For practical purposes, I have listed in the references to this article only nine recent reviews of the literature on this subject. Because it outlines so succinctly what the vast majority of these well-designed and statistically significant studies conclude, I would like to concentrate on Richard Goranson’s “A Review of Recent Literature on Psychological Effects of Media Portrayals of Violence.” Goranson identifies four major issues:

1. Effects on Learning.—Are children likely to learn and remember new forms of aggressive behavior by watching the kind of violence presented in the mass media? What are the conditions, if any, that encourage the actual performance of aggressive acts learned through the media?

2. Emotional Effects.—Does the repetition of violence in the mass media result in a decreased emotional sensitivity to media violence? Is a decreased emotional sensitivity likely to have any implications for the probability of actual aggressive behavior in real-life situations?

3. The Questions of Catharsis
Does watching the kind of aggression shown in the media result in “aggression catharsis”—a “draining off of aggressive energy”? Does the observation of pain, horror, and suffering result in catharsis?

4. Effects on Aggressive Behavior.—Are there any conditions of observed violence that can serve either to inhibit or to facilitate aggression?

Here is a summary of the research findings regarding each of these issues:

1. Novel, aggressive behavior sequences are learned by children through exposure to aggressive actions shown on television or in films. A large proportion of the aggressive behaviors learned by observation are retained over long periods of time if the responses have been practiced at least once. The following conditions encourage the actual performance of aggression: a similarity between the observed setting and the viewer’s real setting when the observed aggression “worked”; when it wasn’t punished; and when it was the favored and most frequent method used to attain goals.

2. There is a decreased emotional sensitivity to media violence, as a result of the repetition of violence in the mass media. Classical desensitization takes place, as practiced in modern behavior therapy. There is a decreased aggression anxiety and an increased ability to be violent with others.

3. The original studies of Feshbach, which purported to demonstrate “aggression catharsis,” have never been replicated and have been disproved by a number of other studies. These other studies have shown the opposite of catharsis, i.e., an increase in the viewer’s subsequent aggressiveness. There has been no evidence that the observation of pain, horror, and suffering results in catharsis. Goranson speculates that the persistence of a belief in the aggression catharsis notion may stem from a misapplication of Aristotle’s original concept of catharsis, which applied only to the “tragic” feelings of grief and fear that could be discharged through active expression by the audience during the performance.

4. Aggression can be inhibited by (1) reminders that the aggression was morally wrong in terms of the viewer’s own ethical principles and (2) an awareness of the bloody, painful aftermath of aggression.

Aggression can be facilitated by (1) the cue properties of available targets, i.e., stimuli in the postobservation period that have some association with previously observed violence—an association between the victim of the observed violence, and the target of the viewers aggression—and (2) the general state of arousal of the aggressor, e.g., when, in experimental settings, the subject is verbally attacked and then exposed to film violence, he later is more aggressive than one who wasn’t attacked before being exposed to film violence.

**Surgeon General’s Report**

*Television and Social Behavior—A Technical Report to the Surgeon General’s Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior* was published in 1972. This five-volume report, summarizing the results of 23 separate research projects, comes to the same conclusions as Goranson did in 1969—and as researchers did as far back as 1950. Why, then, does so much controversy persist about this Surgeon General’s Report?

The controversy arises from the sixth volume of this report, a summary volume written by the Scientific Advisory Committee. It is important to note that when this 12-person committee was being formed, a list of 40 social and behavioral scientists who had been recommended to the Surgeon General’s office by the academic community for membership on this committee was presented to representatives of the television industry. The television industry representatives “blackballed” the seven of the 40 listed scientists who had the most outstanding reputations and work in the field of violence research. These seven were replaced by five television network executives. In addition, there was enormous political pressure on the Scientific Advisory Committee to produce a unanimously signed document. As a result, the summary, while it concludes that a causal relationship between violence view-
Television is seen and heard in every type of American home. These homes include children and adults of all ages, embrace all races and all varieties of religious faith, and reach those of every educational background. It is the responsibility of television to bear constantly in mind that the audience is primarily a home audience, and consequently that television’s relationship to the viewers is that between guest and host. . . . By law the television broadcaster is responsible for the programming of his station. He, however, is obligated to bring his positive responsibility for excellence and good taste in programming to bear upon all who have a hand in the production of programs, including networks, sponsors, producers of film and of live programs, advertising agencies, and talent agencies . . . .

Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising. This responsibility cannot be discharged by any given group of programs, but can be discharged only through the highest standards of respect for the American home, applied to every moment of every program presented by television.

In order that television programming may best serve the public interest, viewers should be encouraged to make their criticisms and positive suggestions known to the television broadcasters. Parents in particular should be urged to see to it that out of the richness of television fare, the best programs are brought to the attention of their children . . . .

The presentation of techniques of crime in such detail as to invite imitation shall be avoided. . . . Violence and illicit sex shall not be presented in an attractive manner, nor to an extent such as will lead a child to believe that they play a greater part in life than they do.

Racial or nationality types shall not be shown on television in such a manner as to ridicule the race or nationality.

Television broadcasters should exercise the utmost care and discrimination with regard to advertising material including content, placement and presentation, near or adjacent to programs designed for children. No considerations of expediency should be permitted to impinge upon the vital responsibility towards children and adolescents, which is inherent in television and which must be recognized and accepted by all advertisers employing television.

On the basis of the evidence presented, one can only conclude, as did Liebert and colleagues, that the NAB code “appears to be just a public relations document never intended to quide actual practices.” Indeed, on at least one documented occasion in 1963, when the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) attempted to control excessive commercialism in television by suggesting that the NAB’s own code be used to set the guidelines, the NAB opposed the plan of using its own code and actually organized committees in each state to lobby against it!

In 1968 a consumer organization, Action for Children’s Television (46 Austin St., Newtonville, MA 02160), was formed. It was largely through the efforts of this organization and other consumer groups that the FCC developed some new guidelines for children’s television in November, 1974. All broadcasters are supposed to be in full compliance with these new guidelines by Jan 1, 1976, but there is no evidence from current programming or from announcements of fall 1975 programming that any substantive move toward such compliance has been made.

Some Recommendations and Comments

It is important to remind
ourselves that _prosocial_ behaviors can also be produced and encouraged by television. The best known example of this is "Misterogers’ Neighborhood." There are a number of others, such as "Call It Macaroni," produced by Westinghouse in New York, which takes a group of children to a different part of the country from the one in which they live and teaches them something they have never known or done before; "Big Blue Marble"; "Rainbow Over Seven"; and "Fat Albert and the Cosby Kids."

It would seem to me that the time is long past due for a major, organized cry of protest from the medical profession in relation to what, in political terms, is a national scandal. Such an outcry can and should be accompanied by specific recommendations, based on sound child development principles and the hard data already available to us from 25 years of investigation of the relationship of television violence and aggressive behavior in children, for new kinds of television programming for children and youth.

San Francisco’s Committee on Children’s Television, Inc. (1511 Masonic Ave., San Francisco, CA 94117), a nonprofit organization established by a racially diverse group of parents and professionals dedicated to improving children’s television programs through research and an affirmative, active plan for community participation in broadcasting, has developed a set of _General Guidelines for Selecting Television Programming for Children_. These guidelines should be available in every doctor’s office, hospital clinic, and child health station. They are as follows:

1. Does the program appeal to the audience for whom intended? (A program for 12-year-olds should be different from a program for 6-year-olds.)

2. Does the program present racial groups positively and does it show them in situations that enhance the Third World child’s self-image? (Who has the lead roles? Who is the professional or leader and who is the villain?)

3. Does the program present gender roles and adult roles positively? (Are the men either super-heroes or incompetents? Are the women flighty and disposed to chicanery? Are teenagers portrayed with adult characteristics?)

4. Does the program present social issues that are appropriate for the child viewer and perhaps are something a child can act on at a child’s level? (Litter versus atomic fallout, or pet care versus saving wolves.)

5. Does the program encourage worthwhile ideals, values and beliefs?

6. Does the program present conflict that a child can understand and does it demonstrate positive techniques for resolving the conflict?

7. Does the program stimulate constructive activities and does it enhance the quality of a child’s play?

8. Does the program separate fact from fantasy? Does it separate advertisements from program content?

9. Does the program present humor at a child’s level? (Or is it adult sarcasm, ridicule or an adult remembering what he thought was funny from his childhood?)

10. Does the program have a pace that allows the child to absorb and contemplate the material presented?

11. Does the program have artistic qualities?

12. Has your child seen an appropriate amount of television for the day? (Or is it time to turn off the set?)

Children have neither money nor the vote. We, as parents and as professionals, must be their advocates or they shall have none, for they are certainly no politician’s constituency.

As Williams and Crane have said, “To be silent is to acquiesce, and it is clear that, if we truly care about our children, we cannot be silent.”

_Thoughts for Transfer_

Included in this newsletter, is a reprint of the Annual Report of Dr. Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Foundation. Although Dr. Pifer’s report is directed toward higher education, the thoughts he expresses are equally applicable to the Common School function in America. Because of this, they are included for your study. The reprints were most graciously provided by Dr. Pifer upon request. For his willing generosity, we are most appreciative.

Robert H. Williams
_Editor_
A NEW IN-SERVICE OUTLOOK
by Dr. Richard Finnegan
Curriculum Director
Avacortes S.D. 103
Avacortes, Washington

Whether one prefers to use the term “in-service workshops” or “professional growth activities” (it seems that the nomenclators can’t resist temptation) it is generally agreed that some form of support on the part of school districts to provide teachers an organized, concerted means of improving the efficiency and impact of the school program is a reasonable and worthwhile effort.

Traditionally, it has been assumed that the responsibility for increased professional proficiency lay with the teachers, both in terms meeting state or district requirements and in providing their own financial support. During the last several years, however, there has been an increasing trend to support staff development at the district level with either funds, release time or a combination of both. Extra pay or extra work, early dismissal or hiring substitutes to release teachers are a few of the ways the format for in-service may take form. Obviously, a determination needs to be made as to the most appropriate method to fit the circumstances of a particular district. In order to make this determination, a number of factors need to be taken into account including the intended breadth and depth of the in-service, the attitude of community and staff, the length of the school day and in most districts, the dog-wagging tail transportation system.

Usually, in-service programs are designed to meet a number of needs which may commonly include implementation of newly adopted instructional programs and/or materials, to strengthen an existing program, to introduce staff to new materials, methods, or ideas and to accommodate the perceived needs of staff.

The Washington Administrative Code requires teachers to attend meetings and “... other professional work ...” required by administrators or school boards for the purpose of improving school services. While this implies definite administrative or board direction, it has become common practice to actively involve staff in determining need and content of in-service programs and in presenting such programs to their colleagues.

Commonly, the focus of in-service programs is determined in two primary and overlapping ways. First, by district needs originating from new adoptions requiring in-service for appropriate classroom implementation and from the need for updating and rejuvenating existant programs. Secondly, in-service receives impetus from teachers who express request for in-service in some particular field or for specific purposes.

It also appears from the literature that, other than providing in-service for newly adopted programs or materials, the best source for determining the content of in-service is the teachers themselves. This appears self evident. A staff survey can quickly reveal major areas of in-service need as seen by the teachers and attending to these identified needs generally results in increased proficiency, more commitment to program and an increased receptivity to other forms of in-service.

Often, in-service program development becomes a cooperative effort of the staff, the district and college consultants forming a consortium to plan and conduct training-development sessions over a period of time. One of the more successful and economical processes for in-service development is to recognize expertise within the district. Often, the needed expertise to organize and carry out high quality in-service is overlooked on one’s own district. Utilizing district staff for this purpose tends to develop a climate of confidence and responsibility in staff and contributes to increased proficiency among active participants.

Often, the question of when to hold in-service is important. Generally, studies indicate that staff and administrator response to in-service is most positive during the months of October, February, March and April. November, prior to Thanksgiving, seems satisfactory and reaction to utilizing September and January appears split probably because of the prior period of inactivity. May appears to be a wind-down
month and response to use December and the summer months for in-service is negative for obvious reasons.

Essentially, in-service development should be built upon a number of components. Primary among these are:

1. Development of a regular system for needs assessment which gives strong consideration to teacher input.

2. Incorporation of incentives for in-service which may include tuition, extra pay, release time, etc.

3. Development of a joint effort including staff, administration and college representatives.

4. Utilization of staff in organization and presentation.

5. Concentration of effort in the months of October and February through April unless particular circumstances strongly warrant adjustment.

6. Evaluation of in-service to determine success in meeting needs of teachers, districts and students.

Obviously, in final analysis, those who operate in-service programs must continually seek to determine the benefits that are accrued to the students. Without that sharp focus, in-service becomes something resembling a professional-educational circus, containing many special wonders but with little lasting positive effect.

\[\text{\textit{MAN consists of body, mind and imagination.}}\]
\[\text{\textit{His body is faulty, his mind untrustworthy,}}\]
\[\text{\textit{BUT}}\ldots\]
\[\text{\textit{His imagination has made him remarkable.}}\]
\[\ldots \text{JOHN MASEFIELD}\]

\[\text{POLITICIZATION OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT}\]
\[\text{Dr. Rod Hermes, Superintendent}\]
\[\text{Clarkston Public Schools}\]
\[\text{Clarkston, Washington}\]

Dean James Quillan of Stanford University noted some years ago that two of the most common and, at the same time, most undesirable means of affecting curriculum decisions are by legislation and by default. Both of these adverse means came into play in the recent session of the Washington Legislature. A verdict on the final results of their action will have to await the passage of time—as is the norm for curriculum decisions.

The Legislature, in its wisdom, enacted two major pieces of legislation that will have an impact on curriculum. Senate Bill 3026 is aimed at accountability through requiring districts to identify student learning objectives in grades K thru 8 in Language Arts, Reading, and Math. It further requires that “such
learning objectives” shall be measurable as to the actual student attainment and evaluated at least annually. Substitute House Bill 1345 requires annual administration of a state developed achievement test to all students in grades 4, to assess basic skills. The results are to be made available to the legislature and to local school districts to “ascertain the achievement levels and input variables of their children as compared with other students within the district, the state, and if applicable, the nation.” Additionally, the testing bill requires random sample testing of students in grades 8 and 11 to “evaluate how Washington students in these grades compare to students in the same grades tested in other comparable national achievement surveys”.

The Legislature was rather clear in its stance that the above legislative actions pursuant to curriculum concerns, were necessary as a “reform” and to promote “accountability” because the education community had defaulted in their responsibility to the children they served and to the community that pays the bill.

Lest we succumb completely to a “knee jerk” reaction to the negative aspects of legislating curriculum, a pause for further analysis is in order.

First, it should be noted that this spate of educational reform had a “straw man” beginning as a defense erected by the legislature to fend off attacks on their inability or reluctance to come to grips with our antique and inadequate funding mechanism, or at least as a means to buy time. In this regard, they have been successful in moving through two legislative sessions with no substantive financial reform by insisting that education reform must come first. The fact that both of these pieces of legislation were originally introduced in a considerably more adverse form than they took on in final passage, is a tribute to educators who provided wise counsel and to legislators who accepted it. Not all legislators bowed at the feet of the “straw man.”

Second, we should recognize that the requirements incumbent in the legislation are not necessarily negative in all of their provisions. A separate analysis is in order. In the case of Senate Bill 3026, requiring the development of objectives, the legislative mandate is not dissimilar from the thrust found in school districts across the state to more precisely defined learning objectives, in terms of outcomes. It leaves this determination at the local level and merely requires that objectives be developed, and that there be an evaluation of their attainment level. Thus, to many districts it is requiring what has already been accomplished.

In others it may aid in providing impetus to finish what has been started. Some will undoubtedly see it as unwarranted interference. It is difficult to cast as totally adverse, a concept that has occupied the time and energy of so many professional educators over the past decade. The fact that it becomes incumbent upon the district would not in itself seem harmful to students, if a properly professional job is done in objective development, activity identification, and evaluation.

The testing bill—Substitute House Bill 1345 has much more potential for adversity. It too, however, is not totally without merit. It is true that onerous use of comparisons will be an irresistible temptation in some quarters, and that the entire concept of “every pupil testing” is questionable on a statewide basis. On the other hand, data may be forthcoming, if properly used, that could be of help to the educational community in pursuing its mission. The legislation does place responsibility for the development of the instrument in the hands of our state education agency and, with the exception of one grade, every pupil testing is avoided. If it can be assumed that the drafters of the bill had as one goal the heightening of attention to the importance of instruction and achievement in the basic skills at the early grades and if this results in greater attention to achievement in the basic skills, without adverse side effects, it could be a beneficial outcome. Nonetheless, the testing bill requires careful watching to prevent abuse and misuse.

The motivation that led the Legislature to pass these two bills was obviously not purely educational. It is the political atmosphere that prevailed at the time of passage that is most bothersome. As we work to build from the positive potential of this legislation, we should also remind ourselves of the pitfalls of “building” curriculum through legislation or through default. Let us hope that this pattern does not become habit forming, and let us work to that end.
How to Live with State-Wide Testing
Robert Grunewald (Curriculum)
and
Toshio Akamine (Measurement)
Washington State University
Department of Education

As is by this time well understood in schools of the state, the last session of the Washington State Legislature passed several accountability measures which have direct impact on schools. Two of these were a bill SB (3026) which requires districts to designate learning objectives for K-8 reading, language arts and mathematics, and a bill (Substitute H. B. 1345) which requires state-wide testing of pupils in these basic skills areas. The testing bill encourages districts to test pupils at second grade for diagnostic purposes, requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to test a sample of 2,000 pupils at grade eight and eleven, and also requires S.P.I. to prepare and conduct an every pupil test of achievement in the designated subjects at grade four. The results of this last test are to be compiled and made available to the legislature, school districts and the public.

Many of us have already taken a position on various features of state-wide testing. The idea is not new to the nation or the state. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, although sharply criticized in earlier stages, has come to be accepted as a sophisticated index of educational attainment of various broad groups and in a considerable range of subject areas. This is being accomplished with minimum threat to individuals and districts and yet has provided useful data for educational planning.

In 1974 the Washington Legislature placed an item in the S.P.I. budget for pilot studies of various approaches to accountability. In connection with this provision, the Basic Skills Assessment and Delivery System Advisory Committee was appointed in Spring 1974. Its twenty-two members included representatives from the Legislature, administrators, teachers and various professional organizations. President Richard Usitalo was the representative from W.A.S.C.D. (Ted Knutsen is now serving.) This committee provided guidance to S.P.I. in designing and implementing the accountability measures piloted under that funded program. Among the activities were two E.S.D. based projects to help local districts develop “grass roots” approaches to accountability and several measures related to the development and administration of materials and procedures for testing a sample of pupils in basic skills at various grade levels over a cycle of years. One of the findings of that year’s activities was that “an assessment of a small but carefully selected sample of students can produce valid generalizations about the achievement of all students at a given grade level.” These generalizations could be valuable at the state level for providing technical assistance for district curriculum and instructional improvement in the basic skills areas. The S.P.I. began development of a testing program allowing maximum participation of districts in the selection of objectives and test items and using a sampling technique to reduce costs and still provide state wide data similar to that in the National Assessment program. An outgrowth of that development is the scheduled assessment of mathematics achievement this spring which uses a selected sample of fourth grade pupils.

In requiring every pupil testing the bill passed by the Legislature did not follow the findings of the pilot program. The bill passes was not sponsored by the Superintendent of Public Instruction nor approved by the Advisory Committee. It represented a compromise between those legislators who wanted every pupil testing at a number of grade levels and various other groups, some drawing upon the S.P.I. experience. Besides the greater costs involved in every pupil testing ($300,000 was appropriated to support the activities of S.H.B. 1345) the approach mandated requires a different kind of test than had been the objective of state planning, one that is reliable for individual pupils other than population groups. This makes it difficult to capitalize upon the experience of states, such as Maine, which have followed the N.A.E.P. model. In addition to the every pupil vs. sampling issue there are other possible questions concerning state-wide testing as adopted:

What are the implications of concentrating attention and resources of three skills in the face of the wide range of other skills critically needed for survival in the modern world?
Will "what the tests measure" exert a narrowing or restricting influence on instruction within the skill areas selected?

How can we translate test data into teaching and learning activities enabling valid diagnosis and prescription?

How can schools, teachers and pupils be protected from "scapegoating" on charges based on partial data?

How can it be assured that, after the expense of effort of testing, the results will call forth necessary measures and resources to capitalize on results?

Will it be possible to guard against the assumption that the particular testing approach funded will supply all the data needed for educational planning? (Many districts are already using a wide variety of data gathering procedures).

Some possible desirable outcomes of the impending program may be:

The sampling of students at grades eight and eleven may give guidance to future testing legislation.

The data provided may give legislators and the public a new confidence in public schools of the state.

Perhaps the process of determining objectives and selecting appropriate test approaches can provide opportunity for wider involvement of educational groups and the public, this further opening up the system.

Members of W.A.S.C.D. have an important stake in the development of an accountability system that will serve the needs of pupils in Washington Schools. The current public concern for quality and efficiency in public education can be used to advance the cause of educational planning and the improvement of instruction. To this end we should strive to:

Involve a greater segment of the population in the setting of goals and priorities.

Improve our assessing and evaluating procedures so that considerable additional information besides that obtained from the mandated testing is available for interpreting and program planning.

Plan now for accurate interpretation and fair dissemination of the results.

Take whatever measures are possible to prevent harmful effects of misuse of tests and test results on teaching and learning process.

Utilize district and higher education staff to support S.P.I. efforts to shape the proposed system to the most profound educational needs of pupils.

Work to couple testing and resources so that the effort will result in improved curriculum planning and instruction.

Even at this late date inform local legislators concerning the possibilities and inherent dangers in various approaches to state-wide testing.

Lastly, we can remember that public education still has a large reservoir of public support and good will. State-wide testing may not lend itself to relaxation and enjoyment, but we can listen judiciously to what the legislature interprets as public demand and use our professional judgment and influence to make this effort better than it otherwise would be.
BASIC EDUCATION

Is there a vast over-simplification occurring in the field which ends up as Basic Education’s being arithmetic, word attack skills, spelling and writing? Here are some examples of what has been thought should be considered basic:

a. Reading a newspaper.
b. Reading road signs, warning signs, etc.
c. Writing business or personal letters.
d. Writing short memoranda.
e. Filling out forms such as applications.
f. Counting money, making change.
g. Verifying a pay check or bank account.
h. Comparing prices of consumer goods.
i. Computing interest.
j. Listening to, understanding, and following simple, oral instructions.
k. Filling out a voter’s ballot or using a voting machine.

There are other points of view which need consideration. Even the Council for Basic Education includes geography, government, science, history and foreign languages, although they place Latin and economics in the grey area.

Another view says that Basic Education is:

1. Acquiring the skills of locating information to use in problem solving.
2. The ability to categorize information into retrievable units.
3. Acquiring the ability to ask the right questions.
4. Acquiring the knowledge that problems are solved through rational thought.
5. Acquiring the skills and abilities useful in all fields and largely transferable from one to another.
6. Acquiring the ability to perceive problems and solve them.
7. The ability to understand people, to communicate with them, to deal with them well, as individuals and in groups.
8. The ability to organize, to structure data into an ordered pattern, to marshal scarce resources for given ends.
9. The ability to devote full effort to the task at hand, and

10. Memory.

The difference which I see between these viewpoints is the difference which you find in those who can and those who don’t. Basic Education in the first sense will not lead to the commitments needed in this world.

The schools of America serve many publics. Not all of them are crying out for “basic education”, and if you ask them to define it, you will find that it must have a broad definition to serve America. Our strength is upon our differences—not our similarities! And the job of the schools is to increase that difference, not to lessen it.

I realize that vociferous groups are calling for basic education as a way of controlling expenditures of the schools. That’s one way to achieve it, and school people can perhaps achieve popularity by bending to the will of those groups.

It will take real leadership and courage to stand in front of the criticism and to speak out for good education for all in this diverse and pluralistic society.

We have a choice to stand and say, “The products of our schools can count money and make change”.

OR

“The products of our schools can reason well and make value judgements based upon studied thought and discourse.”

I hope we’ll opt the high road this time. This quote is an appropriate one on which to close:

“Not armies, not nations, have advanced the race; but here and there, in the course of ages, an individual has stood up and cast his shadow over the world.”

E. H. Chaplin

Robert H. Williams
President-Elect
WSASCD
April, 1976

FIVE WAYS TO WIN THE RESPECT OF CHILDREN

1. Firmness. The young have a need for a “tower of strength.” That “tower” is frequently provided by an adult who makes clear the standards to which children are expected to adhere. Until a child acquires experience on his own, he wants to rely on the experience of his elders. Until he learns self-discipline, he will welcome your guiding hand.

2. Fairness. Children recognize the reasonableness of a situation as well as its unreasonableness. They will admire the person who is fair to himself, to the rules, to the child, and to the child’s friends.

3. Challenges. The adult who challenges the child’s ambition, his skills and his imagination will gain a friend. Each challenge should be a bit beyond the child’s achievement, but not so far that it will seem impossible for the child to reach, and with each challenge — a dose of encouragement.
4. Helpfulness. Call it service. Or call it concern for the child. Children expect adults to have concern and be able to make clear explanations of subject matter. But children show added respect for the person that shows intelligent interest in their feelings and needs for self-fulfillment.

5. Cheerfulness. Children need to feel that the adults around them are confident, competent, and happy in solving the problems of living. They respect above all the person who faces problems with good humor, faith and assurance. The final proof that a person is "grown-up" is his ability to take a joke on himself.

FOUR WAYS TO LOSE THE RESPECT OF CHILDREN

1. Threatening. Threats set a price on disobedience. If the child is willing to pay the price, he disobeys. There is always the danger that a threat will overstep the bounds of reason. Designed to instill fear, it fails to dissuade, and then he who threatens is in trouble. If he doesn't carry out the threat, he weakens his authority. If he does, he loses respect.

2. Inconsistency. A person is inconsistent when he punishes the child for an offense and lets another go unpunished for the same offense. Inconsistency goes hand in hand with unfairness, and indecision.

3. Showing temperament. The adult who lets his feelings come to the surface every time things do not flow smoothly is in danger of losing the children's respect. In one major survey of children's opinions, they indicated they have little regard for a person who "flies off the handle," or who is unpredictable and is either hard-boiled or overly sweet.

4. Belittling. Make fun of a child, his work, his playmates, his goals, his possessions and you become smaller in the child's eyes yourself. Belittling can take many forms--the worst of which is to disgrace a child before his fellow pupils.

Reprinted from the Wisconsin ASCD Newsletter
March, 1976

IT'S ABOUT TIME TO THINK OF MOTIVATING THE TEACHING STAFF
Dr. Thomas N. Turner, Associate Professor
University of Tennessee
Knoxville

Having a highly motivated teaching staff is not an important thing, to twist a line from the late king of football coaches. It is everything. That is, it is everything if a school or system is to do more than go through the motions of educating children. Yet, more important as staff-motivation is, it is often neglected or given little attention as a supervisory responsibility. This is partially because teaching is assumed to be a self motivating profession. The individuals who choose teaching as a career are supposed to be dedicated and have high levels of professional and moral attitudes. Being motivated is seen as the teacher's own responsibility - not that of those in supervisory roles.

This has been a convenient assumption to make. The only problem is that the self motivation assumption does not work. Every teaching staff is not excited about teaching or about their school and system. Every teaching staff is not as effective as it should be. Still, few school systems have been engaged in staff motivation. Indeed, a cycle of "blame" psychology or "scape-goat" psychology has been established for the schools. Everybody blames everyone else for the sorry state of education. It is a glib, an easy, a natural solution, from parents, to children, to schoolboard, to teachers, to colleges of teacher education, to principals, to supervisors, ad infinitum— everyone can identify countless weaknesses. It is simply easier to blame teachers for their lack of motivation than to assume the responsibility for doing anything about it.
From blaming, the next step has been police action. Education has certainly not been lax in this regard. Rules of conduct for teachers exist in every system. Curriculum builders have even attempted to avoid the problems attendant to teacher motivation by developing learning materials which are "teacher-proof" or require little or no thinking or thoughtful behavior from teachers. A more recent phenomenon has been that part of the thrust for accountability and behavioral objectives has been the need to force teachers into more careful forethought.

The difficulty with coercive action is that staff motivation can no more be forced or policed into being than it can be assumed. Coercion does not work either. The education profession has not really benefited from attempts to motivate teachers by means of the process by which they themselves are evaluated.

Some school systems seem to depend altogether upon the threat of evaluation to keep teachers actively involved in self, professional and program improvement. Fear is too often the motivator. This is a clear misuse of evaluation. Sound evaluation does not have the purpose of threatening or causing fear. It is intended, rather, as a guide to continuing activity. Judgmental aspects of such evaluation are necessary and important. However, judgmental evaluation is not a way of motivating teachers. The school staff and evaluation program systems which are most effective seem to be those which can correctly assume a high level of staff motivation. When evaluation is used in a punitive threatening manner, it works in a way similar to punishment in the classroom. That is, it provides a method of controlling the most undesirable individuals and of keeping a minimum level of behavior, but it does not cause anyone to go much beyond minimum standards. To some personalitites this invites undercover violation. Personal gratification of the evaluators by those being evaluated is also a possible and often undesirable side effect. This invites personal and professional dishonesty as well as a damaging false sense of personal importance on the part of the evaluator. When this happens, the evaluation procedure loses its effectiveness. Any staff motivational value which it might hold disappears. Disenchantment and low staff morales are almost certain to occur.

Requiring and evaluating motivation then, seem to be counter productive to their own ends. Assuming motivation is foolish. The fault of both ideas is that underlying, often unstated assumption that motivation is the personal professional responsibility of the individual teacher. This is a tremendous oversimplification. Like most oversimplifications it is partially true but not essentially true. One cannot ignore that teachers should be personally motivated and held accountable to act accordingly. However, the teaching situation must be such that it inspires, nurtures and furthers that motivation. There is a basic supervisory responsibility to motivate staff. Teachers are human beings. Like all human beings their motivation is complex, changing, and dependent upon factors in the school situation which they do not control. It is not their responsibility alone to maintain their motivation. It is the school system, through its supervisory personnel, which is in the last analysis responsible for maintaining the morale and motivation.

A logical place to begin is with the things that motivate people to become teachers to begin with. A number of studies have attempted to identify the psychological characteristics of teachers and the various factors which turn teachers on to teaching. Masling and Stern (1966) made one such attempt to categorize and describe the motivators of teachers which were subconscious. The motivation for teaching which they identified were: (1) practical or pragmatic; (2) status striving; (3) nurturant (want to mother); (4) non-directive (want to help development of pupil independence); (5) critical (want reform and improvement); (6) pre-adult fixated (prefer society of children); (7) orderly (want to regulate behavior); (8) dependent (seeking security and reassurance); (9) exhibitionists (attention seeking); (10) dominant (seeking reassurances of personal superiority). Other studies have used different classification systems. Almost all seem to point to complexity of motives for which individuals enter teaching. This very complexity itself must be given consideration in proving the motivation of a teaching staff. The very first supervisory consideration, then, should be to provide individuals with the opportunities to grow in relation to those motivations they relate to best.

Intermeshed with the diverse individual personality motivations is an equally varied set of factors present in the school situation. Fox and his associates (1974, p. 19) have labelled these as school climate factors and point out their effect upon students and teachers alike. They identified eight interdependent general school climate factors: respect; trust; high morale; opportunities for input; continuous academic and social growth; cohesiveness; school renewal; and caring. Careful examination reveals a close possible
relationship between the factors involved in school climate and the motivations for teaching. This would be an almost unavoidable conclusion whether one depended on the illustrative lists exempted from the literature or on one's own careful conceptualization of the two. This is quite natural since both relate closely to human needs and to the recognition of teachers as human beings with such personal needs.

The supervisory responsibility with regards to maintaining and developing staff motivation, then, is a significant one. It includes a careful evaluation of individual teacher motivation and needs. Further, development of programs which best recognize and nurture those general human motivational needs in ways appropriate to teachers are vital to the improvement of instruction. The remainder of this article deals briefly with several ideas for developing staff motivation. All of the ideas are simple and direct. None of these is especially new. It is perhaps their combination and focus which differentiate them.

A Few Guidelines for Motivating Teachers

1. **Make Teachers feel as though they are part of the decision making process.**

At the action end of education this is simply recognition of the facts of life. Teachers can make or break any decision made by supervisors regarding curriculum by their actions. They are more likely to implement decisions in which they have participated. Often educators in supervisory positions fail to recognize and realize the real dangers of tokenism and lip service with regard to faculty decision making. Pseudo-democracy is more damaging in the long run than open dictatorship. False decision making freedom makes personnel feel they are held in contempt, thought of as stupid. It frustrates teachers in their inability to deal with what they know to be the “real” situation. Pseudo-democracy is too "slippery" to confront but too false in its manipulative style to do anything but demoralize in the long run.

2. **Continually work atconvincing the teaching staff they are good.**

“Nothing succeeds like success” is an ancient cliche’. Cliche’ though it may be, the maxim has truth. There is a momentum effect in success that is very observable in sports and entertainment. Teams lose and win in streaks. Momentum is just as important in teaching. Success orientation and belief in self is important to the “Self-fulfilling prophesy” idea has received a great deal of attention in recent years. If it has validity for the teaching art, it has as much validity for the development of teachers. Recognizable as a factor in what individuals think of themselves, is how they feel others think of them.

3. **Be as concerned, if not more concerned, with communicating to teachers positive feedback from the school community as with forwarding the negative.**

This is often minimal and more often ignored. It is easy to take credit instead of passing it. In fact, principals and supervisors need to explore ways of generating such positive feedback. Teacher appreciation days and awards should be part of every community. Ways should be found to show recognition of good quality teaching in younger as well as experienced teachers.

4. **Point out and accentuate to staff the unique features of the programs of which they are a part and in which they can take special pride.**

Central office or supervisory programs cannot be substituted or camouflaged as staff involved programs. But those programs which are instructionally innovative or experimental should be recognized as professional accomplishments.

5. **Provide as much publicity for groups and individuals, both children and teachers, as possible.**

Call attention to staff and students and what they are doing. It represents recognition of both.

6. **Cultivate an atmosphere of mutual professional trust among staff.**

Professional trust is a word which carries several meanings. To ignore any one of these meanings is
to cause the trust pattern to be ineffective. Among the multiple “trusts” essential for a teaching staff are trusts in the integrity, the ability, the concern, and the friendship of ones colleagues. Where these qualities are lacking in a staff, there is no “jell” or cohesiveness.

7. Recognize the validity of differences in teaching style.

Many teachers are motivated by their own autonomy and individuality. This individuality is an essential ingredient in all superior teachers. Many schools today seem to be destroying that quality. The attempt is to raise quality by standardization. The net result is more record keeping and regimentation and less teaching and excitement about teaching.

8. Convince teachers that the supervisors stand behind them.

This requires action as well as promise, and it is essential at every level of supervision. It implies a two-way confidence and loyalty between staff members and supervisors. The honesty factor is important in that once a faculty member feels betrayed there is a grass-fire kind of spread of disinterest that cannot be stopped.

9. Reduce the paperwork and let the teachers know it.

No teacher is motivated to spend a life-time in record keeping. Where jobs of this sort can be consolidated or diverted from teachers, they should be. Any expansion of record keeping roles of teachers should be carefully considered.

10. Be concerned with the personal problems of staff members.

These will have effect on teaching performance. A supervisor who can deal sympathetically with deserving situations increases his or her own effectiveness. One who can only think of the rules creates nothing but hostility.

11. Show that there is a sincere belief on the part of the supervisors that the staff is highly motivated.

The highly motivated teacher needs to be recognized as such. A little illusion may do more good than harm for the teacher whose motivational drives are in doubt. Motivation either feeds on itself and grows, or dies.

Conclusion

Motivation of teaching staff is a crucial concern. Supervisors of teachers need to give more thought and action to this area. In-service programs to increase teacher effectiveness should never be organized without giving thought to this concern. Staff motivation as a key focus of in-service improvement has a great deal of merit. To assume a high level of motivation as simply requisite to being a teacher is a form of complacency that schools cannot afford.
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