

A PLAN FOR SELF-DIRECTED CHANGE IN AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

CARL R. ROGERS

Western Behavioral Science Institute
La Jolla, California

THE title which I first chose for this paper was "A Practical Plan for Educational Revolution." I felt, though, that this might offend and antagonize too many people. Why is there need for a revolution in education? After all, tens upon tens of thousands of dedicated student-teachers, teachers, instructors, and professors—over the whole spectrum from nursery school to Ph.D.—are working wholeheartedly in our educational system, trying to improve it in a multitude of ways. Why then any talk of revolution? I should like to make clear my reasons for believing that only a tremendous change in the basic *direction* of education can meet the needs of today's culture.

A New Goal for Education: A Climate for Change

The world is changing at an exponential rate. If our society is to meet the challenge of the dizzying changes in science, technology, communications, and social relationships, we cannot rest on the *answers* provided by the past,

but must put our trust in the *processes* by which new problems are met. For so quickly does change overtake us that answers, "knowledge," methods, skills, become obsolete almost at the moment of their achievement.

This implies not only new techniques for education, but indeed a new goal. In the world which is already upon us, the goal of education must be to develop individuals who are open to change, who are flexible and adaptive, who have *learned how to learn*, and are thus able to learn continuously. Only such persons can constructively meet the perplexities of a world in which problems spawn much faster than their answers. The goal of education must be to develop a society in which people can live more comfortably with *change* than with *rigidity*. In the coming world the capacity to face the new appropriately is more important than the ability to know and repeat the old.

But such a goal implies, in turn, that educators themselves must be open and flexible, effectively involved in the

processes of change. They must be able both to conserve and convey the essential knowledge and values of the past, and to welcome eagerly the innovations which are necessary to prepare for the unknown future.

A way must be found to develop, within the educational system as a whole, and in each component, a climate conducive to personal growth, a climate in which innovation is not frightening, in which the creative capacities of administrators, teachers and students are nourished and expressed rather than stifled. A way must be found to develop a climate in which the focus is not upon *teaching*, but on the facilitation of self-directed *learning*. Only thus can we develop the creative individual who is open to all of his experience; aware of it and accepting it, and continually in the process of changing. And only in this way, I believe, can we bring about the creative educational organization, which will also be continually in the process of changing.

A Tool for Educational Change

One of the most effective means yet discovered for facilitating constructive learning, growth, and change—in individuals or in the organizations they compose—is the intensive group experience. Known by a variety of names (T-group, laboratory training, sensitivity training, basic encounter group, workshop), it has a common underlying theme and quality of experience.

The intensive group or "workshop" group usually consists of ten to fifteen persons and a facilitator or leader. It is relatively unstructured, providing a climate of maximum freedom for personal expression, exploration of feelings,

and interpersonal communication. Emphasis is upon the interactions among the group members, in an atmosphere which encourages each to drop his defenses and facades and thus enables him to relate directly and openly to other members of the group—the "basic encounter." Individuals come to know themselves and each other more fully than is possible in the usual social or working relationships; the climate of openness, risk-taking, and honesty generates trust, which enables the person to recognize and change self-defeating attitudes, test out and adopt more innovative and constructive behaviors, and subsequently to relate more adequately and effectively to others in his everyday life situation.

Since the mid-1940's, such workshop groups have been used extensively with industrial executives, government administrators, professional groups, and laymen—groups considered to be normal and well-functioning—under a wide variety of auspices, of which the National Training Laboratory is perhaps the best known (Benne, Bradford and Lippitt, 1964).

Generally speaking, the aim of these intensive group experiences is to improve the learnings and abilities of the participants in such areas as leadership and interpersonal communication. Another aim is to bring about change in the organizational climates and structures in which the members work. These group experiences are characteristically conducted as an intensive residential experience in which the participants live and meet together for periods ranging from three days to two or three weeks. (A widely used variant is the sensitivity-training course offered by

university departments in which the groups meet once a week throughout a semester or more.)

Within the past several years, educators have begun to make use of the intensive group experience, though only to a small extent. Groups involving educational administrators (Miles, 1964), teachers (Bowers and Soar, 1961), student-faculty groups from the same institution (Boyer, 1964), and occasionally intensive groups within the classroom (T. C. Clark and Miles, 1954; J. V. Clark and Culbert, 1965) have been used. In the education setting, the aims have been to release the capacity of the participants for better educational leadership through improved interpersonal relationships, or to foster learning by the whole person—student, teacher or administrator.

The workshop group has also been used on an experimental basis with school dropouts, unemployed youth, and predelinquents, as a means of helping them achieve greater personal maturity and effectiveness through improved personal and interpersonal competence in coping with a variety of life situations.

Although these several uses in educational settings have had satisfying and promising results, there has been almost no attempt to utilize the intensive group experience in a coherent approach to change in a total public educational system. Hence, an all too common consequence has been that a teacher or faculty member returns from such an experience ready to behave in new and changing ways, only to discover that his attitudes are not welcomed in a "stable and well-regulated" educational organization. Two

alternatives are open: he returns disappointedly to his previous conventional behavior, or he becomes a puzzling and disruptive influence in his institution, neither understood nor approved.

It seems quite clear that this new tool for change cannot be used in the most effective manner unless the *whole system* is moving toward change in a way which accommodates change in its own personnel and its own units. Industry is already learning this. It is this principle of opening up the possibilities for change in the *whole system* during a *relatively short period of time* which is the essence of the plan which will be presented.

The Hypotheses of the Intensive Group Experience



Before proceeding further, it seems advisable to state, somewhat more fully and more precisely, the hypotheses which underlie the process of the basic encounter group (see Rogers, 1967, for a more complete description of this process). This whole area is one in which practice has far outrun both theory and research. Consequently, the hypotheses stated below have been often validated in practice, but there has been only a modest amount of research on these points.

Here then are the practical hypotheses:

- A facilitator can develop, in a group which meets intensively, a psychological climate of safety in which freedom of expression and reduction of defensiveness gradually occur.
- In such a psychological climate, many of the immediate feeling reactions of each member toward others, and toward himself, tend to be expressed.

- A climate of mutual trust develops out of this mutual freedom to express real feelings, positive and negative. Each member moves toward greater acceptance of his total being—his emotional, intellectual, and physical being, as it is, including its potential.
- With individuals less inhibited by defensive rigidity, the possibility of change—in personal attitudes and behavior, in teaching methods, in administrative methods—becomes less threatening.
- With a reduction of defensive rigidity, individuals can hear each other, can learn from each other, to a greater extent.
- There is a development of feedback from one person to another, such that each individual learns how he appears to others, and what impact he has in interpersonal relationships.
- As individuals hear each other more accurately, an organization tends to become a relationship of persons with common goals, rather than a formal hierachial structure.
- With this greater freedom and improved communication, new ideas, new concepts, new directions, emerge. Innovation becomes a desirable rather than a threatening possibility.
- These learnings in the group experience tend to carry over, temporarily or more permanently, into the relationships with peers, students, subordinates, and even to superiors, following the group experience.

A Plan

Having described the need for educational change, and the intensive group experience as the tool or process by which it might be brought about, I would like now to present a specific plan for implementing this purpose. I would stress that every element of this plan has been tried and found to be effective either in industry, in education, or with other groups. Experienced

personnel are available throughout the country who have the attitudes and "know-how" for carrying out these activities. It is the weaving of these elements into a comprehensively integrated plan which constitutes its novelty.

Selection of a Target Educational System

The plan is such that it could be applied to any educational organization, or to a number of such organizations simultaneously. It is believed the plan would be equally effective in an elementary school system, an elementary-secondary system, a junior college, a college or university, or a graduate school. One might find some increase in the degree of rigidity as one goes up this progression, but the same principles would apply, with some common-sense modification of specifics to meet each situation.

The first step in the inauguration of the plan is the selection of an educational system at one of these levels. There is only one criterion for this selection. It is that one or more individuals in positions of power—preferably the chief administrator and one or two of his associates or board members—have the desire and willingness to involve themselves in a basic encounter group. If they are willing themselves to *experience* the changes which come about in such an intensive group experience, then they could make a reasonable and experientially informed judgment about the remainder of the plan. This is a very simple but also extremely important base for the whole plan which follows. A number of educational administrators and systems have already

indicated their interest in involving themselves in such an experience.

An Intensive Group Experience for Administrators: The First Step

The opportunity would be given for administrators and board members in the system to participate in a one-week intensive workshop (or encounter group, or "T" group) to be held away from their offices, preferably in a relatively secluded resort where they would be free from the usual interruptions and distractions of an administrator's life. This would doubtless have to be in the late summer, before school is under way. The cost would be largely subsidized (details of this later) but the individual would pay a portion of the cost as evidence of his commitment. It seems preferable that this group experience should be voluntary, though if the administration decided that all staff above a certain level must attend, this would be acceptable.

An experienced facilitator from outside (and there is an ample pool from which to draw) will serve as a catalyst and participant in each group of ten to fifteen administrators. Organizations such as the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, the National Training Laboratory, or the Western Training Laboratory can be the source of facilitators for each group and could constitute the professional planning staff.

The group (or groups) will be relatively unstructured, and if past experience is any guide, exploration of current interpersonal feelings and relationships will become a major focus. Often gripes and feuds which have for years prevented real communication come to the surface and are resolved in the eight

or ten hours per day of intensive group meetings. The encounter group provides the administrator with a microcosm for studying the problems he faces, and the problems he *creates*, in his own organization. Through confrontation he discovers how he appears to others. He also has the opportunity for experimenting with and trying out new modes of behavior, in a relatively safe situation.

Although the small encounter groups will constitute the core of the experience, there will be substantive general sessions in which the group (or groups) will be exposed to stimulating educational topics presented either by members of their own staff, or by members of the facilitative staff. This can provide cognitive data to be added to the interpersonal data with which each small group deals.

What will happen in such an intensive week? It is almost impossible to convey intellectually the quality of the relationships which develop. Drawing upon past experience, I think of administrators who have worked together for twenty years, and discover they have never known each other at all as persons; of negative feelings which have "loused up" planning and work for years, which can now safely be brought into the open, understood, and dissolved; of positive feelings which have always seemed too risky to voice; of ideals and hopes which have seemed too fantastic to share with others; of quick angers which arise in the group, are expressed, and strengthen rather than destroy relationships, in the context of trust and openness which has been built; of personal tragedies and problems which make understandable the armor plate behind which some individ-

uals have hidden, and from behind which they begin to emerge; the intense sense of community which develops, in place of the alienation each has felt; the willingness to risk new behaviors, new directions, new purposes; determinations to rebuild family relationships and organizational procedures.

These are only a few of the manifestations of the occurrences in an intensive group experience in which individuals who have interacted as roles—superintendent, board member, supervisor—begin to interact as persons, whole persons with feelings as well as thoughts, capable of being hurt as well as being actualized. Again reference is made to a recent paper in which recorded excerpts of group experiences bring some of these descriptions to life (Rogers, 1967).

What may we expect as outcomes of such an experience for the trustee, the superintendent or president, the deans, supervisors, or administrative specialists in various fields? It has been our experience that some of the outcomes can be described in a somewhat schematic form, as in the following statements.

The Administrator

—will be less protective of his own constructs and beliefs, and hence can listen more accurately to other administrators and to faculty members;

—will find it easier and less threatening to accept innovative ideas;

—will have less need for the protection of bureaucratic rules, and hence will decide issues more on the basis of merit;

—will communicate more clearly to superiors, peers, and subordinates, because his communications will be more oriented

toward an openly declared purpose, and less toward covert self-protection;

—will be more person-oriented and democratic in staff or faculty meetings; hence

—will draw more widely and deeply on the resource potential of his faculty and staff;

—will be more likely to face and openly confront personal emotional frictions which develop between himself and his colleagues, rather than burying the conflict under new "regulations" or avoiding it in other ways;

—will be more able to accept feedback from his staff, both positive and negative, and to use it as constructive insight into himself and his behavior;

—will be more able to communicate realistically with his board of trustees, and thus possibly lay the groundwork for altering the organizational *structure* of the educational system (this will be especially true if the trustees themselves have been involved in an intensive group experience).

I have gone into some detail in describing this initial group experience for the administrators. I will be much more brief in describing the following workshops or encounter groups, since the nature of the process, and the context for it, will be very similar.

Judging from my own experience in working with educators and educational systems, there is little reason to believe that the plan would stop with the workshop just described. With a number of influential members of the system now involved, they are likely to come to the decision to go ahead with making this experience more widely available throughout the system. From this point on, the steps I describe are only one possible program and plan, since the professional staff and the administrators will now become collaborators in planning the ways in which to proceed.

Nevertheless, I will describe some of the possible and probable elements which will follow.

Intensive Group Experiences for Teachers

Following much the same pattern, those teachers or faculty members who wish to become involved in basic encounter groups will be given the opportunity. Depending on the size of the system, this number might be quite small or it might be large. Experience has shown that 80 to 120 individuals can be involved at one time, with six to ten small groups as the core of the experience. Again the aim would be to get them off campus in some appropriately secluded setting, for a period of a week if possible, during a vacation time, or a long weekend of four days if the full week were not feasible. The question of whether to include spouses should certainly be discussed, since an initial impact on home and family is a common occurrence, and if both spouses are included (perhaps in separate groups), it gives a common basis for sharing significant experiences.

Perhaps a word should be said about the voluntary aspect of these groups. Some individuals, in industry as well as education, have heard stories about "T" groups which frighten them—they are group therapy, they force individuals to reveal their feelings, etc. Or they are completely ignorant of such developments and are full of such questions as, "What could you possibly talk about for a whole week?" It seems that such situations are best handled by first dealing with those who are ready to risk themselves in a group, and letting reports of the experience permeate the

total group, creating further readiness. (In a recent group of nurses, I found that the most important single reason for registering for the group was that individuals had seen significant and compelling changes in behavior and personal relationships in nurses who had been previous participants, and now these individuals wanted to experience the process for themselves.)

Another point which should be mentioned is that there is no expectation, at this stage, of reaching every teacher or faculty member. It is quite sufficient that any participant will have peers with whom he or she can share experiences growing out of the intensive workshop. Since many of the teachers' superiors will also have had such growing experiences, the faculty member will be going back into a school environment which will be essentially responsive to any changes in his behavior, attitudes, purposes and relationships.

Another point worth stressing is that changes and innovations which are decided upon (in this or the other groups) are likely to be implemented in practice, because they are self-chosen. It has been a familiar complaint that new ideas in teaching, in curriculum, in methods, are literally "a dime a dozen," but that they tend to be resisted by teachers and administrators. But when individuals have *chosen* to try some of these new ideas, the outcome is quite different.

If we ask what the personal outcomes might be for the teacher or faculty member, we may again try to list some which seem supported by experience.

The Teacher

—will show many of the characteristic

changes listed for the administrator, and in addition

—will be more able to listen to students, especially to the feelings of students;

—will be able better to accept the innovative, challenging, "troublesome," creative ideas which emerge in students, rather than reacting to these threats by insisting on conformity;

—will tend to pay as much attention to his relationship with his students, as to the content material of the course;

—will be more likely to work out interpersonal frictions and problems *with* students, rather than dealing with such issues in a disciplinary or punitive manner;

—will develop a more equalitarian atmosphere in the classroom, conducive to spontaneity, to creative thinking, to independent and self-directed work.

Encounter Groups for Class Units

The next phase will be an intensive group experience for a class or course unit. This may very possibly be desired by a teacher who finds, from his own intensive group experience, that he would like to implement new directions in his relationship with his class, but is at a loss to know how to do so.

For a group involving such a class or course unit, everyone in any way related to the class will be included—assistants, student teachers, supervisors, even the janitor if he has a real relationship with the class. Since a residential off-campus experience will probably be impossible, except at the college level, a different format will often be necessary. It may be that five full school days will be devoted to the intensive group experience, with an outside facilitator again helping to provide the climate of freedom for expression and freedom for responsible

choice. Students and teachers will be permitted and encouraged to discuss problems the class has had. These may start with problems of too great difficulty or too little difficulty in the content matter, but soon the context of feelings will begin to be expressed.

Perhaps for the first time in his life the student will find that his attitudes, his feelings, his opinions, will be *heard*, will be listened to, first perhaps by the facilitator only, but gradually by the other students and the teaching faculty. Often for the first time he will find himself a *participant* in classroom choices and policies, not merely a passive recipient. In one school where something of this sort has been tried, it has been found that nearly always the solution to a classroom problem or impasse, as reached by the total group, is that students choose to take a larger responsibility for themselves and their work and actions.

While it is not expected that more than a small fraction of classes will, at this stage, have this type of intensive group experience, the effect upon the students in these classes can be reasonably well predicted.

The Student

—will feel more free to express both positive and negative feelings in class—toward other students, toward the teacher, toward content material;

—will tend to work through these feelings toward a realistic relationship, instead of burying them until they are explosive;

—will have more energy to devote to learning, because he will have less fear of continual evaluation and punishment;

—will discover he has a responsibility for his own learning, as he becomes more of a participant in the group learning process;

—will feel free to take off on exciting avenues of learning, with more assurance that his teacher will understand;

—will find that both his awe of authority and his rebellion against authority diminish, as he discovers teachers and administrators to be fallible human beings, relating in imperfect ways to students;

—will find that the learning process enables him to grapple directly and personally with the problem of the meaning of his life.

Intensive Groups for Parents

If the groups described above are at all effective in achieving their aims, the ferment will attract attention in the community. Consequently, it will be helpful if concurrently with some of the above, an intensive group experience is offered to parents (assuming we are dealing with an elementary or elementary-secondary system). A group might be offered for officers and chairmen of the PTA, or for parents of students who have been involved in a classroom group experience. The pattern will doubtless have to be different. A weekend group experience might be offered—and these have been shown to be effective—or a three-hour evening session once a week, or a twenty-four hour "marathon" session. Both parents of a student might well be included, if both are interested.

The purpose of such groups is to enrich the parents' relationship with each other, the child, and the school, as well as to make clear the significance of the program being carried on in the school system. Certainly only the smallest fraction of parents can be reached in this way, but these may serve as interpreters of the program to other members of the community.

"Vertical" Groups

Up to this point almost all of the groups planned are groups of peers or near peers. It is usually easier for people to relate significantly to each other when there is not too frightening a difference in status. But at some point the "vertical" group will be attempted. This should probably be on an invitation basis at the outset, and include individuals who have been involved in some previous encounter group. If at all possible, it should be residential and off-campus. Let me sketch such a group and its probable consequences.

Invited would be two members of the board of trustees, two administrative officials, two parents, two teachers, two excellent students, and two failing students or school dropouts. Since such a group might have difficulty getting under way, it could be brought together under some such theme as "The _____ Schools: What I like and don't like about them, and what I want them to be."

The person who has never been involved in a group experience may believe it impossible for such a diverse group of individuals truly to communicate. Yet, very similar groups have been conducted, with extremely rewarding results. When a board member reaches the point where he can *hear* the hatred and contempt of the dropout for the schools, and the reasons for those negative feelings; when the teacher discovers that the board member is not "the big stick," but a human being, often with mixed and insecure feelings about the role he is attempting to play; when the "A" student learns that others less brilliant are

sometimes more perceptive in the feeling realm than he; when a parent finds he can truly learn from an adolescent, and vice-versa; when widely divergent criticisms of and hopes for the schools are brought fully into the open, and examined and challenged in the feeling context in which they exist; when mutual trust grows in a climate which includes mutual differences; then we can say with considerable assurance that no person in the group will remain unchanged. Each will have incorporated broader understandings of self and of the others. Each will to some degree have become more flexible. Each will find that he is involved in changingness.

I think it scarcely need be added that even a very few such vertical groups would drastically change the climate and the flavor of any educational system. Though it has been described in terms most appropriate to a secondary school, it can be utilized at any level from nursery school (yes, nursery school children have feelings too) to graduate school. At any level, it contains the yeast of a revolution in the educational climate.

The Time Table

In carrying out the plan as outlined thus far, it is essential that the various group experiences should be held within a reasonably short period of time, so that the impact will not be dissipated. It is impossible to be specific, since much depends on whether we are dealing with an elementary school system of six schools, or a university with tens of thousands of students and a faculty of thousands. Nevertheless, the aim will be to hold at least ten workshops during the first academic year of the pro-

gram, with from one to ten encounter groups in each of these workshops. Thus, at a minimum, the number of people involved in the intensive group experience will run into the hundreds, a sufficient fraction of the total administrative, faculty, and student body so that the effects will not be lost.

A Plan for Continuing Change

It is a very important part of the plan that a capability for continuing change be built into the system, so that a larger and larger fraction of its members may have the opportunity for one or more intensive group experiences. It is also important that the initial staff of outside facilitators be able to withdraw, retaining only a consultant function, if that is desired. Both these aims are served in the fashion described below.

Training of Facilitators

Those who have participated in the preceding workshops will be given opportunity to apply for further training as group facilitators. From these applicants a number will be selected, not so much on the basis of academic background, but on the basis of attitudes. The person who is relatively non-defensive, who relates in a real and genuine way to others, who is aware of and can express his feelings, who is capable of a sensitive empathy with the feelings of others, who has shown that he cares for others in a non-possessive way, will be the type of person selected.

Such individuals will be given a two-week residential training workshop, during a summer vacation period, in which there will be ample opportunity for

reading, listening to recordings of groups with a variety of leaders, for seeing movies of group experience and interpersonal relationships, as well as for further participation in basic encounter groups. The various procedures advocated by different leaders will be tried out.

As a supplement to, or an alternative to this workshop, these trainees would be encouraged to apply for the internship training program or the workshop for educators offered by the National Training Laboratories.

With this amount of preparation, each trainee can work as a co-facilitator with a member of the outside staff in conducting groups during the ensuing year. When it is mutually agreed that he is competent to handle groups on his own, he will do so, with one or more outside staff members serving as consultants.

In this way, a foundation has been laid for an ongoing change and ferment in the system. Further group experiences for faculty members, for parents, for administrators, can be held. New vertical groups can be formed. By this time too, new ways of working, impossible now to foresee, will have developed and can be tried out. Thus, as the original professional group withdraws to a less active role, the educational system will have incorporated into itself a facilitative function which will mean continuous openness to innovation, continuous change.

It is quite possible that other systems will wish to utilize the services of these facilitators in inaugurating a program of change in their own organizations. This will only make the process more pervasive.

Risks and Objections

Thus far the plan has been presented in positive terms. What are its dangers? What criticisms may be made of it? In what ways may it go wrong?

Possibility of Damage to Individuals

There is often fear that the openness of a group experience, the revealing of heretofore hidden feelings, may result in damage to the person. This risk exists, but it is very small. In followup questionnaires of nearly 500 persons who had been members of groups for which I had been responsible, two felt that the experience had been damaging rather than helpful. This is a serious matter, and needs further study, but it indicates that the fear is almost entirely unjustified.

Possibility of Too Rapid a Change

Administrators—particularly those who have prided themselves on the "smooth-running" quality of their organization, may fear that the plan as outlined would produce too much change. It cannot be denied that when problems, especially interpersonal problems, are faced openly rather than being swept under the rug; when interpersonal relationships are substituted in place of roles and rules; when learning and its facilitation becomes the focus rather than teaching, a certain amount of constructive turbulence is inevitable. It should be stressed that the proposed plan does not pretend to solve all problems—instead it substitutes the problems of a *process-centered* organization for those of an organization aimed toward a static stability.

Possibility of Rejection by the Community

The plan outlined would set the educational system on a path, a direction, rather sharply different from that of the ordinary school or university. This involves the risk of too great a discrepancy between the directions approved by the community, and the directions being taken. This risk has been partially decreased by the involvement of board members and parents in the intensive group experience. Yet it cannot be denied that in every community there are individuals and groups who are devoted to a return to the past, to rigid views of what a school or university should be, and who are deeply frightened by freedom of thought, choice and action, and by the rapid change which characterizes the modern world. Since these individuals and groups would be unlikely to avail themselves of opportunities for an intensive group experience, precisely because it might involve change, they represent a difficult problem to which no easy or pat answer seems possible. Much depends on the context within which the individual system exists.

Possibility of Criticism by Professional Groups

One element of the plan which is likely to arouse criticism and even indignation on the part of psychologists, psychiatrists, and others professionally involved in the field of interpersonal relationships, is the training of faculty members and administrators as group facilitators. The argument is that a full professional training with a Ph.D. or an M.D. is a necessity if an individual is to undertake such a function.

There is solid evidence, too lengthy to cite here, that this is a mistaken view. An outstanding example is the work of Rioch (1963) showing that selected housewives can be given training in a year's time which enables them to carry on therapy with disturbed individuals—therapy which in its quality is indistinguishable from the work of experienced professionals. Thus, the goal and procedure outlined has good precedent. This does not guarantee that it will be free from attack by professional groups.

The Financial Aspects

Though there are several reasons why the intensive group experience has been much more heavily used in industry and in government (State Department, Internal Revenue Service, etc.) than in education, one of the most important reasons has been financial. The costs are considerable, and involve primarily two items. The first is the cost of the facilitative professional staff to inaugurate the program, a cost which decreases as the newly trained facilitators from the system take over. The second is the cost of the residential workshops, which amount to approximately \$15 per day per person and up, depending on accommodations. The usual public educational institution is not prepared to put this kind of money into its own self-improvement, where industry is both willing, able and eager to do this.

Hence, funds should be sought—either by the educational system or by the organization which has been called upon for professional help (WBSI, NTL, WTL, etc.)—to finance these extra costs. The U. S. Office of Education would seem to be a natural source, or a foundation. One should not proceed with

too easy an optimism, because all fund-granting agencies tend to be both conservative and bureaucratic (in spite of their protestations) and a plan for producing significant and pervasive change in education may be looked upon with suspicion. Clearly, what is needed is an organization which not only has funds to grant but is imaginative and forward looking in its policies. Such organizations are not numerous.

Naturally, the exact amounts needed will depend on the size of the educational system. Hence, no estimates of any kind are attempted here.

Assessment of Change

What has been described is a program of action rather than research. Yet one could hardly undertake such a series of steps responsibly without making some provision for assessment of the change, or lack of change, which occurs. There are a variety of ways in which such assessment could be made. One possible procedure is as follows.

The assessment before any of the program begins, made by well-qualified observers, can be compared with the assessment at intervals after the program has begun. Since it is possible that the observers may themselves become biased by continuing association with the system, additional observers should make an assessment at one given followup point. Their assessment can be compared with that of the original team, both at the beginning and at the same followup point.

It is suggested that each assessment team observe and interview a representative sample of administrative, supervisory, and teaching staff and students at each assessment point. They

will make descriptive assessments and ratings on at least the following dimensions of implicit assumptions, attitudes and behaviors, educational methods and innovations:

1. The organizational theory implicit in the operation of the educational system;
2. The educational assumptions or implicit educational philosophy;
3. The implicit assumptions as to personality development and human growth;
4. The attitudes of superiors and subordinates to each other; the attitudes of teachers and students to each other;
5. The level of morale among all levels of the system;
6. The major educational methods in use;
7. The degree to which self-initiated learning is encouraged;
8. The degree to which constructive educational innovations are being developed and employed;
9. The degree to which constructive interpersonal behaviors—open communication, trust, openness to new ideas, flexibility of organizational structure—exist in the system.

For the widest possible range of assessment information, it is suggested that such teams as the following be involved to make these observations and ratings:

1. A team composed of an educator, an organization consultant, and a social psychologist. This team would make repeated assessments, before the program began, and every six months for two or three years.
2. A similar team which would make only one assessment during the second year of the program, its judgments to be compared with the judgments of the first group, with the aim of discounting possible bias.
3. A team composed of an administrator,

a faculty member, and a student from the educational system. The information obtained by this team might be somewhat less objective, but it is likely that it would be much richer in detail. At least two assessments, one at the beginning, and one at the end of two years, would be made by this team.

A Research Program

The plan which has been described would also provide the possibility for a rigorous research program, studying one or more of the basic encounter groups proposed, in order to determine whether measurable changes in the specified dimensions of attitude and behavior do in fact occur. Such a research would make use of instruments of known reliability, administered to the experimental group and to a matched control group which did not undergo the group experience. These instruments would be administered before and after the group experience, and after a followup period of six months or one year.

Suffice it to say that such a research proposal has been carefully developed, and could be included in the program if desired.

Concluding Remarks

In drawing this paper to a conclusion, I would like to say that I have tried to draw up a practical plan for self-directed change in an educational organization. Every element in the proposal has been tried out and found to be effective. What is new is the weaving of all of these elements into a comprehensive plan which could be used as a pattern not only in one system, but in many.

The only requirements for putting the proposal into action would be the

willingness of one educational system (this would not be difficult) and the financial support of some agency or foundation (and this might be more difficult).

Why have I wished to present such a plan? Because I believe that:

Here is a procedure which is appropriate to the educational needs of our present-day culture;

Here is a plan which is capable of being reproduced in many educational systems at all levels;

This plan draws on the natural, built-in motivation for growth and change which exists in every individual and is latent in every organization;

It does not depend on a submissive acceptance of changes suggested from the outside;

This plan could result in the kind of educational revolution which is needed to bring about confidence in the process of learning, the process of change, rather than in static knowledge.

ANY TAKERS?

References

K. Benne, L. Bradford and R. Lippitt. "The Laboratory Method." In: L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb and K. D. Benne, editors. *T-group Theory and Laboratory Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964. p. 15-45.

N. D. Bowers and R. S. Soar. *Evaluation of Laboratory Human Relations Training for Classroom Teachers. Studies of Human Relations in the Teaching-learning Process: V. Final Report*. U. S. Office of Education Contract No. 8143. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1961.

R. K. Boyer. "A Laboratory Approach to the Improvement of Student-faculty Relations and Educational Systems in Engineering." *NTL Human Relations Training News* 8(2):1-2; 1964.

J. V. Clark and S. A. Culbert. "Mutually Therapeutic Perception and Self-awareness in

a T-group." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 1:180-94; 1965.

T. C. Clark and M. B. Miles. "Part II: The Teachers College Studies, Human Relations Training for School Administrators." *Journal of Social Issues* 10(2): 25-39; 1954.

M. B. Miles. "The T-group and the Classroom." In: L. Bradford, J. Gibb and K. Benne, editors. *T-group Theory and Laboratory Method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964. p. 452-76.

Margaret J. Rioch, E. Elkes, A. A. Flint, B. S. Usdansky, R. G. Newman and E. Sibler. "NIMH Pilot Study in Training Mental Health Counselors." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 33:678-89; 1963.

C. R. Rogers. "The Process of the Basic Encounter Group." In: J. F. T. Bugental, editor. *The Challenge of Humanistic Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (In press.) 

Evaluation as Feedback and Guide

1967 ASCD YEARBOOK

Prepared by the Yearbook Committee

FRED T. WILHELMSEN, Chairman and Editor

- Advocates abolition of the overwhelming burden of grades, marks, tests and credits.
- Proposes instead a simpler and more basic evaluation.
- Reports on a demonstration of this simplified and more objective evaluation in an actual school system.
- Points to a future in which teachers will be free to teach and pupils to learn, and in which evaluation will be a more direct and constructive process.

Eight chapters in four parts:

The Problems and the Possibilities; Evaluation and the Teaching-Learning Process; Evaluation and the Larger Organization; A Look Ahead.

Written by:

Fred T. Wilhelms, Clifford F. S. Bebell, Rodney A. Clark, Walcott H. Beatty, Dorris May Lee, Frances R. Link, Paul B. Diederich and Jack R. Frymier.

Pages: 291

Price: \$6.50

**Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036**

Copyright © 1967 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.