family background the major reason for working with the parent, and these data were adequately accumulated, in her judgment, by the extant system of relations with parents. Teacher A claimed, in effect, that she knew what she had to know in order to make her decisions about almost all of her children. Any further information which she might need would appropriately come from interaction with and observation of the child in the classroom.

Summary

One gets an impression of Teacher A as a well trained, mature, professional who knows what she is about in the classroom and knows what she must find out in order to do a good job. She can discuss in specific terms the psychological and social development of many of her children. She can identify the areas of her ignorance about her children, and the techniques she wants to use to fill in these gaps. She would like to have specific support from specialists, and knows what she wants from them and how to use their help. Given her interest in and use of the several supportive materials in the classroom. Teacher A appears to be willing to try techniques which broaden her understanding of the children and the class, and she appears to be tentative and exploratory in her judgments of her problems. She is, in

other words, open to experimental procedures, willing to try new materials to see how they work, and has an interest in a wide range of input into her system of understnading her children. We can, of course, make no judgment as to her skill in using these data or orientations in the classroom. We can only report that she describes herself in this interview in a manner which suggests that she is an open person, with a clear perception of her professional needs, and a clear notion of how to deal with them. If she can translate her interest in the developmental status of her children into classroom practices, she should make a very sensitive and flexible teacher indeed.

Teacher B

This teacher started both interview sessions with a series of complaints about the interference of observers and evaluators with her work in the classroom. It was very difficult for the interviewer to determine precisely what the interfering behavior was, or what it was that was interfered with. The interviews led into a discussion of the needs of Teacher B in the classroom. These needs were variously described by Teacher B as the need to be left alone and the need for support to do her job. Thus, she did not want parents to participate in decisions about her classroom and wanted help from the research staff in justifying this preference. When asked about the kind of services she believed the research staff had to offer, she was very vague. She could not define the diagnostic team's function, she knew of the video taping and of the observers, but these were not desirable activities from her point of view. Her primary comment about these activities was that they were being done for the good and convenience of the researchers and not

for the teacher. On the other hand, when the interviewer replied that the purpose of the work of the evaluation was not to interfere but to get a clearer picture of the operation of the program, Teacher B was very quick to agree that this was an important function and that she would like to cooperate as much as possible. The interviewer reports that it is very difficult to get a clear picture of Teacher B's position on many issues because of this attitudinal oscillation that characterized her approach to most of them.

The overall view that this teacher had of the project was strongly influenced by her goals for her class. She was trained as an art teacher and is most concerned with introducing a good deal of art curriculum into her class. It should be clear that Teacher B is not strongly motivated toward the use of art as means of free expression and discovery. Although this use of art is not rejected by her, she is rather more interested in teaching art as a technique. She wants her children to learn how to use the materials of the artist, and to gain some experience and understanding in accomplishing the artistic task. Thus she has her children do a large amount of drawing, coloring, and sketching, as well as using a wide range of finger paints, cardboard construction tasks and other craft activities. She emphasized several times during the interviews, that she intended to make certain that her children would learn the rudiments of art, and that represented the primary goal of her personal curriculum. She also made it clear that her reason for this is that art is the best way for these children to open their lives to broader experiences and fuller understandings. Teacher B, in other words, has a clear conception of the goals she wishes to

accomplish with her children, and she is bent on that accomplishment. She feels the goals of the project are valuable and interesting, but derive personal significance for her only in so far as they aid in the accomplishment of her own goals. There is, to be sure, a strong concern on Teacher B's part to speak to the developmental and affective needs of each of her children, and in that sense her goals overlap the goals of the project. But one gets the impression of this as a fortuitous event. She is not oriented toward the experimental aspects of the project, and although she has a great concern for the needs of her children, she is not concerned with using the project to discover more about those needs of her impact on them.

Teacher B had an unpleasant year with the parents of her children. She had differences with them on the feedback of test scores, on their observation of her classroom, and in their right to comment on how she was conducting the class. She tended not to be at parent-teacher meetings (among other reasons, she did not like to return to the neighborhood after dark). Although she agreed that parent participation in the Head Start structure is, from the point of view of both the parents and the children, a desirable event, it was clear that it was an event that the teacher must suffer through and keep to a minimum. Consequently, Teacher B and her parents were rather suspicious toward each other for most of the school year. Teacher B did not see the goals of the project which included maximizing parent participation in the affairs of the Head Start classes as very important or of high priority.

Diagnostic services and the diagnostic team were not clearly defined in Teacher B's mind. When asked if there are any particular problems

in her class to which the diagnostic team might speak, she could not specify any. She did not object to a psychiatrist or clinical psychologist coming into her class to observe, but she was not sure how such material might be fed back to her to be useful. She was quick to assert that her children needed a lot of support, but she was unsure as to how an outside group might aid her in supplying that support. She readily agreed that professional observers might play a very important role in the classroom, but she was unable to conceptualize that role in any way. She felt that several of her children were overly constricted and dependent, but that she was more and more able to draw them out. She states that she enjoys giving the emotional support that these children need, and is very proud of the fact that she is the only teacher in the project who has taken several of the children home with her for an overnight visit. The clear enthusiasm with which she describes her strong affective attachments to her children contrasts sharply with the suspicion she directs to the project personnel who might be of service to her in understanding and dealing with the children.

Teacher B's reaction to video-taping in her classroom is one of initial fear and hostility. She thinks of this activity as a technique of evaluating her in the first instance, and only secondarily as a child-directed instrument. Clearly she objects to outside evaluation. If she were to be left out of the tapes, she would have no objection to the work being done in her classroom (except in so far as it is disruptive of classroom routine), although she could not indicate any particular children or events she would like recorded. She has never asked for video-taping in her classroom, nor has any ever been done. She would not allow anyone to take any pictures in her classroom, and

would not want anyone or any group to look at tapes of her class unless she was there to explain the context in which the events on tape occurred. When asked if she had ever had any experience with video-taping in the classroom, she replied that since this was her first year at teaching, she did not have an opportunity to have such experiences.

The role of the observer in Teacher B's eyes is rather that observers are test-givers; and, in part, liaison with parents. This judgment of the role of observers might have been generated or reinforced by the fact that one of Teacher B's observers was a member of the parent group at her Center. She is suspicious of tests since she believes that they are prejudiced against the children such as those in her class. Just as important, she is suspicious of testers, since she believes that testers too often serve to depress the performance of children rather than enhance it. She is very unhappy with having her children measured on such tests by such testers, and would strongly prefer that any scores developed under these conditions not be released to anyone outside the classroom. Teacher B quickly followed this statement with the assertion that she had every reason to expect that her children would show very large gains on IQ and achievement tests, but that she had to be sure that the testing was accurate before she could agree to the release of such information.

In order to explore the nature of the observer role in forms other than testing, it was necessary for the interviewer to suggest such alternatives. Teacher B did not see either the necessity or the desirability of another person in her classroom whose function might be to add some sort of perspective to an

understanding of the children. On the contrary, such a third person might serve very disruptive purposes of evaluation and, perhaps, be spying. When asked how an observation process might be organized to avoid these undesirable events, she replied that only an observer who was known to her and in whom she had full confidence could fit into such a system. Assuming such a condition, she was aked what such an observer might do generally, and to whom in particular might these actions be directed. In general, the observer was described as an extra teacher, one who would do a little more than what the aide in the classroom ordinarily does. In particular, the observer was effectively restricted from dealing with any of the important issues in the classroom. Teacher B felt that certain of her children had problems of self confidence, self control, and need for support. She was dealing adequately with each of these problems and felt not too much need for help. At the same time she felt just a small need for help in assessing the changing patterns of needs of these children, and acknowledged that the observer, if the right kind of person, might serve in this role.

Summary

Teacher B is an inexperienced young teacher who has well formed opinions about what ought to go on in her class and a great deal of uncertainty about herself as the person to do them. She seems to be very open to her children, yet she makes clear that there are certain forms of behavior she will and will not tolerate in the classroom. She is extremely distrustful of anything that might judge her work and will go to great lengths to protect the integrity of classroom

from such an intrusion. Her approach to the problem of observers in the classroom develops directly from this need to protect her from critical evaluation. Given the protection from this outside intrusion, she seems mildly open to innovative techniques, although she does not seem to have the grasp of the developmental issues faced by her children to be able to relate these innovations to the conditions of the classroom. Clearly, an observer in this classroom has several problems to solve before doing a reasonable job of broadening the base of decision-making with this teacher.

Teacher C

Teacher C is Chinese, and two-thirds of the children in her class are Chinese, with the remaining one third, black. The class is held in a Chinese church in Chinatow. It is a section of the city which borders on the black ghetto in both the geographic and social sense. Teacher C is married to the son of the minister of the church and was pregnant during a large portion of the project. She nevertheless taught throughout the full pre=school term.

Teacher C has college training as both a social worker and a pre-school teacher. She has had a wide range of course work covering much of the theory of early childhood development and the impact of poverty on the behavior of children. At the same time, she is very much a part of the Chinese community, and brings to the classroom Chinese values on child rearing. We cannot summarize such a complex issue here, and indeed it is not entirely related to the part of the present report. It is important to note, however, at least one value which this teacher brought to her classroom, which does throw some light on her

relation to the project and its goals. She describes the Chinese family structure as one which requires tremendous commitment on the part of the child (particularly in respect to the authority of adults), but which at the same time both allows and expects the child to be extremely self controlled and independent. Thus the child treats the parent with complete respect, and the parent expects the child to voluntarily prefer this mode of relationship with the parent and to have the self control to carry it off. There appears to be a form of mutual respect that sustains this pattern, and which reflects a very early and very successful socialization process. Thus, Teacher C was able to give an example of a four year old who was rather more aggressive in class than she felt was appropriate. The most meaningful way of dealing with this situation was to speak to the parents of the child. There appears to have been no threat of punishment or withdrawal of support on the part of the parents. The child was simply told that the aggressive behavior was wrong, and he was expected to change. According to Teacher C, the child has been fine in class ever since. She does not need to reinforce the parents' admonitions in order to maintain the child's behavior. Within this system, it is clear that the major problems for a teacher are in the area of behavior management, and that she expects a great deal of support from the parents in dealing with such problems. Under these conditions, it is not surprising to have discovered that this teacher felt no restraints on her leaving the classroom for long periods of time, particularly when these absences were associated with her pregnancy. For several hours almost every day, she would go to the living quarters of the church (her father-in-law is the minister) where she would take

care of the business of her pre-school center, and where she would rest. She had every reason to believe that the children would continue in the classroom, with the help of the aides that they would be able to follow the routine she had set up, that they had the resources among themselves to sustain them throughout a pre-school day. Clearly such an assumption could have occurred only to a Chinese teacher dealing with a Chinese class. On the other hand, Teacher C is familiar with the theory and jargon of child development, and she does utilize these when necessary.

Teacher C was not at all clear as to the purposes of the project. She was aware of the diagnostic team and of the availability of video-taping. Indeed, her class had been taped, although she claims that no one from the diagnostic team had visited her classroom up to the time of the interview. She claims that she did discuss some aspects of her classroom with the observer assigned to her class, but she could not recall the details of the discussion. Very little testing was done in her class because more than half the children do not speak English well enough to be tested. On the whole, the project represented a distant, albeit mildly interesting event which had little affect on her daily activities.

Parents are, for Teacher C, an important aspect of the pre-school program because of their role in the strongly structured family system. This teacher was very aware of the distinctly higher social status she enjoys in comparison to that of her children's parents. Her role, with respect to the parents, is to instill family pride in the good behavior of their children. At the same time, Teacher C assumed that the parents were deeply committed

to the control of the behavior of their children and therefore, they were intensely concerned with events at school. Further, she assumed that the parents were concerned with the status of their children as representatives of the family in school. Thus, Teacher C spent what appeared to be a majority of her time during the day telephoning or otherwise contacting the parents about the activities, programs, and plans of the Head Start Center (see the summary of Teacher C's behavior as recorded in her log). A family which was not informed would, in her words, become jealous of the other families, and this was to be avoided at all costs. Her primary concern was to communicate to the parents that each of their children was receiving a fair share of services available from Head Start. She tended to see the service as the achievement of fair apportionment. Her job was to that distribution. Thus, when she was asked how video taping might be used in her classroom, she insisted that the whole class should be filmed, both singly and as a group. In that manner she made it clear, no family would have reason to be jealous of any other, and all families would be equally pleased at seeing their children on tape. There was no suggestion of a diagnostic role for the taping, and no indication that any particular child might be a more important or interesting subject for taping than any other. The total value in video taping had to do with the techniques used by Teacher C in dealing with parents rather than in dealing with children.

The work of the diagnostic team was of little concern to this teacher. She was able to mention the social-emotional problems of one or two of her children, but did not see that the diagnostic team was of much value

to her. This was true because she felt that she had a full sense of the needs of the children and that she had available to her the full support of the parents of the children in dealing with such issues. One got the impression that Teacher C would prefer to solve the developmental problems of her children entirely within the classroom family structure and keep all external forces uninvolved. On the other hand, she was very quick to indicate that she is a very inexperienced teacher and likely to miss a good deal of the interpersonal dynamics which go on in her classroom. On this account she felt that the diagnostic team would be able to make some contribution by observing those aspects of her classroom which were unavailable to her. She made it clear that this observation function should belong to the diagnostic team rather than the observers since there was not the real competence in the observers to do this job well. She was asked to give a specific example of the need for this observation function, and the only example she could produce was of a girl who had lost her father several months ago and who was overly withdrawn and depressed. Teacher C said, in desperation, "I don't know what to do for her. If the diagnostic team would only come to my classroom!" It was this feeling of desperation, of being entirely unable to handle the problems of this little girl, that made the role of the external experts important to her. No other problems appeared to move her in this direction. Teacher C could report no contact with the observer in her room relevant to any issue other than testing, and she could report no reason why such contacts should be expanded to cover other matters.

In summary, Teacher C appears to see the classroom and her role in it, in a very clear and structured manner.

Teacher D

This teacher is the only Negro in the present sample and the only person whose home is not in the Northeast. She is from a middle class family in Mississippi, a recent graduate of a Negro college in that state, with a major in elementary education, whose husband (also from Mississippi) received a scholarship to a New England medical school commencing in the fall, 1969. Thus, Teacher D, her husband and two-year old baby arrived in Boston shortly before school began, and she was immediately hired as a Head Start teacher. She had no teaching experience outside the practice teaching in an elementary class in Mississippi.

This teacher had little idea that she was part of a project either at the beginning of the year or at the end. She knew that the children were to be tested and that she might receive some feedback from this process, but this was not seen as part of anything other than the normal Head Start routine. She was aware that the participation of parents and other community people was a major part of the Head Start effort, and that certain services (videotaping, and diagnostic evaluations of the children) were available. She was not clear as to which tests were being used or what the purpose was of the taping services. In other words, she saw herself involved in a standard Head Start program with a few deviant activities. She did not see an educational experiment going on around her.

Teacher D's perception of the diagnostic team's work was that it was interesting but not very helpful. In fact the team psychiatrist did

visit her class on one occasion but there was no feedback. When pressed for any examples of children in her class who might be examined by the team, Teacher D mentioned two who had problems. One was described as a liar, and the other as withdrawn. The latter child was very much in need of attention, said Teacher D, and this is what she the teacher, was giving. The diagnostic team would not be able to add to this situation, because the child seemed to be responding very well to the attention administered by the teacher. The other child was being handled firmly by Teacher D and he would soon mature out of that stage. There would be nothing wrong with a professional person observing either of these children, but there is no great need for that, according to Teacher D. She emphasized the point that the role ofthe diagnostic team and of clinical information generally, was of lesser importance to her than the role of academic testing to determine the academic strengths and weaknesses of each child. Teacher D made the point sharply that she was not attracted to the "Head Start" idea. Rather, she preferred instructing her children in numbers, colors, shapes, and words. She felt that this area of development represented the most significant focus for her, and that in order to guide her work she needed information on exactly what her children knew and did not know. The problems of social adjustment were important to be sure, she stated, but that they were of both lesser importance, and lesser in evidence than academic problems. At a later point in the interview, Teacher D was asked what she might get from the research staff that would be of help to her; she quite consistently responded by a request for testing in the academic achievement area.

Video-taping represented more of a problem than an aide to Teacher D. When asked if she would want any particular children taped, she could not answer affirmatively. Later she indicated tha she might like a few examples of the behavior of the child who tended to lie, although the only reason she could give for this information was to be able to prove to others the real extent of the lying. Her primary assumption about the use of videotaping was that it would be used to describe her own behavior with the child. Here she laughed nervously about having her picture taken, and indicated that she saw no real value in anyone else looking at such tapes. She would be interested in seeing herself in that it would afford her a view of "the real me". She felt that this would help her in picking up her mistakes in teaching, but she could not identify any types of mistakes which the tape might reveal. There were no particular issues, techniques, or problems with which she is ordinarily involved to which the videotaping seemed relevant. The only information in which she seemed at all interested appeared to be the academic weaknesses of her children.

Teacher D saw no educational value to her observer (to whom she referred as her aide), except as a housekeeping assistant in the classroom. She expected no feedback from her observer, and indicated that she would distrust any such information because of the observer's lack of training as a professional. Despite her own lack of experience generally as a teacher and specifically as a preschool teacher, and despite her expressed nervousness at the beginning of the program, Teacher D said she felt that she could cope with any of the problems of the classroom. This was particularly true, she

said, because the primary problems of the classroom involved the academic development of the children. Her training was adequate for this task, she felt. There are some problems in early childhood development about which she felt she was not completely knowledgeable, but she saw these in cognitive terms, and they did not represent any major issue for her. She reported that she did not discuss these issues with her observer except when she instructed the observer in methods of teaching the children. Teacher D could offer no examples of how a trained observer might help her work in the classroom.

Summary

This rather traditional elementary grade teacher appears to have little sensitivity to the character of a pre-school classroom, and appears to have little interest in finding out more about this matter. She gives the interviewer the impression of one who is generally not very interested in her job, and who intends to apply whatever knowledge she does have about children in a non-discriminating, rigid manner. Her almost complete lack of interest in the social-emotional needs of young children, along with her cool and aloof manner in discussing them, suggests that she establishes only shallow and superficial personal relations with children, which are typically confined to the cognitive areas. Observers and other supportive services have little significance to her, and one would expect that opening her eyes to the many problems of development faced by young children would be a rather difficult task.

Results and Summary

Although the teachers in this study were not preselected for differences among them, it is very clear that they are quite different people and teachers. They have different orientations toward experimental and clinical situations, they deal with the dependency situations in their classroom in very different manners, and they appear to be somewhat different in their responsiveness to the notion of observer in the classroom. We shall summarize some of these differences below, but for the moment, it is justifiable to conclude that each of these four teachers presented a different psycho-educational milieu into which the observer was inserted. The interaction between each teacher and her observer should, under these conditions, produce a very different picture of an educational experiment. It was this expectation that formed the basis of the case studies contemplated in this project. We expected that each teacher would provide a unique setting of classroom style and educational orientation that would generate a unique history to the growth and development of the observer's role in the classroom and ultimately in the manner in which the classroom operated. It was also expected that the relatively stable role of the teacher (stable at least with respect to the unclear and changing role the observer was expected to play over the year) might be influenced by this interactive process. In fact, very little change in the roles of either the observers or the teachers was noted, and we shall attempt to deal with this phenomenon below.

Although each teacher did present a different picture, the role each played included the common dimension of protection of its integrity. That is, each teacher had a style which tended to resist change or imposition from outside. In this sense the role of the teacher is very different from that of the observer. The teacher's role is relatively clearcut (albeit different in each case) so that which is to be defended is well known to the teacher. She understands her rights and prerogatives in the classroom, her obligations to the children, and her responsibilities as assigned by her employer. The observer, on the other hand, is faced with the possibility of defining her role, of establishing her responsibilities and rights. The very skills required to carry out the observer role (whatever that might mean to the individual observer) was neither known nor clearly developed in the beginning of each observer's participation in the project. The burden of the task in the interaction between observer and teacher lies most heavily on the observer. Her two sources of support: the administrative staff of the project, and the teachers themselves, are very different in the kind of support they are willing to offer the observers. As stated elsewhere in this report, the administrative staff was intent on allowing the observers to develop their own role as independently as possible. The teachers were intent on maintaining the integrity of their own roles and therefore were relatively unsympathetic to the needs of the fledgling observers. Thus the observers found themselves in a very difficult situation. The nature of the resolution of this frustration seems, in retrospect, almost inevitable. The observers had to settle on roles which were clear, well defined, and which did not conflict with the teacher's

view of what they were to be doing. As described elsewhere in this report, almost all the observers fell back on the activities of testers and aides as the primary definition of their role, and they tended to avoid the more complex educational aspects of observation and feedback. This appeared to be the same process in each of the four teacher-observer situations described in this report, regardless of the differences across teachers and classroom situations. Apparently, the pressures on the observers to opt for the traditional and innocuous roles were so great in each classroom, and the alternatives available to the observers were so restricted, that the differences in the educational milieu in which they were working were obscured. It is to a summary of this process that we now turn.

Teacher A

This is the most highly trained and skilled teacher in the present sample. Further, she seems to have established a relationship with her children which allows them to express relatively easily the conflicts they have over their dependency needs, and to direct these needs to her. She responds to a relatively high degree to those requests, and does not appear to be threatened by this kind of interaction with her children. She seems interested in getting clinical information about her children and was not threatened by the possibility of being observed in her work by either a video tape, a member of the diagnostic team, or the observer. She was willing to try experimental techniques in her classroom, and did not feel bothered (except for the effects on the children) of having someone also take over her classroom for a day. She can specify what

it is she needs to know about the emotional needs of each child, and appears to take a traditional nursery school approach to the structure of her classroom. She is a generally quiet spoken young woman who uses a good deal of creative materials in her classroom, and focuses on the social emotional developmental needs of the children.

Teacher A's reaction to the observer was of moderate cooperativeness coupled with some disdain and cynicism. These latter judgments were based on her estimate that the observers did not know enough about the world of nursery school children and teaching to be of any particular help to her. She was very much in favor of more professional help in her classroom, and appeared to be interested in an observer who had such skills. But the quasi trained (as she saw them) observers in the project, utilizing an observation schedule which was not well established or directly relevant to her needs, appeared to her to add little to the expertise in her room.

In this situation, the teacher has mastered her classroom fairly well, and the issues which remain to be solved are of a rather sophisticated nature. For example, it is not at all clear whether this teacher is as highly sensitive to the dependency needs of her children as her ratings on the Dependency Scales indicate. She tended to be very supportive of almost all of the children almost all of the time, and did not always recognize those moments when a child's indirect request for some help might better be denied. To urge a child to be independent is at times an appropriate strategy and it is not clear that Teacher A has mastered this skill. Such an issue as this is a complex one, and requires high level observations and careful feedback.

There is little reason to believe that Teacher A would not welcome such a process in her classroom, and a trained observer geared to this would likely have won her respect and cooperation. Such an observer was not available, however, and Teacher A communicated a clear expectation that testing and aiding would be the dominant form of observer behavior in her classroom. An untrained observer would have few resources to resist such an implied set of prescriptions.

Teacher B

This teacher has the least training in early childhood development, she is the most inconsistent in her behavior toward children, and is the most defensive about being observed, of all the teachers in this sample. Her behavior in the classroom alternates between being very warm and supportive of the children, to being very punitive and hostile to them. The wide swings appear to be only slightly related to the children's willingness to carry out the kind of art work or fit into the social structure which Teacher B prefers. The children are both very dependent and very conflicted about their dependency. They turn to the teacher for these needs a good deal, and are supported in this area a relatively few number of times. Apparently the very strong degree of support and warmth which Teacher B does supply when she is on the supporting side of her style does serve to maintain the children's orientation toward her, even when she is on the rejecting side of the style. She appears to serve as an intermittent reinforcer of children who turn to her for the dependency needs, and as such is able to maintain their behavior at a relatively

high level. There is a relatively high number of children exhibiting a good deal of dependency and dependency conflict, indicating that there is a tenseness established in this classroom which could be related to the inconsistency with which Teacher B dispenses support.

The lack of training for her position is something of which Teacher B is very aware. She exhibits a great deal of bravado in asserting that she knows what she is about in the classroom, but she leaves the observer with the feeling that she is not at all that sure of herself. She clearly does not want to be observed or evaluated, has little idea of what she might get from professional or even quasi professional support in the classroom, cannot identify the kind of information she would like to have about her children, but says that she would be interested in particpating in experimental studies. However, any study which involves measurement of her behavior in the classroom is not at all attractive to Teacher B. In like manner, she indicates a willingness to have parents particpate in various ways in the business of her class, but is most resentful when they do, and she regularly fails to attend parents' meetings.

Teacher B's reaction to the observer was to limit observer functions to just those testing activities which she felt obliged to allow in her class. She received no ratings on the observer scheduel, no feedback, and had no involvement with the observer function in any way. Her observer served exclusively as her aide and tester and appeared unable to deal with Teacher B in any other manner.

Clearly, Teacher B was unaware of a good deal of what was going on in her classroom, and what her impact was on the children. Her resistence

to observer functions is probably closely realted to her defensiveness about her own failings of which she was only vaguely aware. Dealing with such a situation is a difficult and perhaps long term matter, and one which requires a great deal of planning and follow-up. Since Teacher B was the "teacher-in-charge" of the classroom (a role much more clearly defined than anything the observer was able to acquire), the authority she derived thereby made her all the more invulnerable to thrusts from outsiders. Small wonder that the observer could not in this case penetrate the barriers of Teacher B. No wonder the observer was willing to settle for the clear but innocuous role of tester.

Teacher C

This teacher presented an interesting combination of an understanding and accepting preschool teacher, and a clearly defined representative of the Chinese culture inserted into the classroom. The expectations she had of well controlled and well mannered independent behavior from each child appeared to be shared by most of the children including some of the non-Chinese. At the same time, she was able to break the posture of the rigid teacher and respond in a warm motherly fashion to a child asking for help. This seems like an effective combination in that relatively few dependency requests were made by these children, and most of those were directed at the teacher rather than at the aide. Teacher C spent a good deal of time out of the classroom (she was pregnant and the Head Start classroom was in the church of which her father-in-law was the minister), and she relied on the

standards for good behavior to maintain control in her absence. In most instances, the routine of the classroom and these "Chinese" norms did in fact serve to keep the classroom functioning smoothly. One had the sense that the teacher was able to use the forces within the Chinese family to reinforce the controls she put on each child. At the same time she was able to use her knowledge of early childhood development and teaching techniques to speak to the special needs each child brought to the classroom. As a result of this style, Teacher C gave a very contradictory first impression. One saw a teacher who spent very little time in the classroom and who appeared not to respond directly to each child. More careful and systematic observation indicated that she did indeed respond to the social-emotional properties of the children and classroom, but that this response was in the framework of her culture. An anecdotal datum on this point was the surprise voiced by the evaluation team when the true number of dependency requrests directed toward and answered by Teacher C was revealed by the analysis of the dependency observation data. Even the observers were not aware of the extent to which Teacher C was interacting with her children. Although comparisions between teachers are not really possible utilizing these data, it is worth noting that this teacher had a relatively high rate of interaction despite the reduced amount of time she spent in the classroom.

The reaction Teacher C had to the observer in the classroom was consistent with her approach to the children. She was willing to cooperate on anything the project was interested in giving her, but she saw no need for much of what was offered. She knew where solutions to inter- and intra-personal

problems were to be found, and she knew how to find them. The parents, and the community represented a kind of direct support to her work in the classroom, and they also represented a clear obligation on her part, that she was interested in dealing with parents more than she was in dealing with observers. That is, the observers represented less value to her than the parents and the observer function was not either seen or utilized in any meaningful fashion. They were, consequently, utilized strictly as aides.

The problems faced in this classroom were essentially those of balance between the independent and dependent needs of the children. Since the approach to the solution of these problems were shaped by the unique cultural orientation of this teacher (which is, of course, true of all teachers), and since the observers were not Chinese, there is the possibility of great difficulty in determining the way in which an observer could contribute to these solutions. Further, not all children in this classroom were Chinese (several were black and one was white) which presents an interesting mix of children and expectations. An observer who intends to contribute to the teacher's broadening horizons, would clearly be in need of preparation in these subtle cultural issues. Without such preparation, it is hard to see how such an observer would be able to establish the basis for a strong role structure in the classroom, or a solid basis for interaction with the teacher on an equal, professional basis.

Teacher D

This teacher considered herself in a temporary position for which

she was only tangentially prepared. She did not feel strongly committed to the classroom and responded to the children in much the same way. She had a relatively low number of dependency requests directed to her compared to the number directed toward other teachers. Further she tended to respond relatively little to the conflicted situation with which she was faced. The attendance in her class was very low, and the attrition was high among highly conflicted children. One had the impression that a child had to be strong and independent in order to remain in this classroom. Teacher D's expressed interest was in the academic improvement of the children (although she was not clear on how to accomplish this goal) and her behavior in the classroom indicated a clear lack of interest in the psycho-social needs of the children. Here, the role of the observer in supplying such relations emerged sharply. This appeared to keep the class on an even keel and kept Teacher D from being forced to pay too much attention to the behavioral issues in the classroom. At the same time, it kept the observer busy as a second teacher whose role was somewhat coordinated with, but clearly distinguished from, that of Teacher D. Since they had little to do with each other, there was little problem about the growth of the observer's role or the development of adequate interaction between teacher and observer. This also meant that the goal of increasing the responsiveness of the total classroom to each child's needs was only indirectly and inadvertently achieved.

Given the narrow focus of this teacher, it is not surprising that she professed no awareness of the observer, qua observer, at all. She was

uninterested in anything which related to experimentation and definitely did not want to be watched while she was teaching. She was interested in academic information about her children exclusively and thereby estabished the conditions under which she related to the children. It is apparent that for a variety of reasons, Teacher D knew just what she wanted to do in the classroom, and knew what she wanted to avoid. This would make the activities of the most sophisticated observer difficult at best. Its effects on the relatively untrained observer in this project was to keep any context for the development of notions about new observer roles from emerging. The classroom was so completely structured (from the point of view of the major goals of the teacher) that little room for the observer role existed. On the other hand, the whole realm of interpersonal relations between teacher and children was left generally to the care of the observer. This produced a clear set of functions for the observer, without raising the issues contained in the original notions about observerz. In this manner, a modus operandi between teacher and observer was established which appeared to last to the end of the school year.

Conclusion

The most impressive fact which seems to emerge from this study is the disadvantage, in terms of strength and stability, which the observer role brings to the interactive situation with the teacher. Compared to the teachers's role, the observers in this study were ill defined, poorly prepared, and inadequately supported. This is not meant, of course, to be a criticism.

It is a finding rather than an assumption, and one which emerges only after a period of observation of the process itself. The teacher role is defined in several different ways, but defined nevertheless. It contains the intrinsic power of final decision in the classroom derived from both the formal school structure and from the traditional rights and privileges accorded teachers in this society. The observers have no such justification for their existence, and must create their position out of nothing more than a conviction that they are able to make a meaningful contribution to the classroom. Whatever support they can receive must come from external sources (the project) which, however, has intrinsic limitations. The most critical limitation is that the project did not, and could not, directly affect the operation of the classroom. That, of course, would be inconsistent with the aims of the project: to create the conditions for the reformation of the classroom through the introduction of the observer. Thus, the observers started with a distinct disadvantage.

The ultimate source of the reduction of the observer to a nominal position in the classroom was the teachers capacity to establish a defense against the observers. Thus Teachers A and C were able to deal with their observers by leaving them nothing to do in any professional sense. Both A and C covered so many of the aspects of the children's needs in the classroom that the observers were overwhelmed with thetask of being at least as professional, if not more professional, than the teacher. Teachers B and D so clearly defined the bounds of behavior for the observers that the latter were unable to transcent those bounds and approach other issues of their own making.

They were given opportunities to slip into established and service oriented roles, and given little opportunity to do anything else, thus restricting their behavior.

The increasing use of non-teaching specialists in the classroom (ranging from paraprofessional aides to master teacher supervisors) suggests many new relationships which might emerge in such situations. There is no doubt that each kind of supportive person can be considered a change agent of sorts, and that ultimately the structure of the classroom will be drastically changed. The outcome of this study suggests that this process of change is an extremely complex one for which a good deal of preparation is required. The proper mix of authoritarian pressure to change and spontaneous intent to change is not yet clear, but at least it can be concluded that some sort of lever over the intrinsic power of the teacher in the classroom must be found before major change will take place. This seems as clear for those teachers who are responsive to change as for those who will, for whatever reason, resist change as long as possible. The lever can be described in political, human relations, or power terms, but for the present we prefer to describe it in professional terms. It seems clear to us that the change agent must be at least as wise and knowledgeable as the teacher before the political power, or the financial power (as is very often the case recently, of the change agent can materialize. The change agent must be able to speak to the essential educational issues of the classroom, and be able to see the relevance of the goals toward which the change is leading to the contemporary issues of the classroom. In that manner the teacher will be able to enter the dialogue, and the movement to change will have begun.