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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Numerous approaches to the study of teaching have surfaced in recent research designs. According to Dunkin and Biddle, educators who authored the first text on teaching based on research evidence pertaining to classroom behavior, more than 10,000 studies have been published on "teacher effectiveness." They state: "Evidence is now beginning to accumulate concerning the effectiveness of different teaching strategies." They raise many questions based on the synthesis and interpretation of these studies and what the studies are accomplishing when the results are integrated. In most cases, the results are far from definitive.

It seems that much more research has focused on the activities rather than the effects of teaching. Researchers appear to retreat from the study of teacher effectiveness due to perceived difficulty in providing valid information. There seem to be no simple answers in dealing with the problem of teacher effectiveness. According to Travers, one difficulty in doing research in this area is that there is no good


\[2\] Ibid., p. 2.

\[3\] Ibid., p. 16.
theory which might help explain how people in school create a social climate.

While Dunkin and Biddle and Travers make evaluations regarding the need for more research, the writer would like to focus on the area of theory development, particularly Dunkin and Biddle's recommendation: "High priority should be given to the development of explanatory theories concerned with teaching that will integrate concepts already found useful for expressing classroom events, and findings concerning those events." The writer's interest is the integration of useful theories where there is justification.

Because there are important associations and commonality, theories from the fields of communication and education can and should be integrated. Some communication theories seem appropriate to integrate, since many educational research designs include a major emphasis on communication interaction that occurs in classroom events. Furthermore, functional characteristics and commonality of purpose can be noted as being inherent in both communication and education. Both fields of study integrate ideas from many other fields and disciplines. Both embrace methods for altering behavior and attitudes. Both involve ethical concerns and values for the betterment of self and society. Both involve the use of influence and management of human and material resources. Both are concerned with the products of change and with developing critical methods to use in evaluating or analyzing the degree of change.

---


2 Dunkin and Biddle, op. cit., p. 430.
There seems to be confusion in both educational and communication research regarding the theoretical starting point for research. In educational argument, Hall comments that the philosopher and the scientist claim to look at knowledge differently. The philosopher looks at metaphysics for reality, while the scientist looks at epistemology. These opponents are engaged in the task of understanding. Hall asserts: "Feuding among philosophers and psychologists—and especially the intellectual intolerance upon which it is based—is theoretically unjustified." Both the philosopher and the scientist are contributing to the development of theories and both are adding to the body of knowledge.

Communication scholars engage in scholarly debate concerning the starting point for research and what constitutes evidence in research. According to Brockriede, research is a process, and as a process has no single starting point. He does consistently emphasize that philosophical assumptions are fundamental and often underemphasized. Communication research functions similarly to educational research and has developed from an integration of theories and philosophical perspectives. Brockriede affirms that interpretation of philosophical stances are useful and undergird participation in the research process.


7 Ibid., p. 402.


9 Ibid., p. 3.
Philosophical assumptions lead to theories and without philosophers, even though they do disagree, the starting point and theoretical basis for research would be limited. Theories from various philosophical assumptions generally cross disciplinary boundaries, influencing many fields of study. For example, Kerlinger states: "It is quite likely there is no educational theory....It is likely that educational theories are really sociological or psychological theories..." It seems that the recommendation made by Dunkin and Biddle could include crossing disciplinary boundaries to study a theory which may prove to be fruitful to both communication and education research and teaching.

The Study

The writer will investigate the relational theory Martin Buber initiated in his I-Thou philosophy. The question raised by his theory is as follows: Can Martin Buber's I-Thou philosophy be traced as a significant influence in stimulating the development of theories in communication education and humanistic education and does the philosophy lead to a relational emphasis in both? The study will examine the philosophical stance of Martin Buber which is related to the development and integration of theories in the two areas of concern.

Martin Buber's seminal work I and Thou delineates the differences in quality between the I-Thou and I-It relationships. Reciprocity is demonstrated by I-Thou interaction, while the I-It interaction demonstrates little or no mutuality. Central to Buber's theory is the concept that

\[ \text{10 Gephart and Ingle, op. cit., p. 428.} \]
dialogical interaction must be inherently relational. According to Buber in his essays on education, the educator must build mutuality between himself and the pupil. This state can only be accomplished when the child trusts the teacher, and it is the instructor's responsibility to establish the trust basis for the relationship in which teaching can occur. The teacher must experience the student although the student is not yet ready to experience the teacher reciprocally. Teachers build mutuality by seeing the student's reality without losing sight of their own.

The study should:

I. Investigate Buber's I-Thou philosophy and explicate his theory.

II. Trace and analyze his influence on communication education.

III. Analyze the influence of his theory on the development of humanistic education.

IV. Develop implications and interpretation of relational theory for educational practice.

V. Give examples of practical application.

The Problem

Why do education scholars and teachers need to examine a relational theory? John Holt's book How Children Fail shocked educators and parents alike by a searing attack on American education in the 1960's. His focus was largely directed toward the relationship between teachers and students evidenced by the poor quality of communication in most instructional


12 Ibid., pp. 176-179.
setting. He states that students:

...are afraid, bored, and confused.
They are afraid, above all else, of failing, of disappointing or displeasing the many anxious adults around them....
They are confused because most of the torrent of words that pours over them in school makes little or no sense.

Larry Cuban, a humanistic educator, makes an insightful observation when he states: "In authoritarian schools,...beliefs that students have enormous intellectual, emotional, and cultural shortcomings merge with an intrinsic lack of faith in youth...." Furthermore, according to Cuban, students mirror the teacher's attitudes through their expectations of teachers. Cuban observes further:

Students, for example, expect a teacher to lay down rules, hand out tests, demand silence, and assign homework—in short, to run a tight ship. These expectations don't preclude students testing the limits...it is part of the trading off that marks the struggle between the teacher and the class.

Harold Lyon addresses the issue of the teacher/student relationship and the central concern of the humanistic educator. He poses a rhetorical question and then answers it in the following:

Why is it that learning has to be presented in such a way that it becomes unpleasant work? The answer was reached that learning doesn't have to be unpleasant work, but...our educational system seems to make it that way partly by conditioning teachers and faculty to deal only with intellectual content at the expense of feelings.

15 Ibid., p. 78.
This is occurring at a time when students are more deeply than ever in touch with their feelings and alienated from that which is purely intellectual and non-feeling.

For years, the teachers who have been achieving success in the classroom have been practicing what I have labeled as 'humanistic education'--that is, integrating the intellectual content with feelings. There is really nothing new about this approach. These teachers, however, are very rare 'birds.' If a person is lucky, he can recall one or two such humanistic teachers from his past as standing out from the mass of otherwise indistinguishable 'intellectuals.' What is it about our system that prevents more of these beautiful humans from developing?

Carl Rogers extends the criticism when he asserts that the vast majority of schools are locked into a traditional and conventional approach that reduces significant learning to an improbable if not impossible accomplishment. He is hopeful for the future of education if humanistic alternatives become values in the systems of education. He asserts the following:

It is my contention that tomorrow's educator, whether the humblest kindergarten teacher, or the president of a great university, must know, at the deepest personal level, the stance he takes in regard to life. Unless he has true convictions as to how his values are arrived at, what sort of an individual he hopes will emerge from his educational organization, whether he is manipulating human robots, or dealing with free individual persons, and what kind of a relationship he is striving to build with these persons, he will have failed not only his profession, but his culture.

What has been argued thus far is that schools are inhumane institutions where values, rules, roles, and norms stifle the potential learning that might occur in them. The issue is the relationship between

---


18 Ibid., pp. 217-218.
individuals. To alter the situation, as Carl Rogers suggests, people must be the central value of the school, especially with regard to recognizing their internal states. The value of perpetuating institutional goals at the expense of individual self-esteem is not acceptable because youth are the most vulnerable persons and innocent victims in the institution. Relational I-Thou theories seem to get at the very heart of the educational issues.

Why should communication scholars and teachers examine relational theory? Human communication includes the problems of face to face and relational aspects of interaction. Social needs have created the situation. Theories need to deal with basic human needs of self-esteem and belonging. According to Phillips and Metzger, loneliness makes people afraid and unable to make contact with other people. They state:

People who are unable to make intimate relationships with others are lonely. Such people are unable to help others or or to be helped by others. One person, alone, can do little to influence decisions, either social or personal. Lonely people cannot play a role in decision making, even about their own social relations. They find it difficult...to achieve their personal goals.\footnote{Gerald M. Phillips and Nancy J. Metzger, \textit{Intimate Communication}. (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), p. 3.}

People have to meet their basic social needs to be able to grow and survive. O'Neill and O'Neill state:

We do have needs for interdependency, which means sharing our dependencies and needs with others in a way that helps us deal with these needs and grow beyond them. We do need emotional closeness, we do need to know someone cares for us, we do need to love as well as be loved and we also need to grow.\footnote{Bobby R. Patton and Kim Giffin, eds., \textit{Interpersonal Communication in Action}. (New York, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1977), p. 343.
The problem of achieving meaningful relationships is made more
difficult in our society. Hall explains the problem culturally. He
describes the American culture as "low context." Low context means
that there is more dependency on information explicitly coded from
external and diverse sources. The distance between persons and their
sources of information is often confusing in low context cultures. 21

He states:

The level of context determines everything about the
nature of the communication and is the foundation on which
all subsequent behavior rests...In the restricted code of
intimacy in the home, words and sentences collapse and are
shortened....'Talking down' to someone is low-contexting him--
telling him more than he needs to know. 22

American culture has changed rapidly and its mobility has
created numerous problems in relational communication, both intra-
personally and interpersonally. Communication educators have addressed
the problem through the rationale that relational skills can be taught.
In order to develop communication skills, students need to understand
theories. A study of Martin Buber's I-Thou philosophy seems worthwhile
in aiding understanding of relational communication.

Methodology

The writer will utilize the historical method to develop the study.
Auer asserts that the method "may not only create a record of what has
gone before, but also serves as a guide to future developments." 23

21 Edward T. Hall, Beyond Culture. (New York, New York: Anchor

22 Ibid., p. 93.

23 J. Jeffery Auer, An Introduction to Research in Speech. (New
states further: "the historical method results in establishing probabilities, not absolutes."  

In dealing with historical materials, the researcher should engage in criticism. The criticism should be both external and internal. External criticism involves checking the integrity of source material to determine whether it is admissible as evidence.  

Van Dalen states: "He, the researcher, also needs a good 'chronological sense,' a versatile intellect, good common sense, an intelligent understanding of human behavior, and plenty of patience and persistence."  

Internal criticism involves interpreting the meaning the source intended in the documents under consideration.  

An historical study may present perspectives on the future. Problems of the present may be easier to deal with when there is greater understanding of the past. Cook and LaFleur state:  

Any problem will be easier to deal with if we can get some perspective on it, can step back and view it in its context of past and present events. ...A historical perspective can serve the educator involved in educational policy-making, and it can serve any member of the profession in dealing with educational problems.  

---

24 Ibid., p. 29.  
26 Ibid., p. 168.  
27 Ibid., p. 168.  
Limitations Of The Study

The study will be limited to a focus on the relational elements common in communication and education and influenced by Martin Buber's I-Thou philosophy. It will not involve the study of logic or linguistics. It will not involve nonverbal communication theories, because the area of nonverbal communication could be a study within itself in the relational dimension. It will not involve quantitative or empirical evidence about communication interaction in either the field of education or communication unless qualitative evaluative statements have been asserted by the researcher or critic. For example, Flanders' study (1963) espoused the "two-thirds" law that presents evidence to indicate that teachers talk two-thirds of the time in classrooms. This has lead some critics to assert that there is too much teacher talk in the classroom. Methods or techniques of teaching will not be considered as ends in themselves, but will be analyzed and evaluated only as they are associated with relational goals.

Sources

Due to the diversity of areas which Martin Buber's philosophy influenced, the writer will call attention to major resources which are limited by this study. R.G. Smith's translation of I and Thou completed in 1937 and available in second edition since 1958 was used by researchers and commentators in this study. A second major source is I and Thou translated in 1970 by Walter Kaufmann. Kaufmann wrote a helpful introductory section to give his explanation of the content.

Dunkin and Biddle, op. cit., p. 54.
Other major works include *Between Man and Man*, translated by R. G. Smith, *The Knowledge of Man*, translated by M. Friedman and R. G. Smith, and *Pointing the Way*, translated by Maurice Friedman.

The major secondary source for Buber's thought is Martin Buber: *The Life of Dialogue* by Maurice Friedman. It is the only single-volume comprehensive version of Buber's thought. It is systematically presented and has received widespread acclaim in both the United States and England. Martin Buber sought to publish the book in German, Hebrew, and Japanese. It is the first study of its kind to apply Buber's philosophy to many fields such as theory of knowledge, philosophical anthropology, education, psychotherapy, ethics, social and political philosophy, and religion. The volume also contains the most complete list of works by him and about him.

Several dialogic theorists in communication enlarge the theory. John Stewart's article "Philosophic Foundations of Dialogic Communication" links the theory to communication and teaching. Johannesen's article "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue" seems influential. John Poulako's article "The Components of Dialogue" delineates the Self, the Other, and the Between. John Makay and Beverly Gaw describe the characteristics and conditions for dialogue in their book *Personal and Interpersonal Communication: Dialogue with the Self and with Others*.

Much of the relational influence in humanistic education came through psychology, particularly Martin Buber's influence on Carl Rogers.

---

Studies of the Person is a series of books edited by Carl R. Rogers and William R. Coulson. These books include Learning to Feel—Feeling to Learn by Harold C. Lyon, Jr., Freedom to Learn by Carl Rogers, Humanistic Teaching by Donald H. Clark and Asya L. Kadis, and Personal Teaching by J. T. Dillon. Other sources include The Experience of Schooling by Silberman, How Children Fail by John Holt, and other conference and commission reports on school reform.

Procedure

The writer will begin the study in Chapter II with a brief biographical sketch of Martin Buber and trace some of the influence which lead him to his theory. Next, his major concepts associated with the I-Thou philosophy will be explicated. Chapter III will trace the I-Thou philosophy by communication theorists. The chapter will include a discussion of the influence on communication research and education, and the concepts, characteristics, components, and conditions for dialogue. Chapter IV will trace the I-Thou influence on humanistic educational theories. This chapter will discuss the goals and relational focus and the criticism of education which motivated the reforms sought. Chapter V will deal with the influence of the relational focus on educational practice, particularly the implications for teacher effectiveness. Chapter VI will present some practical examples and Chapter VII will conclude the study and synthesize the results.

Definitions

There are some key terms throughout the study which need to be defined.
I-Thou—The relational element which describes the meeting, reciprocity, and mutuality of two beings in genuine awareness of each other is the I-Thou relationship.

Dialogic Communication—This describes the embodiment of the I-Thou relationship and all its implications in the process of communicating.

Humanistic Education—It is a trend or movement in education to promote the holistic view of the teacher/student in relationship. It is the philosophy that persons are the most important entities in the school.

Humanistic Educator—This is any individual who engages in the promotion or implementation of the person centered, relational philosophy.
CHAPTER II
RELATIONAL THEORY

Martin Buber's relational theory has been lauded and embraced by philosophers, theologians, and educators alike. His philosophy of dialogue dates back to the first decade of this century, but it reached its most fruitful expression in the book I and Thou (1923). He begins from experience and from what is human in man. It is an existential definition and deals with the study of the wholeness of man.¹ Kaufmann emphasizes Buber's definition: "The essence of man is determined by the fact that 'he shares infinitude and he shares infinity.'"² Buber rejects the traditional idea that reason is the distinctive human characteristic.³

Buber has characterized his own long life (1878-1965) by the term "narrow ridge," because he felt that it best described his stance in life. He said that he did not rest on sure statements about absolutes, but between gulfs where there was no certainty of knowledge or of meeting what remains undisclosed.⁴ Friedman states:

Buber's 'narrow ridge' is no 'happy middle' which ignores the reality of paradox and contradiction in order to escape

²Ibid., p. 13.
³Ibid., p. 15.
from the suffering they produce. It is rather a paradoxical unity of what one usually understands only as alternatives--I and Thou, love and justice, dependence and freedom, the love of God and the fear of God, passion and direction, good and evil, unity and duality.?

In the following discussion, the writer will focus on the events influencing Martin Buber's development of his I-Thou philosophy.

Early Life

Martin Buber was born in Vienna, Austria, February 8, 1978. When he was three years old, his parents were divorced and he moved to his grandparent's home in Lemberg in Galicia. He apparently went there after his mother had left him at the age of four. This experience he later called a mismeeting when he realized, at age four, that his mother would never return to him. He felt that this was the origin of his understanding of genuine meeting.7

His grandfather was a rabbinic scholar, but combined his work with business and farming. It was in his grandfather's home that young Buber experienced the Jewish traditions, especially the tradition of Haskalah which was to influence him throughout his career. (Haskalah was one segment of Hasidism and Hasidism emphasized the virtues of love, joy, and humility.) His grandmother was a practical minded woman who

---

5Ibid., p. 3.


lavished kindness and love on the motherless boy. Buber's respect for his grandmother was in her ability to really express something, particularly when she really addressed someone, she really addressed them.

While Buber never saw his mother during his youth, his father continued to take some responsibility for him. In his ninth and tenth years, he stayed with his father in an Hasidic settlement in Sadagora in Bukovina. In their community houses, he experienced the communion that later influenced his philosophical thought.

Academics

Buber received private tutoring until he was ten years old and after that he entered school. From fourteen until eighteen, he joined his father in Lemberg. He attended Polish primary and secondary schools, experiencing for the first time a secular education where Jewish children were separated from the rest of the students by their religious differences. The intolerance of the children left Buber with a miserable feeling. At age fourteen, Martin was nearly driven to suicide by his deep concern over space and time, but his reading of Kant's "Prologemana to Any Future Metaphysics" saved him. Buber accepted the notion that man's world view is limited by his own terms, imagination and cognition.

9Friedman and Smith, op. cit., p. 20.
10Woods, op. cit., p. 4.
12Streiker, op. cit.,
Kant's writings continued to influence him throughout his early academic career. Buber's interest in infinity, the contemplation of time and eternity, was discussed in the writings of Nietzsche whose thought and style of writing was an influence in his writing of *I and Thou*.

At the age of eighteen (1896), Buber enrolled in the University of Vienna where the romantic environment of the Viennese culture added a new dimension of experience. For Buber, the teaching of F. Jodl, who edited the works of Ludwig Feuerbach, placed philosophical anthropology, the question of man, at the center of Buber's focus where it consistently remained. Feuerbach's philosophical orientation was in contrast to Kant's. Feuerbach's impetus was in the relationship of man to man and not in man's cognition, as was Kant's. Later, Feuerbach's focus was to be that of Buber's, the Between. Unity was to become the element of most concern to Buber.

At the University of Berlin, where he studied in the summer of 1898, and from the fall of 1899 to the summer of 1901, he was influenced by two teachers, Wilhelm Dilthey and George Simmel. It was at this point that religion and mystics were to return to Buber's thought.

During his university years, at the age of twenty, Buber married a German girl who was a student at Munich, Paula Winkler. At that time,
he was nearing completion of his university work and in 1900, he wrote his dissertation on the relationship between unity and multiplicity, concentrating on the works of speculative mystics from Eckhart to Boehme. 19 One of his first publications was an essay about Jakob Boehme. 20 In the essay, he took the position that he was to extend upon in the I-Thou philosophy. Wood states:

He [Buber] explained and apparently accepted the Renaissance notion of microcosm, where God is present in His totality within each creature and comes to light in man. The cosmos itself is composed of two movements: the movement of conflict, through which individuals emerge as distinct, and the movement of love, which leads back to unity. The two movements complement each other; through conflict the Other is set over against us, and through love, which culminates in a world feeling, we unite with the Other—-with the stone, the tree, the animal, and with our fellow men. And in this union of the I with the Thou, God comes to birth in the soul. 21

Career

While Buber had secured the basic tenets of the I-Thou philosophy, he continued to be influenced by religion and mysticism throughout his career. In 1901, he became editor of the Zionist journal in Vienna, but in less than a year, after some personal conflict, he moved to Berlin to work on the Jewish national movement in central Europe. From about 1904 until 1914, Buber dropped out of the Zionist movement to study Hasidism. He left his study of Hasidism in 1914 after a dramatic conversion experience. A young man came to visit him one day. Buber

19 Wood, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
20 Smith, op. cit., p. 4.
was courteous and friendly to him, but his religious ecstasy blinded him to the distress of the visitor. Buber failed to perceive what was really troubling the young man. Later, Buber learned that the visitor was killed in a war. The youth had sought an answer from Buber as to whether or not he should go to that war. Buber was overwhelmed by his own neglect in taking more seriously the situation. He states:

Since then I have given up the 'religious' which is nothing but the exception, extraction, exaltation, ecstasy; or it has given me up....I know no fulness but each mortal hour's fulness of claim and responsibility. Though far from being equal to it, yet I know that in the claim I am claimed and may respond in responsibility, and know who speaks and demands a response.

Buber went back to editing and from 1916 until 1924 edited the journal Der Jude which attempted to further the spiritual realities of Zionism, rather than the political aspirations. According to Smith, his work during this time "was to introduce the students of the Free Jewish Academy to their own traditions...and grew to remarkable proportions."

In 1923, Buber went to Frankfurt University, where he was Professor for Jewish History of Religion and Ethics. In 1933, the Nazis took away his post, but he remained in Germany until 1938, helping and encouraging his Jewish compatriots. In 1938, he went to Jerusalem as Professor of
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Sociology in the Hebrew University. From then until near the time of his death, he continued to participate in national issues. During this time, in the 1950's, Buber set up and directed an institute for adult education that trained teachers in the methods to which he devoted himself in his I-Thou philosophy.

In addition to teaching, he traveled extensively, lecturing in Europe, America, Switzerland, and Germany. By the time of his death in June 1965, he had drawn together all his major works in the Nachless collection.

After he secured the tenets of his I-Thou philosophy, it seems that Martin Buber was committed to a life of practicing them. He was no "arm chair" philosopher. Even in his latter years he was productive. He had the opportunity to accomplish all his major goals and put together his writings. While each of his works contained portions of the whole and were termed "fragments" by most scholars, the continuity of his thoughts centered around the I-Thou theme.

Next, the writer will explicate the I-Thou theory in several sections, I-Thou, I-It, The Between, Being and Seeming, Institutions, and Community.

**I-Thou**

Buber defined man as the creature capable of a living relation with the world and things. Essentially, the relation is one man to another,
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26 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
27 Friedman, op. cit., p. 182.
where one experiences the mystery of the other being in the mystery of one's own. The uniqueness of man is not in the individual nor in the collective, but in the meeting of the I and Thou.\(^{29}\)

According to Buber, the I of the I-Thou is conscious of perceiving experiences. It is conscious of sounds, of dreaming, and of sensation and is open and receptive to events. Sometimes there is silence, even in the presence of another person who will withhold his presence. When this occurs, the other will act in some manner to call attention to his presence. The act, without a word spoken, is dialogue. Both have experienced the other. Dialogue can exist without words or signs that mean words. Words and signs may be used to communicate, but this does not make dialogue in and of itself. The dialogue is the communion between people. People may come in contact with each other and they may communicate, but until they perceive that they have been joined in their perceptions, they have not joined in dialogue. The minimum expectation for dialogue is mutuality in inner action. So no matter how active people may be, until they are conscious of their activity and have turned to one another, they have not had dialogue.\(^{30}\) They have not experienced the life of dialogue. The life of dialogue is the communion which occurs from genuine meeting.

The life of dialogue is not associated with either dialogue or monologue whether verbal or nonverbal. Dialogue and monologue may give


\(^{30}\)Smith, op. cit., pp. 1-2.
the appearance of the life of dialogue. Dialogue may occur as in a conversation which is characterized by a lack of need to communicate something, learn something, or make a contact with someone. The only need is to have one's own self gratified by making a favorable impression. Dialogue may be disguised in monologue when people meet and talk in circuitous ways, yet imagine that they have communicated. The person who does not engage in living dialogue, even in the tenderest moments, never goes beyond the self.  

**I-It**

Buber contrasts the I-Thou relationship with the I-It relationship. The It experience creates alienation, because the It is an object, a thing. The world of It is transferred through culture from predecessors. This development from generation to generation creates a barrier to dialogue and decreases the power to enter into relationships.

The It can become a Thou at any time or a Thou can become an It. The I-Thou and I-It alternate necessarily. Constancy of the I-Thou is not possible or desirable. The I-It relationship is a product of the I-Thou which points back to it. This mediation through the senses between objects and persons enable living relationships. However, only the world of the I-Thou can give meaning to the world of It for the I-Thou.
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is the starting point for meaning and significance. Only the I-Thou person is free to act meaningfully in response to concrete external events. The unfree person sees only the resemblance of one situation to another. The free person responds without social and psychological conditioning, as a whole and conscious, while the unfree person does not respond spontaneously, but merely reacts through preconditioning. This person sees persons, not of value in themselves, but by their usefulness and similarity to others with whom he has associated in the past. He is unable to share direct contact. The free person experiences a fuller and more direct sharing.\textsuperscript{35} Buber states:

\begin{quote}
Free is the man that wills without caprice. He believes in the actual, which is to say: he believes in the real association of real duality, I and You....
\end{quote}

One can understand how the It-world, left to itself, untouched and unthawed by the emergence of any You, should become alienated and turn into an incubus....\textsuperscript{36}

No one can be entirely free or unfree, according to Buber, and no one is purely person or individuality. Some people are so defined by person that they may be called person and some so defined by individuality that they may be called individuals. Genuine dialogue, however, must be characterized by persons.\textsuperscript{37}

The Between

Persons develop from individuals who have learned to respond from the uniqueness and exclusiveness of each relationship. From the context of each relationship, meaning is developed for both partners beyond

\begin{flushright}
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mere commonality and identification. Friedman states: "The meaning... is found in neither one nor the other of the partners, nor in both taken together, but in their interchange." The reciprocal participation of whole and active persons creates the sphere of the between. There is no smooth continuity in the sphere of the between and it unfolds in dialogue as it is being realized, completed, or intensified. When two beings open themselves to each other, the wholeness of their existence is compressed. Buber states: "Only when two say to one another with all they are, 'It is Thou', is the indwelling of the Present Being between them."

The between seems to have a life of its own, but must arise from genuineness and authenticity of the two partners. It is in the sphere of the between that the two partners grow together and experience each other fully. Because one person grows, the other grows synergetically.

**Being and Seeming**

Being and seeming, according to Buber, are a duality which is a significant problem in the I-Thou relationship. Persons are often troubled by the impressions they make on others. The problem stems from what one really is and what one wishes to seem. These two are mixed together, although one of the two positions dominates. For
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example, two persons look at each other. The first type looks spontaneously without concern for how the other person sees him. On the other hand, the second type looks at the other person with a consciousness of his own image and produces the look which has the affect of being spontaneous.

There are basically six possible beings who may interact when two persons communicate. First, there are the two as they wish to appear to each other. Next is the actual appearance of each to the other, which may not at all coincide with how each wishes to appear to the other. Last is the bodily presence of each. The complexity illustrates the difficulty of genuine human dialogue.

True dialogue is when the two communicate to each other as what they really are. Authenticity occurs when there is being and not seeming. Seeming creeps in when each, or one or the other, reserves himself as he is in the interaction.

According to Buber, the crisis of man, in this context, is what occurs between persons. Moral uprightness must evolve from the being and not the seeming. True moral uprightness is not tempted by the seeming, but is free to express itself in the being. When persons yield to seeming, it is the essential cowardice in them. Life lived from the being is often difficult, especially when it has been lived long in the seeming, but the reward is the satisfaction when the real being is confirmed. No real satisfaction occurs in the seeming, because it lacks depth. Real being in the meeting between persons is rewarded by growth and satisfaction. 43

43 Friedman and Smith, op. cit., pp. 75-78.
Institutions

Institutions alienate people because they divide people from their emotions. Buber states:

Institutions are what is 'out there' where for all kinds of purposes one spends time, where one works, negotiates, influences, undertakes, competes, organizes, administers, officiates, preaches...

Feelings are what is 'in here' where one lives and recovers from the institutions...here one enjoys one's inclination and one's hatred, pleasure and, if not too bad, pain...

Institutions comprise a complicated forum; feelings, a boudoir that at least provides a good deal of diversity.

Institutions bring people together without creating or promoting any fellowship. A loving community should result when people come together with feelings for each other, but that is not how it is. Just being together with feeling for each other is not enough. There must be a living reciprocal relationship which may include feelings, but is not derived from them. Institutions keep persons from creating the relationship needed to create community. 45

Community

While institutions are "out there," community is "in here" where there is a dynamic flowing from I to Thou. Today, as defined by politics, groups are important in accomplishing common tasks or goals. What is most important is what goes on within them to influence what they accomplish. Thus, if a group bands together to overthrow the state, according
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to Buber, comradery is promoted only for the value it has in assisting the group to be more powerful and effective in its assault. These are collectives, bundled together, not bound together, for the single purpose of being more powerful.

Genuine communities, however, are where community happens. That is, in growing communities, persons are side by side with one another and a multitude of persons. Community is based on the confirmation of each person as they live for each other.\(^4\) Social relations are not built by human units that have no relations with each other. The edifice of community is relations.\(^5\) The tension of the alienation between persons and collectives has been resolved for Buber. He has created a third alternative. The relation that takes place in the I-Thou can also occur in the We of community. Friedman points out that Buber has called for a restructuring of society into a community of communities to enable the relations among men to be more dialogical in nature.\(^6\)

For persons to build I-Thou relationships or community, they must accept the responsibility to respond to others. Buber realized this when he experienced the youth to whom he did not respond. Buber concluded that genuine responsibility exists only when there is real responding. The response must come from signs and words given in everyday life. In that every situation calling for a response is different, there must be
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constant sensitivity to the demands for response. It is then that persons become responsible. 49

Central to this study is the use of the I-Thou philosophy in education. Buber wrote essays about education and the education of character. These will prove useful in a later discussion of the integration of dialogic theories for teachers. Next, the writer will turn to an explication of Buber's essays on education.

Education

Friedman interprets Buber's definition of education as a "conscious and willed 'selection by man of the effective world.'" 50 The teacher as a person must represent a living selection of the world who meets, draws out, and forms pupils. The teacher does not select the students who will be taught, but must accept all students who come without desiring to dominate them. 51

Buber believed that each child is not only unique but that the human race begins anew each time a child is born, making the education process the opportunity for the human race to begin again. He did not believe that the child creates or learns to create within himself, alone, or in the "libido." Neither did he believe that the child learns from the "will to power" which is constituted by forces above him arbitrarily forcing on him what he should learn. 52 In the modern sense, this is
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represented by the either-or's of two contemporary antithetical educational philosophies. The "old" educators emphasize the importance of "objective" education which is obtained through instruction centered around the Great Books, classical tradition, or technical knowledge. The "new" educators emphasize the subjective side of knowledge and the development of the creative powers or ingestion of the environment according to individual need or preference. These, according to Buber, are fragmented parts of the whole.\textsuperscript{53} In an analogy, Buber said that the first represented the "funnel" and the latter the "pump." The "funnel" is the subject-object relationship, where there is a passive reception of tradition from above. The "pump" is the drawing forth of the powers of the self.\textsuperscript{54}

To return to Buber's discussion of his definition of education, that is a selection by man of the effective world, the meaning he intended was that the educator manifests what is to be learned through his selection from the whole environment. Learning is summoned from the selections and manifestations of the educator who acts as though he did not consciously select the act.\textsuperscript{55} The educator presents himself to the child in very subtle forms, such as gestures or hints, rather than imposing his will arbitrarily upon the child. In the appropriate environment which allows freedom and communion, the child is free to encounter the real values of the educator and venture to experiment for
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himself. The teacher is responsible for the child but must not intrude too much. 56

In education, the element of inclusion is very strong and constitutes the relation. The relation is one of pure dialogue," states Buber. 58

The most inward achievement of the relation in education is trust. The child must trust the teacher, trust him to really be there and not just there superficially. From the relation and without intruding too much upon the child, the educator changes the events of the relationship into an atmosphere for learning. The atmosphere is created by the quality of the relationship. 59

Somewhat of a problem occurs in the developing relationship when the educator experiences the child. Friedman explains:

What is most essential in the teacher's meeting with the pupil is that he experiences the pupil from the other side.... this inclusiveness must be largely onesided: the pupil cannot equally well see the teacher's point of view without the teaching relationship being destroyed. 60

Additionally, according to Buber, two things are experienced, at the same time, simultaneously. First, the limitations of the one-sided experience and second, the responsibility to the position of the child. What is usually experienced by the educator is an uncertain feeling or some ambiguity. The ambiguity resolves itself gradually as
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the educator builds trust and is successful in meeting the needs of the child on a moment by moment basis. 61

---

Education of Character

In his essay, "The Education of Character," Buber asserted: "Education worthy of the name is essentially education of character." 62 Buber was careful to delineate the difference between personality and character. Essentially, personality remains outside the influence of the educator, but moulding character is the educator's greatest task.

The way the educator goes about this task must remain within the framework of the relational, the dialogical. The educator cannot announce to the children that he intends to improve their characters. To build character, the educator uses all the environment and all the school tasks as problems. The young people must be lead to learn right and wrong and not have it dictated to them by the educator. On the other hand, the educator should not deceive the pupils through subtle means of concealment. If the educator attempts to manipulate, his own habits will be noticed and affected negatively. The genuinely effective educator spontaneously deals with problems and his own genuineness sparks the appropriate and natural effect that he has on young people.

There is only one way to influence the student and that is to gain his confidence. Once the confidence is won and the student trusts the teacher, the student begins to ask questions and show interest. He responds because the teacher has approached him genuinely and with total
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acceptance. The teacher has become an interested participant in his life before attempting to influence him. The teacher shows an awareness of the responsibility and takes it seriously.

When the student asks to be influenced, that is the moment that the educator makes a conscious step toward the education of character. In responding to questions, many problems arise because the questions are diverse, including anything that directly affects the student. The problem for the educator is to give the "right" answer or response in a concrete way.

Even though the teacher has gained the pupil's confidence, he can expect disagreement and conflict. But conflicts are part of the problems which are necessary to confront and can be highly educational exercises when they occur in a healthy atmosphere. The educator who has established a dialogic relationship finds appropriate responses to overcome the difficulty of adverse situations.

One of the major difficulties for the educator who is developing his student's character is to find truth or values that are worthy to exemplify. Values are generally inherent in the student's culture and what one culture values another does not. The genuine educator must not pass on contradictory cultural values. Buber suggests that the teacher must "start from above" with students by looking at that which is un-typical about the situation in question. In this process, every situation would need a different solution and there would be no automatic "right" or "wrong" responses.

In taking a fresh look from "above," the educator can begin to develop the goal of educating character. Students build character by learning to think for themselves and find solutions to situations that
have no clear cut answers. They learn to overcome the habit of responding with dogmatic or value laden answers. Students generally do not realize their blind devotion to cultural values and their need to rely on themselves for solutions. Genuine educators have insight to the structure of great character and are skilled at eliciting from students the values they find desirable for themselves. The students have reasoned through the problem and can responsibly choose the value they can justify. Buber expands the notion:

He [the educator] can awaken in young people the courage to shoulder life again. He can bring before his pupils the image of great character...He can show that even great character is not born perfect, and the unity of his being first has to mature before expressing itself in the sequence of his actions and attitudes....But unity itself, unity of persons, unity of the lived life, has to be emphasized again and again.

The unity to which Buber alludes is the unity of community. He does not emphasize the individual or the collective in his structure of great character, but the responsibility that great characters feel as they unite in full relations.

Theory of Knowledge

Education is generally associated with knowledge and the question of what constitutes knowledge concerns most educators. According to Buber, the importance of knowledge is that it points man back to the reality of what is concrete, which stems from the I-Thou relationship.
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Buber's theory of knowledge expresses and answers the felt need of man to account, in a more humanly way, for what is known.

Traditional epistemology has been based on the subject-object relationship, how the subject knows the object. This has been the major basis for the theory of knowledge from Plato to Bergson. There have been differences in emphasis between rationalism and empiricism, idealism and materialism, personalism and logical positivism. The nature of the knower has been questioned as to whether the knower's source is consciousness, survival, power, scientific observation, or intuition. The object has been questioned as to whether it is material reality, thought in the mind of God or man, spiritual, mystical, or something upon which one arbitrarily projects categories. Finally, the question arises concerning how the subject comes to know the object. Is it through dialectic, reasoning, scientific method, phenomenological insight, or intuition?

The I-Thou philosophy deals with an entirely different way of knowing. The contributions of Buber have been lauded, as an alternative to the traditionally valued. Friedman states:

The German theologian Karl Heim has spoken of this distinction between I-Thou and I-It as 'one of the decisive discoveries of our time'--'the Copernican revolution' of modern thought. When this new conception has reached fuller clarity, it must lead, writes Heim, 'to a second new beginning of European thought pointing beyond the Cartesian contribution of modern philosophy.'

In Buber's theory, knowledge of the external world comes through relation to other selves. Through social relationships, the child
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categorizes the world and is enabled to see knowable objects in an orderly way. In this way, the child moves from the I-Thou to the I-It relationship with the world. The child constantly compares his objective reality to the perceptions of others and their objective reality. This is a technical process, but provides a way to view reality through the reality of others with whom an I-Thou relationship exists. In this way, the I-Thou and I-It alternate in an integral relation. Social reality is objectified through the Thou and yet provides a final reality. The final reality is a way of technically mediating through the senses and the word, the symbols that allow persons to communicate and enter into relationships. While objective reality remains indirect and symbolic, it is the channel through which real dialogue can occur. When the objectified reality blocks the return to the I-Thou knowing or the I-Thou never existed, the world becomes an entirely objective external reality. When total objectification occurs, words or symbols become independent objects or ends in themselves. Words are sheer denotation.

The point of view of many, such as the logical positivists, is to seek to objectify reality so that everyone derives the same meaning from everything. This would apply to red lights and mathematical symbols, as well as seeing the future in tea leaves or the stars.

For Buber, it is impossible to criticize I-Thou knowing on the basis of I-It knowing. Phenomena that has occurred in the past cannot question the present knowing; the situation is different. For example, traditions which are past phenomena can only be passed on through an individual's present experience of the tradition, what it means to him. The same is
true of the individual's interpretation of nature and God. To Buber, all knowledge is knowledge of the Thou in present meeting. 68

**Summary**

Martin Buber's position in life was on the "narrow ridge" because his philosophy did not concern itself with development of absolutes. He positioned himself in a region where there is little certainty of knowledge and possibly no revelation of meaning. Yet, it was in his rejection of either-ors and his understanding of paradoxes which lead him to the "narrow ridge."

Buber's philosophy was influenced by his religious background and educational training. As a child, he experienced the traditional Jewish culture, but later, in his university life, a secular culture. These influences were integrated into his philosophical thought as he examined them through his experience. Study of various philosophers influenced him along the way. Early in his education, the writings of Kant were most influential, but later the writings of Feuerbach gave him the greatest insights in developing his I-Thou theory. The answers he sought as a philosophical anthropologist were encapsulated in this theory.

The I-Thou philosophy was the frame of reference for Buber's explanation and examination of man's experience, values and knowledge. In the I-Thou relation, it is what man experiences with others that determines his reality. Reality is based on subjective knowledge and,
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as such, is concrete. From genuine encounter with others, persons develop responsibility and community. Morality and uprightness are based on this genuine concern for the meeting of others, although the authenticity takes courage. The reward for courage is the depth of satisfaction and growth that persons and societies achieve.

Buber showed that genuine educators are those who seek the I-Thou relationship with their pupils. Through the relation, they achieve mutuality which is necessary to appropriately and effectively influence the development of their pupil's character, their major task. The genuine educator teaches character through the influence he has from developing trust and gaining confidence of pupils. He teaches students to think for themselves in conflicts and questions of value. In doing so, he structures their potential to develop great character. Great characters bring unity and community to society and restructure values and culture.
CHAPTER III

DIALOGICAL COMMUNICATION

Martin Buber's I-Thou theory seems to have influenced the field of communication in the development of dialogical theories of communication. These theories have been used as criteria for research and teaching. The rationale for expanding communication education curriculum to include the teaching of intrapersonal and interpersonal communication skills is embedded in Buber's relational philosophy.

In his article "Philosophical Foundations of Dialogical Communication," John Stewart contends that there are four influences from relational theory that are basic. First, scholars and teachers are emphasizing the "reciprocal bond" and the "relationship." This seems to be, for some, a radical or, perhaps, revolutionary point of view. Second, communication educators have adopted experientialism. Numerous textbook writers and teachers suggest "activity" methods, such as simulation games, exercises, role playing, structured experience, and case studies to "teach" the concepts. These activities may be the major focus of the instruction or they may supplement the study of interpersonal theories. Third, dialogical theories have developed an instructional focus on intrapersonal communication and an interest in self-concepts and subjectivity. Fourth, dialogical theories have influenced an emerging conviction of holism, that is, acceptance of a multitude of variables. The holism
pedagogy means that cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning are integrated.1

Stewart directly confirms that Buber has significant influence on dialogic communication scholars and teachers when he states: "it is clear why Buber is cited by most dialogic communication scholars and teachers. In his work are combined all the fundamental elements of a dialogical approach to speech communication."2

In this chapter, the writer will explicate dialogical theories which have expanded Buber's relational theory to assist scholars and teachers in understanding the concepts, characteristics, components, and conditions of dialogical communication.

Concepts

In his influential article "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue," Richard Johannesen delineated the central elements of dialogic relationships. These concepts have been studied by a number of scholars under a number of labels.

Central to Johannesen's rationale is that dialogue seems to represent an attitude, principle or orientation as contrasted with a method, technique, or format. There is a spirit of dialogue or a dialogic stance. He expands on Buber's theory to include the development of man's personality as well as man's knowledge. He also emphasizes the notion that while a speaker holds certain convictions and wants to be
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understood or to influence, he does not impose his will upon another to bolster his own ego or self-image. Here, the concept of dialogue is to perceive the other person's point of view.

Johannesen believes that Carl Rogers offered a second major impetus to the concept of communication as dialogue and associates Roger's approach to psychiatry as dialogic. In non-directive therapy, the therapist-client relationship is most important in the treatment. The therapist must accept the basic value of the client and see the world through the client's eyes. The therapist must demonstrate a genuine concern for the client through a non-evaluative orientation to him.

Johannesen further expands the discussion of the concepts by contrasting dialogic communication, as he notes most writers do with monologue. Monologue is generally viewed as undesirable human communication. It is frequently negatively analogous to persuasion or propaganda. Again, most of this concept develops from Buber's initial theory. The speaker who uses monologue demonstrates all the characteristics of negative use of power and uses others as objects, communicating for his own profit. Johannesen points to the concurrence of many writers, such as Matson and Montague, Howe, Gurdorf, and Greenagel, that the monologic communicator does not take other persons seriously as persons, but as objects for his own use.

Raising a conceptual issue, Johannesen focuses on the question of whether or not monologue and dialogue are mutually exclusive opposites. Matson and Monagu separate them bi-polarly, while Buber maintains that "pure" dialogue seldom exists. These ideas lead Johannesen to conclude that dialogue and monologue should be viewed on a continuum.
Another conceptual issue he raises is whether or not monologue should be equated with persuasion or propaganda. While many persons view persuasion and propaganda negatively, more neutral definitions conclude that persuasion and propaganda may be either sound or 'unsound, ethical or unethical. Buber tends to show that influence can be exerted without coercion or manipulation. Keller and Brown's ethical formulation of dialogue indicate that the major concern should be founded on needs of the participants. They indicate that the attitudes of the sender and the receiver are more important elements of the communication than message or channel.

Finally, Johannesen raises the issue of the various manifestations of dialogue. There are numerous questions for researchers regarding the environment for dialogue. Speculations are that dialogue more likely occurs in private, two-person, face to face, oral communication situations that extend, possibly intermittently, over long periods of time. There are many such possibilities for dialogue.

While privacy seems most conducive for dialogue, Rogers and Buber carried out what they considered to be a public dialogue. It seems that dialogue could occur in small groups.  

Johannesen seems definitive when he asserts about dialogic communication theories:

Clearly the concept of communication as dialogue is one being advocated to play an increasingly central role in contemporary communication behavior. In any case, to extend
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the boundaries of knowledge about human communication and to facilitate improvement of communication between people...is warranted.

Johannesen's article clearly utilized Buber's concepts throughout and indicate through citations where Buber's basic relational theory is important in developing more considerations. Acceptance of the other as a person was stressed in Johannesen's argument and he indicated the questions raised by this issue in propaganda and persuasion. Most importantly, Johannesen was specific in both the questions he raised and in his confirmation of the value the dialogic perspective has for the field of communication.

Characteristics

Johannesen suggested that there are some characteristics of dialogue which should be understood. He states: "Martin Buber's analysis of two primary attitudes and relationships, I-Thou and I-It, is seminal in influencing the emerging concept of communication as dialogue."^5 He concludes that the major attitudinal dimensions can be described and he demonstrates them in the form of a major list with explanations.

They are as follows:

Genuineness. The communicator is direct, honest and straightforward in this attitude. He avoids projecting an image or facade. Roles and conventions are cast aside so that openness and feeling can dominate.

Accurate Empathic Understanding. This attitude is achieved in communication resulting from seeing things from the other's position or
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experience. Involved is the ability to interpret situations from the other's side as well as one's own. It is important to accurately interpret and clarify feelings.

Unconditional Positive Regard. This attitude is best expressed through nonpossessive warmth. Valuing the other person as having worth as a human being is important here. Confirmation of individuality, rather than mere tolerance of him is desirable. Through the confirmation and trust, the other may be better able to reach his maximum potential. While his behavior may not be acceptable, he is accepted as an individual.

Presentness. Persons participating in dialogue must give their full attention to the interaction. There must be a willingness to take time, to concentrate, to be accessible, and to get involved. There are risks in getting attached to the other. There is receptive listening and responding to the revelations of each.

Spirit of Mutual Equality. By superficial social standards, the participants may not be considered equals. However, in their exchange, they see each other as persons and not objects. They avoid a superior-subordinate relationship and do not make power plays. There is no desire to impose opinions or wills on each other. Agreement on issues is secondary to the relationship. Each helps the other make a responsible decision.

Supportive Psychological Climate. There is free expression in an atmosphere where each encourages the other to communicate. No value judgments are made that might be a barrier to the interactions. There
is a desire by participants to listen accurately and not prejudge, anticipate, interfere, compete, refute, or misinterpret meanings. 6

Buber's criteria for dialogue seems accurately extended in the categories and explanations by Johannesen. Certainly genuineness, accuracy in empathic understanding, valuing the worth of other human beings, experiencing the present moment, mutuality, and supportive atmosphere are consistent with Buber's philosophy. However, the essence of Buber's philosophy does not seem to be enhanced through the fragmentation of categories. It seems that there is equal stress on each of the criterion, while Buber's writings suggest that certain criterion are basic and other criteria develop. What is basic to Buber, but not stressed by Johannesen is that the participants are engaged in mutuality regardless of roles, beliefs or position in life. While the participants do not abandon or ignore those roles or beliefs, they participate mutually in dialogue. Basic to the mutuality is trust. Johannesen does not stress trust as a basic component, yet trust is strongly emphasized in Buber's works. Friedman states: "'existential trust' is the real heart of Buber's teaching.... Buber states... that existential trust was indeed the heart of the attitude underlying his life and thought." 7

In another work focusing on dialogic communication, Makay and Gaw link Buber's theories to the study and teaching of interpersonal communication. Their list of characteristics and explanations bears some

6 Ibid., pp. 45-46.

similarity to Johannesssen's list, except they add a seventh characteristic, love.

- **Courage in Communication.** To extend ones real self to another is a risk of self-acceptance as well as acceptance from the other. Persons must rise above the insecure periods of conflict within the self and tell others who he is. Anxiety results when courage to communicate cannot be found and extended to others. Communicators need to face reality in open and meaningful ways. Persons need to know themselves in order to participate positively with the other. In acting with courage, the other is encouraged to reciprocate. In their sharing, communion is achieved for both.

- **Genuineness in Self and Image Projection.** Communicators who wear masks abandon their real selves for a repertoire of roles that move them toward phoniness. This is a vulnerable position involving some questions of ethics.

Persons can project a variety of images, but the image one projects should be congruent with the genuine self in a unified whole and should be the image the other receives. Self in organized traits can be an expression of the unified self in many communication contexts.

- **Accurate Empathic Response.** Empathy is the ability to see the other person's point of view and vicariously experience with him. Many writers have commented on the importance of empathy in communication. Most share the view that it requires much sensitivity. Empathy seems to generate feelings in the process. Accuracy and self-disclosure in what is communicated is of utmost importance to participants if they are to become empathically involved.
Unconditional Positive Regard. This characteristic was especially important in Rogers' client-centered therapy and has been broadly adopted in professional practice. The therapist spends much time orienting himself to the client's perception by allowing the client full expression. Through a nonjudgmental attitude, the therapist confirms the client as an individual. This corollary occurs in interpersonal communication between persons who confirm each other and, as a result, move toward each other.

Realistic Communicative Equality. People maintain numerous task roles in society and many of these roles have power and status associated with them. Superior-subordinate relationships occur in classrooms, among military personnel, and government officials. When persons communicate as equals, they minimize the roles, particularly the power dimension, and treat each other with individual respect and acceptance.

Presentness. Many questions arise about the ability of persons in our society to get involved in and committed to meaningful dialogue. If an individual does become fully involved, it takes concentration on the situation at hand. It seems that this occurs mainly in the professions and the "helping" relationships. Presentness requires effort in daily life because partners can take each other for granted so easily and lose this special quality without realizing it.

Love. There are numerous meanings for the word "love," but all requires some sacrifice of self for another. In dialogue, this means giving expressions of deep feelings. Love is the unity of two beings into one and, as John Powell indicates, it is a peak experience. Peak experiences, as Powell describes them, are aesthetic in nature and are
not sustained but arise when mutuality is as high as is humanly possible. Peak experiences may or may not occur in marriage, but marital relationships are one example of where they could occur.  

Although Makay and Gaw's discussion was thorough in describing the characteristics one would expect to see in genuine dialogue, they tended to emphasize emotions more than Buber did in his theory. For example, Buber indicated that empathy can occur without an emotional display. Buber stated that experiencing the other's position and genuinely being aware of the other and the between did not necessarily involve feelings and that love was not a necessary condition for dialogic relationships. The question, however, may be one of degree. Emotions may accompany the I-Thou relation to a greater or lesser degree. All of the characteristics themselves occur in varying degrees, depending on the situation, but this is not indicated by the theorists.

Makay and Gaw seem accurate in their interpretation of the risk involved in communicating. Buber emphasized the uncertainty of outcomes in relationships. The situation of developing a relationship begins on a moment by moment basis, according to Buber. The vulnerability of persons in genuine encounters seems proportionate to the risk. In their categories, Makay and Gaw interpret Carl Rogers' client-centered therapy approach as a corollary to dialogue. According to the public dialogue between Buber and Rogers, Buber questioned the approach based on wide

---

8 John J. Makay and Beverly A. Gaw, Personal and Intercpersonal Communication: Dialogue with the Self and with Others. (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishers, 1976), pp1 113-119.
variance of responsibility in the patient/therapist roles. The role of the therapist is bound by the situation, according to Buber, and he can experience the patient, but the patient can never experience him. In this sense, they never achieve dialogue. Buber did not discount the helping relationship, but did not agree that it was the situation for an authentic dialogical relationship.⁹

To contrast dialogue, Makay and Gaw describe monologic communication. Buber generally described monologue and dialogue as opposites and in the following list Makay and Gaw extend the contrast by describing monologic characteristics:

1. Primary concern for power over the other.
2. Primary concern with persuasion for profit, regardless of whether or not the ends justify the means.
3. Primary concern with personal prestige and status.
4. Primary concern with shaping the other's image regardless of the other's concern for developing a unique self.
5. Primary concern with self-aggrandizement.¹⁰

Monologic dialogue represents Buber's I-It relationship and, as the list indicates, the other is treated as an object. Buber would agree that monologic characteristics are undesirable for genuine dialogue and thwart the development of an I-Thou relationship.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 121.
Components

John Poulakos criticized Johannesen in his early article for mistakenly using the term "components" of dialogue when he was actually meaning "characteristics." He argued that the components were the parts or ingredients of the dialogue, rather than the traits, features, or qualities. He, in turn, describes the three components of dialogue, the Self, the Other, and the Between.

The Self. The Self, although individual, is a collection of many selves and includes traits that are integrated to make a personality. There are two possibilities for the internal traits of Self, one demonstrates unity and the other demonstrates fragmentations and imperfections. The latter Self is limited, and, as such, may decide to change from this internal alienation and come closer to others. The decision to change and participate in dialogic communication must be made by two Selves. This process precedes dialogue. Growth of the Self is a product of participation in dialogic communication. Part of the growth occurs in the decision to unify Self in synchrony with another Self. When the Selves decide to enter dialogue, they bring themselves to the situation with a desire to grow.

The unified Selves find meaning in the process of interaction. The meaning each finds is two dimensional, the Self interacting and the Self observing. Since stepping back from the situation as an observer would

---

hinder a dialogic relation, the Self observes through his partner. Each Self sees and understands himself through the responses to him. In this process, the Self becomes his own creator.

The difficulty becomes that of accepting the Self one sees, because the external forces in society often work against the Self one desires to be. Roles and norms expected by society may exert influence against creating one's Self. If one accepts only the external roles, one may never know who he is. The total immersion of Self into external roles is the dehumanizing and alienating factor in society. When the Self steps back as an observer, he may see what is happening with external forces and once again place himself in the position of entering dialogue. It is in the desire to become who he is that the Self chooses to enter dialogue. The self rejects the "oughts" of society and takes charge of his own life and direction.

It is difficult to enter dialogue in an age when there is a dichotomy between individualism and collectivism. Individualism stresses the belief that each is an entity belonging exclusively to himself and he is the center of meaning. Collectivism, on the other hand, destroys the individual importance. The individual's only loyalty is to the group and its goals. The group mentality prevails. Persons become statistics and objects.

Dialogic communicators dismiss the dichotomy and recognize the importance of personhood and personal growth through participation with others. It is through this participation that the Self becomes who he is, reaching his potential growth. 12

12 Ibid., pp. 199-204.
Martin Buber's influence can clearly be seen in the concept of growth occurring through relations. Poulakos quotes Buber in his discussion of self-growth. Influence can clearly be seen in the idea of the dichotomy between individualism and collectivism. These two forces are opposed by Buber because neither promotes growth. Instead they create barriers to the life of dialogue.

The Other. According to Poulakos, "The category of otherness encompasses everything outside one's own self." Others are different from oneself and also observable. There is distance between one and his Other, but the distance allows the possibility for coming together in dialogue.

Others are experienced as influence on the Self. In relations, the Other is needed for self-growth, but in alienation, the Other prevents self-growth. Enough of the Other is necessary for the Self to become who he potentially can become.

Others who are treated as objects are stripped of their humanity and can never be known beyond the exterior. This is a destructive process. Using the Other to gain a favorable impression of Self amplifies the process of destruction. Subtle manipulation of this sort inherently backfires on the Self resulting in superficial relations. Influence gained through manipulation of the Other places external criteria upon him and presumes that he will become what is willed.

To have real dialogue, the Other must be accepted. Elements of differences do not matter, because they are acceptable in the relationship.

13Ibid., p. 204.
Acceptance of differences does not mean that there will not be conflict, but the conflict is in the exchange of views, not the relationship. There can be no authenticity without acceptance, and it is central to the confirmation of the Other. There can be no growth for the Other without confirming him. He must be allowed to become what he is.\textsuperscript{14}

Again, Buber's influence is clearly attributed to the view that the Other must be accepted and confirmed. Although Poulakos did not refer to trust as did Buber, trust is implied in confirmation. It is through trust that influence is possible, but the influence of the Other must evolve from the dialogic perspective to be growth promoting for the individual.

The Between. The entity of the Between is an element where the two, the Self and the Other meet. Without this entity there is no dialogue. Dialogue is not within two beings, but only exists in the Between. Two partners placed together in a situation does not indicate a relationship.

Poulakos refers to the Between as "intersubjectivity." When the Between exists, the unity of the two partners is so great that a third person who is not participating may feel like an intruder. There is much difficulty in explaining the Between because it is an invisible force which cannot be observed, yet, it keeps the relationship alive. The synchrony existing in the Between creates the intimacy out of which each person grows and becomes. There is building of evolution of the

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., pp. 204-207.
Between as mutuality grows in the presence and awareness of each.

Physical presence, perceptual awareness, and even interaction do not account for the Between. Extending the essentials to include the openness of each partner to share begins to get at the problem of description of the Between. It is the construction of interconnections which link the partners to the Between.

Once the Between is established, it is permanent. The physical presence, awareness, and interaction of the participants may continue, but are not requirements after the relationship is established. The Between is reconstructed in the minds of the partners each time they think of each other or any time they meet. In this sense, persons who have established their relationship, but who are physically removed from each other's presence, even for extended periods, never lose the Between.

Although the Between retains permanancy, it is never complete. There is always more to evolve from the relationship. There are differences in seeming and being in relationship. Those who fear to risk themselves in allowing others to see them as they are never experience real confirmation from others. They are always concerned about what they can do to make favorable impressions. This creates a barrier to the Between and to their growth. Those who risk themselves in being what they are may be disapproved, but when they are confirmed, the Between is created and they find growth and satisfaction. People generally choose which to do, be or seem, from one situation to the next, but patterns develop which delineate whether a person is or seems. To Buber, being is better than seeming.
Authenticity occurs when persons enter a relationship as they are and do not allow seeming to interfere. Self-disclosure or telling all does not make one authentic or give the relationship stability. That which does account for the stability and permanency of the Between is each allowing the other to see and experience what is.

In some ways, the above treatment suggests that role taking and role playing are not appropriate in dialogic communication. If one were to consider that roles are selected, interpreted, and acted out by a Real Self, then it is possible that dialogic communicators do take roles in a constructive way. Roles do not have to be interpreted negatively. There does not need to be inauthenticity in roles.15

Poulakos suggests in his discussion that the Between is a new concept which could help in understanding the communication process. It is not a new concept in Buber's relational theory, however, but in its application to communication research and teaching. Poulakos supports the notion that the concept offers new directions and emphasis. His discussion added to that emphasis.

Conditions

In current society, people have the freedom to talk. Social needs would be difficult to meet without talk. Most tasks could not be accomplished without people interacting to solve problems, make plans, and implement plans. Ideas would be more difficult to generate if people did not have the opportunity to speak to each other. Yet,
interaction alone is not enough for dialogic communicators. Makay and Gaw list and describe the conditions for dialogic interaction that could occur in any situation where humans freely communicate. Conditions differ from characteristics, in that, they are possible contexts out of which dialogue occurs. Without some of the conditions, no dialogue will occur.

**Involvement.** When people feel a strong personal need to communicate, involvement is likely to occur. Participants who commit themselves to interact with appropriate intensity take the situation seriously. People who are involved are internally motivated and transcend the environment. There is usually appropriate levels of interest, excitement, or enthusiasm, rather than dull superficiality in the exchange.

**Openness, Freedom, and Responsibility.** A favorable atmosphere for dialogue exists when the participants are open to genuine exchange. The openness allows a sense of freedom. But openness and freedom are not dialogic if they are used irresponsibly. Meaningful dialogue occurs when participants act in behalf of each other. Each person must genuinely care how he uses openness and freedom and be sensitive to others for whom he is responsible.

**Mutual Trust and Respect.** Participants in dialogue must mutually trust and respect each other. Respect for other persons indicates a liking, an appreciation, and a recognition of authority or expertise. Trust is an absolute necessity for dialogue and without it problems occur. Persons find it difficult to cope with problems related to trust. There is high risk in trust, but the risks must be taken if dialogue is to occur.

**Sincerity and Honesty.** These two conditions are associated with the self. The communicator must value that for which he speaks. He must
listen with earnestness, too. It is very difficult to hide feelings and falsify information. Being sincere and honest in communication involves risk to the self. Sometimes it is necessary to call attention to the barriers which hinder sincere and honest communication.

Appreciation of Individual Differences and Uniqueness. Communicators often misunderstand each other because they fail to identify human individuality. External norms cause prejudice which acts as a barrier between people. People fear those unlike themselves and will not dialogue with them. Hostilities are created because of differences over ideas. The dialogic communicator accepts these differences and enriches his life with a variety of contacts.

Acceptance of Disagreement with a Desire for Resolution. The experience of having conflict and disagreement is common to all. At times it is more intense than one would like. Since disagreements are inherently a part of life, they must be realistically faced. Difficulties can be solved more peacefully through dialogue. A desire to be dialogic creates better atmosphere for the resolution of conflict.

Willingness to Admit Error. In conflict or argumentation, one can observe a variety of attitudes in the encounter. Although one learns in our society that it is entirely appropriate to argue and to take a strong stance, one also learns that stubbornness and dogmatic biases can be harmful, too. Human error is possible in any communicative activity and dialogic communicators seem quite willing to admit their humaness and possible tendency to err. Changing ones mind, shifting positions, or modifying the stance are all possibilities within conflict
and argumentation. Allowing others to influence or persuade is another
means of confirmation of the other and is usually balanced reciprocally.

Feedback. This term is quite prominent in communication models.
It is a term that indicates some type of response to the communicator.
Feedback is very important in providing appropriate information in
communication. Dialogic communicators use feedback as a way to adjust
their messages and responses to indicate their attitude on a moment by
moment basis. Their sensitivity to other communicators is demonstrated
by the quality of their feedback. Failure to listen often causes
communication problems because it lowers the accuracy of the feedback.
Many people are simply too busy planning their own messages that they
fail to give appropriate feedback. It is both helpful and desirable to
give anyone who speaks active feedback through expressions that he can
interpret. Active feedback encourages involvement between the communi-
cators.

Positive Attitude. In the dialogic frame of reference, attitudes
are psychological constructs which can be negative or positive.
Attitudes exist in clusters of similar or related constructs. An
attitude directs behavior. In genuine dialogue, attitudes are positive
forces leading to better understanding and learning. Student attitudes,
for example, tend to be negative when they are required to take courses
they do not want to take and are less likely to learn as much. Meaning-
ful learning or dialogue does not occur when negative attitudes exist.  

---

16 Makay and Gav, op. cit., pp. 125-134.
Makay and Gaw's discussion of the conditions for dialogue contain the elements central to Buber's I-Thou theory. All of the constructs identified and explained indicate a concern for genuine relationships with others and attention to these constructs would likely improve communication. While contexts for communication would vary, the conditions would need to exist for dialogic communication to occur. The problem with the theory involving conditions, according to Buber's philosophy, is that the conditions develop existentially and ontologically and would be difficult to delineate from the lists of characteristics. Buber's notion is that dialogue happens in present time, on a moment by moment basis.

**Summary**

Martin Buber's I-Thou theory was significantly influential in the development of a relational focus in communication research and education. Dialogical communication theories focus on the quality of interaction between participants, the quality of their relations. What is implied is that the relational dimension constitutes an ethical level of exchange. The integrity of the participants is gaged by their willingness to enter genuine dialogue. The relationship is dependent upon a reciprocity of consciousness to develop a living encounter and not merely on the language or activities of people who happen to be present in synchronated events in a situation. The quality of the relationship determines the growth of individuals as they respond to each other synergetically.

Several communication theorists contributed to an enlargement of the theory. John Stewart linked the theory with the research and teaching of communication. He was particularly explicit in citing
Suber's philosophical influence and contributions. Johanesen's earlier article concerning the emerging concepts of the theory was influential in bringing relational theories to the attention of scholars and teachers. He discussed the basic concepts of dialogic communication, raised important questions and associations, and affirmed his belief that the study of dialogical communication is warranted. He further expanded the theory by describing characteristics of dialogic communication. Makay and Gaw also discussed the 'characteristics, but added the dimension of love. John Poulakos' study involved the difficult task of delineating the components of dialogic communication, the Self, the Other, and the Between. He seemed to shed considerable light on the complexities of genuine communication. In his discussion, he adhered closely to Suber's basic tenets. Last, Makay and Gaw established the conditions of dialogue which form further experiential and subjective criteria for the study of dialogical communication.

Each theorist discussed and expanded the relational theory by identifying, explaining, and describing concepts or criteria. Each theory added more emphasis to the relational focus. Through the emphasis, understanding, and teaching of these theories, communication may be improved in future generations.
Advocates of humanistic education integrate cognitive and affective learning in school in much the same way that advocates of dialogical communication integrate them in research and teaching in the field of communication. In doing so, both fields involve a relational focus. The impetus for the focus was much the same, though for humanistic education, Carl Roger's client-centered therapy became self-directed learning. Rogers' work was influenced, however, by his study of Martin Buber's I-Thou theory. In 1957, Rogers and Buber met and discussed their theories in a public dialogue. Rogers stated:

One thing I would say before starting to talk with Doctor Buber is that...It was only an hour or two ago that I met Doctor Buber, even though I had met him long ago in his writing.¹

Friedman made reference to the fact that Rogers' writings indicate influence from Martin Buber's I-Thou theory and the two thinkers resemble each other.²

Since both the field of communication and education borrow heavily from psychology, the integration began occurring approximately the same


²Ibid., p. 166.
time, the early 1960's. They were responding to somewhat different problems. Communication scholars and teachers were influenced through psychotherapy, as Johannesen pointed out, while humanistic educators were responding to the outcries of students and critics in all levels of school. They were critically reacting to behavioralism and the overemphasis in school on objectivity and cognitive learning. Consequently, they sought to integrate cognitive and affective learning in an attempt to balance the emphasis. In their concern with more humane practice, they became involved in a relational focus.

Lyons notes that in school affective learning and cognitive learning belong together. If cognitive learning is isolated and feeling is ignored, man is not developed to his highest potential. Students enjoy school. They have highly charged feelings and emotions that are totally unrelated to the curriculum and are often taboos of the classroom, boy-girl relationship, love-making, protests, social causes, dances, cars, and music.

The humanistic education philosophy does not allow leaving out the cognitive end of learning. It does not allow teachers to become psychotherapists. It does advocate that the healthiest place for everyone in society is somewhere between the two extremes, with the ability to view both ends of the continuum. Humanistic educators advocate integrating the intellectual atmosphere with feelings in the classroom. People should be accepted and looked at as whole human beings whose feelings do directly influence learning. Lyons asserts: "...isolating cognitive
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learning from affective learning is a mistake—a mistake, the impact of which we are feeling on campuses and in classrooms all over the country."\(^4\)

Most gifted students who have reached high academic goals point to one or two individuals who influenced them by a strong, supportive relationship. The influential individuals usually built a more intimate relationship than is expected traditionally. They usually push and encourage students to achieve their potential.

Students must have a taste of success in the classroom. Teachers should be constantly aware of this need of the child and the power the teacher has to cause students to bloom.\(^5\) Earl Kelley states: "To humanize education, the teacher needs to recognize and value each child's uniqueness and cherish it as the individual's most priceless possession."\(^6\) Martin Buber strongly advocated the unique value each child has to society and his philosophy strongly supports Earl Kelley's assertion.

Development of the intellect will not be the major way to solve social problems. One of the greatest problems today is personal and interpersonal relations. Society needs people who accept and respect each other before many problems can be solved.\(^7\) Silberman asserts:

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 4.

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 6-7.


"Our most pressing and educational problem...is not how to increase the efficiency of the schools; it is how to create and maintain a humane society." Martin Buber advocated that society could become restructured through the I-Thou relationship which could be fostered in each child.

Goals

In a Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, the Commission made recommendations which indicate a need for change in the goals of public secondary education. These new goals must meet the needs of all youth, those common needs and those unique needs. The education each child receives must be a quality education. The new goals should tend to allow people to live together more harmoniously, to solve problems more effectively, and to value continuous learning.

The purpose of goals is to guide schools in the direction that they should be moving. Many of those departments of education and school boards should provide the framework for the goals to be met. These officials and leaders should set long range goals.

Unfortunately, people do not evaluate the effects of goals and, once goals are established, they often become tradition or custom in a community without any regard to changes in society. For example, the goals set in 1918 by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education became known as the Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Although other high commissions designed other goals, the

---

8 Ibid.
Seven Cardinal Principles have remained the lasting goals of most educators. As late as 1966, 85% of all teachers polled said they felt that the Seven Cardinal Principles were satisfactory goals. An equally strong statement came from administrators. However, the Commission of 1918 made clear in the introduction to the report that the goals should not be static and that modification would be necessary as society changed.9

One of the traditional goals of education has been the transmission of the culture. It is necessary to understand the past, but it is not enough. Knowledge becomes obsolete. Harold Benjamin illustrates the problem when he said that education must also prepare people for the future. There must be more concern about teaching people how to learn. Learning is natural and children who can't learn are abnormal. However, the educational process often makes them abnormal. Preparing people for future learning is an important goal of education.10

Among Martin Buber's criteria for the education of the child, he included the problem of dealing with culture and the preconditioning of the child's values through culture. The problem, as Buber articulated it, is that norms and values which are forced on the child by society have little or no meaning to him. Educational goals have been plagued by stagnation and Buber's philosophy supports the humanistic educator's criticism that educational goals must be appropriately altered to adapt

10Patterson, op. cit., pp. 20-21.
to new societal challenges and needs. When the individual suffers because of the weaknesses of goals, society will ultimately suffer.

Carl Rogers strongly believes in the need for revolutionary change in our education goals. He states:

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.\footnote{Carl R. Rogers, \textit{Freedom to Learn}, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), p. 303.}

He goes on to say that "knowledge," methods and skills quickly become obsolete. The new goal of education should be that of helping people to become open to change. People need to learn to live comfortably with change rather than rigidity. If people are to be taught to be open, then educators must be open and flexible. Teachers, administrators, and students must not feel threatened by change. Teachers must learn to facilitate self-directed learning and this is the only way to have a creative educational organization.\footnote{Tbid., pp. 303-304.} Buber's stance was clearly congruent with Roger's idea of openness and freshness of approach to each new problem.

**Teacher As Facilitator**

In a new humanistic concept of teaching, Carl Rogers views the traditional term "teaching" as a vastly overrated function. He believes that teaching assumes that something is assimilated and that assumption alone is erroneous. He states the following:
Teaching and the imparting of knowledge make sense in an unchanging environment. This is why it has been unquestioned function for centuries. But if there is one truth about modern man, it is that he lives in an environment which is continually changing.

We are, in my view, faced with an entirely new situation in education where the goal of education, if we are to survive, is the facilitation of change and learning.

When the teacher takes the role of facilitator, a number of principles of learning should be considered, according to Carl Rogers:

1. Human beings have a natural potentiality for learning.

2. Significant learning takes place when the subject matter is perceived by the student as having relevance for his own purposes.

3. Learning which involves a change in self organization—in the perception of oneself—is threatening and tends to be resisted.

4. Those learnings which are threatening to the self are more easily perceived and assimilated when external threats are at a minimum.

5. When threat to the self is low, experience can be perceived in differentiated fashion and learning can proceed.

6. Much significant learning is acquired through doing.

7. Learning is facilitated when the student participates responsibly in the learning process.

8. Self-initiated learning which involves the whole person of the learner—feelings as well as intellect—is the most lasting and pervasive.

9. Independence, creativity, and self-reliance are all facilitated when self-criticism and self-evaluation are basic and evaluation of others is of secondary importance.

10. The most socially useful learning in the modern world is the

---

learning of the process of learning, a continuing openness to experience, and incorporation into one-self of the process of change.

To be an effective facilitator, Carl Rogers presents some guidelines. First, the facilitator must set the mood or climate for the class. He must trust the group and the individuals. Second, the facilitator must help the group to elicit and clarify its purposes. Third, he must rely on the student's desire to implement the meaningful purposes individually. Fourth, he should organize and make available every possible resource for learning. Fifth, he should regard himself as a resource to be used by the students. Sixth, he should respond both to the intellectual content and the emotions and attitudes of the students. Seventh, as the classroom atmosphere establishes and reflects trust and acceptance, the facilitator becomes a participant learner, expressing his views as those of one individual. Eighth, he shares his own feelings and thoughts with the students without endeavoring to make demands or impose upon them. Ninth, he keeps on the alert for the expression of strong feelings by the students. Tenth, he recognizes and accepts his own limitations.\(^1\)

All of Rogers' principles seem congruent with Buber's philosophy. However, Buber's educational objective would be to develop the student's character and Rogers' principles do not seem to address this major objective in implementing the teacher roles he advocates. Rogers' suggestions extend Buber's philosophy but do not definitively delineate

\(^1\) Rogers, op. cit., pp. 157-164.

\(^15\) Ibid., pp. 164-166.
the quality of the teacher/student relationship or the kind of student
product he wishes to develop. Buber clearly states that students cannot
function alone in the "libido," but Rogers' principles seem minimal in
addressing the problem of the role/relationship between the teacher and
student. The question raised seems to involve how the teacher and students
may be able to participate together in the learning process. The students
need the teacher's participation with them, according to Buber, but
Roger's principles seem to stress mainly independent and self-initiated
learning.

Leeper suggests that becoming a humanistic educator requires a new
approach to life, altogether. It is not simply a new "technique." It
requires a deep commitment to students, deeper than most teachers want
to have. It may involve being available to students 24 hours a day.
Dr. Thomas Clark writes about "caring and communicating." He suggests
that being a humanistic educator is both simple and complex; that being
a teacher is not donning a costume as one enters the classroom. The
teacher must care about individuals who are students. Subject matter
is treated as a "means" rather than an "end." The subject-matter can
become a means to self-development and self-understanding. Subject
matter can form a cognitive link whereby two or more individuals can
interact and can create an affective experience.

The humanistic educator is concerned with more than appropriate
behavioral response or "memorization-regurgitation" cycle. He realizes
that both the teacher and the student have values which cause them to
catalog and interpret facts. The humanistic teacher is candid about
these attitudes, does not judge, but questions frequently. Being honest
with students and admitting the need for continuous learning is probably
the most significant attitudinal focus of the humanistic educator.\(^{16}\)

The humanistic educator Leeper and Clark describe very closely
resembles the dialogical communicator suggested by Buber. The caring,
the genuineness, the attitude toward subject matter and knowledge,
the questioning techniques, and honesty and freshness of approach
clearly indicate Buber's influence. All of these characteristics of
the teacher are important to the potential quality of the shared
relationship in the classroom.

**Self-Actualization**

The results of creating a humane school should reflect in the
attitudes and values of individuals and ultimately in society as a
whole. What type of individual should be the product of education?
Maslow believes he should be self-actualized.

Maslow's theory of self-actualization is not an easy objective
to achieve and the criteria to judge the objective is not simple. Some
objective criteria have already been developed, however.\(^{17}\)

Maslow's contribution to humanistic social psychology is in his
preoccupation with healthy people rather than sick ones. Maslow’s
theory rests upon a hierarchy of human motivation. That is, a person
has a predisposition to satisfy basic needs before subsequent ones can

\(^{16}\text{Lyons, op. cit., pp. 151-153.}\)

\(^{17}\text{Patterson, op. cit., pp. 22-23.}\)
be satisfied. In order to understand self-actualization, Maslow made extensive investigations of people he considered self-actualized. 18

In adopting the goal of developing the self-actualized persons, education is not at odds with other institutions in society, such as the home, the church, the economic system, the political system, or any other institution. The goal is not an external goal and is therefore not forced upon an individual. The goal is inherent in the human being. The individual has internal motivation, that gives purpose and meaning. 19 This idea permeates the relational philosophy of Buber, but Buber differs with psychologists, in that, for him purpose and meaning arise ontologically and existentially from the dialogical relationship.

For Maslow, the self-actualized person is able to interact in an open and honest fashion because he accepts others and accepts himself. But the question can be raised, can individuals who are open and honest exist in today's society? Since today's society is so competitive, can people be taught love? People who are self-actualized in a competitive society might not be at a disadvantage; however, there is a more important question. Can today's society afford not to change goals from competitiveness to self-actualization? In the past, societies which did not have enough individuals with characteristics showing self-actualization disappeared. Survival of societies depends on individuals who contribute


19 Patterson, op. cit., pp. 22-23.
positively to civilization. Since survival is dependent on individuals and individuals are dependent on interaction, the quality of the individual and the interaction must be high in order that society may survive.

Cooperation rather than competition has been the basis for survival of groups and societies. Evidence indicates that people can develop characteristics of cooperation to a high degree. Studies by counselors and psychotherapists and communication educators indicate that people can acquire more humane behavior with education and training. The affect of the self-actualized person has a positive growth promoting effect on others around him. Buber's relational philosophy clearly lead him to the conclusion that growth and learning can only occur between caring individuals who act in a spirit of community. The society Buber envisioned is characterized by self-actualized persons who can depend upon each other for mutual support. This will be the goal for all educators who take seriously their responsibility in developing youth for such a role in society.

**Inhumane Schools**

Humanistic educators were looking critically at the condition of schools as they formulated their alternatives and innovations. Education had been in the process of becoming more and more inhumane. Paul Goodman's study of the educational system led him to the belief that for many youth it would be better if they had no formal schooling at all.

---

20 Ibid., p. 28.
He suggested that education tends to retard rather than facilitate the learning of children. Holt suggests in his critical evaluation that many students give the impression of learning while others look out the window; that both types of students are trying to get through the day with the least pain possible; that most children are tense and anxious and becoming neurotic; and, that the classroom becomes a jungle except for those who wish to conform. He suggested that there are few "winners" and many "losers." 21 He alluded to emotions in school:

What is most surprising of all is how much fear there is in school...most children in school are scared most of the time, many of them very scared...The scared fighter may be the best fighter, but the scared learner is always a poor learner. 22

School Organization

In a previous discussion of his philosophy, the writer noted that Buber believed institutions alienate persons. Humanistic educators believe that schools have become large institutions flooded by students who feel no sense of individual worth. Furthermore, educational organizations attempt to operate efficiently through goals and controls that ignore individual needs. Authority and power are used in schools to insure that all members fulfill their roles. Rules and sanctions are used to maintain order. There is also a rigid division of labor. The personnel are evaluated according to the standards related to their

21Patterson, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

speciality. The larger the organization, the less possible are face-to-face relations among members. This fosters a more formal atmosphere that creates the feeling that a "faceless" authority rules the organization. 23

The bureaucracy is created to assist an organization like the school to operate more efficiently. Its objectives are to create a more rational, unemotional, precise, and efficient organization. Each office is under supervision and control of a higher one. When schools employ the scientific management approach, teachers' relation to supervisors are analogous to the relation of a man to his supervisors in the armed forces, government, and business. The view is held that the teacher should be an obedient servant to administrative authority. This view is in conflict with democratic educational administration which recognizes the human factor within the organization. 24

**Administration**

Humanistic critics advocate that education systems must be managed by human managers before teachers can be expected to be humane. Lyon states:

> If our schools and our educational systems are managed by less than human managers, we cannot expect our teachers to be humanistic in their orientation. Accordingly, emphasis on people-oriented management must begin at the top echelons and flow down if it is to have any positive effect on teachers. 25

---


24 Ibid., pp. 44-47.

25 Lyon, op. cit., p. 251.
Lyon goes on to present a study done by Likert which isolates high producing managers and low producing managers in order to examine their characteristics. Likert contrasted the characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Producers</th>
<th>High Producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Production oriented (people considered tools to get the job done).</td>
<td>1. People oriented (people considered to be unique individuals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Little two-way personal communication (relatively inaccessible to workers).</td>
<td>2. Good two-way personal communication (is accessible to workers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Autocratic</td>
<td>3. Allows subordinates to participate in decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor delegator</td>
<td>4. Good delegator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Punitive</td>
<td>5. Relatively nonpunitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identifies with only his subordinates.</td>
<td>6. Identifies and relates with both his superiors and his subordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fails to plan ahead.</td>
<td>7. Plans ahead effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Holds frequent formal meetings.</td>
<td>8. Holds few formal meetings (not necessary since communications are effective).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In time of crisis, pitches in with workers thereby relinquishing his role as a supervisor.</td>
<td>9. In time of crisis, maintains supervisory role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Workers in his unit feel pride toward their work groups.</td>
<td>10. Workers in his unit feel strong pride toward their work groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Workers feel their boss is ineffective in his relations with top management.</td>
<td>11. Workers feel their manager has good communications with top management and can effectively represent their interests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26Ibid., pp. 251-152.
The data shows 100 percent the characteristics necessary for high producing managers and humane educational administrators. The feeling seems to prevail in most educational bureaucracies that personal problems of subordinates are not to be brought to superiors who are supposed to maintain an impersonal and objective role. Working in a bureaucratic environment could be enjoyable if the bureaucracy were more "people-oriented." But making the bureaucracy emotional and personal goes against the theory that protects itself by being objective. It seems a reasonable and humane goal that each administrator should be held responsible for the morale, motivation, career developments, and goals of subordinates.

Lyon states that he prepared a memo to the Commissioner of Education and other top management people which explained the Likert findings and suggested to them that each supervisor rate himself. The results were a barrage of extremely defensive memos telling why they could not participate in self-evaluation. Lyon analyzed the cause and asserts the following:

The conventional bureaucratic philosophy, so often practiced in our school systems of management by "direction and control," is inadequate in motivating today's employee, whether teacher or mechanic..."Direction and control" are somewhat useless in motivating people whose important needs are of the higher social and egoistic variety, such as needs for self-esteem, recognition, independence, achievement, knowledge, status, and self-fulfillment.

---

27 Ibid., pp. 253-254.

28 Ibid., p. 255.
In the low-producer type bureaucracy, superiors presume that subordinates will not like responsibility or work and need to be manipulated. The subordinates must be given material incentives to accomplish goals. In schools superiors use threats, money, or grades as incentives. In contrast, the high-producing bureaucracy assumes that people like responsibility and that motivation for work or learning is natural and inherent in all people. Humanism flourishes in this type of environment. Trust and confidence grow. Administrators see tasks as creating maximum opportunities for teachers or students to learn. External incentives are not enough for teachers and students who also must satisfy their own needs while working toward organizational goals.

Superiors in a bureaucratic organization such as a school must allow subordinates to make decisions without the fear that a mistake is fatal. Failure must not mean punishment if the subordinate is going to grow and develop into a responsible person.²⁹

Furthermore, humanistic critics feel that larger school size makes more impersonal bureaucratic control. The large school may be more efficient for the bureaucracy, but it is not more efficient for the individual.³⁰ In the April 1974 Report of the Twelfth Annual Conference on Civil and Human Rights in Education, Jean Grambs commented on school size:

²⁹Ibid., pp. 255-259.

The big school is the breeding ground of much that is wrong with American education. In the large school, children can drift along for years without being seen by anyone, and pretty soon they drift out into a life of small rewards and great failures...

Solutions are being sought for large schools. An example is Newton, Massachusetts where they are devising "little schools." In Evanston, Illinois, Township High School is organized as unit schools. Dr. Gramb suggested a similar solution:

Perhaps, since we are stuck with large buildings and large schools, the best thing would be to break them into discreet units, either by creating small satellite schools in nearby buildings or houses, or by breaking up the building into subunits, physically separated from each other.

Silberman believes that schools today, because of their large size and overcrowded conditions make the social environment a very demanding one for students. Students must do things together most of the time. There is very little opportunity for private action. Individual activities sooner or later conflict with someone else such as the teacher or another student. If there is an opportunity for individual action, distraction or interruption makes it virtually impossible. The environment that is congested is likely to be frustrating to the

31Ibid., pp. 18-19.


Buber's philosophical stance clearly supports the humanistic educators' view that the bureaucratic system undermines meaningful interaction and has a debilitating effect on individual growth and productivity. For humanistic educators, large schools and authoritarian style managers are not desirable or conducive for the educational process. What they advocate are smaller schools or small school units and democratic style managers to alleviate the problem of alienation between persons. Buber's philosophy would support such a move and his influence seems apparent in the development of the rationale for such advocacy.

The Teacher

The most influential person in the classroom is the teacher. Most of what happens either directly or indirectly focuses on the teacher. Psychologically speaking, the teacher controls the classroom environment.

Tanner and Lindgren assert that the teacher is widely perceived as the "authority figure" in the classroom. The role is sometimes parent, "boss", director of learning, judge, guidance worker, and therapist. In some ways parents and teachers are sometimes in conflict as authority figures particularly when they disagree. Children see teachers as making the same demands as parents and they behave toward the teacher
much as they do the parent.\textsuperscript{35} From the student perspective, Tim Dailey comments that in the elementary school the teacher plays mother or father much of the time.\textsuperscript{36}

According to Tanner and Lindgren, the specific personal qualities of the teacher have been the topic of a substantial body of research. Research shows that children acquire their attitudes, values, and motives from adult models. The more a child is exposed to certain qualities he identifies in an authority figure, the more likely he will be to acquire the same qualities. The imitation is often rewarded by the teacher with approval gestures and finally with a grade.\textsuperscript{37} Tim Dailey makes astute observations about his own experience, common to most students, of going to school to listen to the teacher, doing assigned homework, reciting, and following directions. This happens from kindergarten to graduate school. What is perceived by most is that the teacher, by virtue of being a teacher, is right, and to be educated is to know what the teacher knows. The facts must be "memorized" then repeated to the teacher. Too much of the time these "facts" are the values and beliefs of the teacher. Feelings and emotions are left out, at least on the overt level. On the covert level, when the teacher grades, his feelings affect him. When the student anticipates the grade, he


\textsuperscript{36}Lyons, op. cit., p. 46.

\textsuperscript{37}Tanner and Lindgren, op. cit., p. 27.
feels the pressure of being judged by the teacher. He often associates his worth as an individual with the grade he received and feelings are genuinely aroused.\(^{38}\)

In most classrooms, according to Silberman, a student's words and actions are constantly being judged. The knowledge of the judgment by peers and teachers is a source of constant threat to the student. The threat is that of being a failure. Much of a student's effort is directed toward strategies that will avoid his appearance of being a failure. The threat to the student's self-respect takes more energy than either thinking or learning.\(^{39}\)

Because the teacher has so much power and is an influential model, the responsibility for humanistic responses to students is intensified. The "god-teacher" and the "machine-teacher" are those who know all the answers and are to be worshipped. Many teachers have the idea that they must know all the answers. They are threatened when they do not and they pretend to know because they are unsure.

Clark and Kadis believe that autocratic methods in the classroom are rarely justified. How can a student living in a democratic society learn democratic principles when he is under a dictatorship? Most students are treated as second-class citizens. First-class citizenship in the school too often belongs only to the administrator and sometimes the teacher.

---

\(^{38}\) Lyons, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

\(^{39}\) Silberman, op. cit., p. 3.
Clark and Kadis also contend that there are plenty of teachers who are not worthy to be a part of the profession. Too many times, teaching has been thought of as a job rather than a profession. Unprofessionalism is easy to spot in many schools. The gossipy teacher is not trusted by parents and as a result they do not consult him on a professional level. On the other hand, the genuinely professional teachers are treated like baby sitters until they prove themselves.  

Humanistic educators note that much of the research that has been done since 1950 on teacher attitude and its affect on students in the class indicates that there is a significant relationship between positive teacher-pupil relationship. Studies by Hughes and others show that 40 percent of the teaching acts in the classroom are control. The teacher directs behavior and learning activities. The teacher controls behavior in what Thelen has called "toilet training". The high level of teacher control and low level of cognitive activity make it difficult for pupils to engage in inquiry or to deal with abstract concepts.  

The Flander's system of Interaction Analysis has been a popular system to research and analyze teacher behavior in order to determine the effect upon students. By using the Flander's system the following has been discovered:

descriptive studies of classroom behavior suggest that the typical classroom is one in which the cognitive

level of the interaction is low, and the degree of teacher control is high.\textsuperscript{42}

One study by Silberman indicates that when teachers have specific attitudes about students, the attitude is reflected in the classroom. In a study he states that four distinct teacher attitudes emerged from their descriptions of students. These attitudes are attachment, concern, indifference, and rejection.

"Attachment" reflects the teacher's appreciation for the child's conformity to institutional and teacher expectations. Comments from the teacher that the student is never any trouble to me shows that the type of student mentioned does not make any demands on the teacher.

"Concern" is an attitude toward students who make extensive but appropriate demands. The teacher obtains satisfaction from helping a child who is receptive and appreciative and worthy of the teacher's concern.

"Indifference" is an attitude shown toward a student with whom the teacher does not feel involved. Teachers frequently state that they are hardly aware of the person being in the room. There are no feelings one way or the other. The demands this person makes go ignored.

"Rejection" is shown to students who are not worthy of the teacher's attention. The students' demands are more than the teacher wants to handle. The comments from the teacher usually contain elements of hopelessness with the whole situation.

The study makes an ironic observation. Because students expect the teacher to avoid favoritism, the teacher usually responds by avoiding

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 74-75.
treating students she likes differently from those she dislikes. As a result, the study shows that the teacher would avoid calling on students described with "attachment" attitudes to answer questions. The student who received "concern" from the teacher was checked on frequently with regard to his academic and personal welfare. The teacher catered to many of his concerns while other students were ignored.

"Indifference" was exhibited by the teacher's lack of enthusiasm toward the student. There was very little teacher initiated contact between the teacher and student. When the indifferent student contacted the teacher, the teacher responded briefly, perfunctorily, and adequately. Few comments of praise were given to the student described as indifferent.

"Rejection" students could do no right in the eyes of the teacher. The teacher viewed the students as capable of helping themselves. Their attitude was considered "poor" by the teacher. The child who was rejected was under constant surveillance. The comments made by the teacher were deliberate criticism in front of the whole class. The rejected child was often refused help.

What this study shows is that students do not share the same experiences in the same classroom. Teachers are often influenced by their own prejudices and values. Students are often favored who reinforce the teacher's social-class values. Numbers of studies show that teachers' expectations of students create a self-fulfilling prophesy that is "played-out" in the classroom. Students' psychological well-being

\[43\] Silberman, op. cit., pp. 86-96.
is determined by how the teacher perceives them. The problem of changing a teacher's perception is hard to overcome because of the categories used in schools to describe the child. At times teachers have admitted that they regret their first impression judgments of students. After getting to know the person better, the teacher gained a greater feeling for the student.\textsuperscript{144}

J. T. Dillon, a humanistic teacher, sums up his early method of teaching:

I was taught to maintain good order (that meant I was to be tough). I was to keep professional distance (that meant I was not to be friendly). I was to insist on respect (that meant I was not to allow any student to express individual will). I was in all circumstances to show faculty solidarity and unity (that meant I was to help a bunch of bigger guys to gang up on a little kid). I was to be fully backed by the office in any show-down with a kid (that meant I didn't have to apologize, temporize, or compromise). I was to train boys to become men (that meant I could slap a kid in the face and then slap him again if he cried, winced, or resisted). In sum, I was to assume a position of authority and ensure that I kept it....

There appears to be a kind of struggle going on between teachers and students. Each group trains its initiates on how to win. Teachers trade gimmicks for making kids do what they want them to do and students trade tricks for avoiding doing it.

Buber's philosophy supports the humanistic educator's view that the teacher's role and responsibility is to accept all students. Humanistic educators believe that teacher attitudes toward students and the subsequent acceptance or rejection of them determines the quality of the relationship and learning which may occur. Buber would agree with

\textsuperscript{144}Ibid, pp. 119-120.

\textsuperscript{145}J. T. Dillon, \textit{Personal Teaching}. (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 149-151.
humanistic educators in their criticism of teachers who use manipulation
to motivate students. He would argue strongly that gimmicks and tricks
which make objects of students are totally inappropriate and monologic
responses. The humanistic educator, in total agreement with Buber,
advocates treating students as whole persons, developing their highest
potential through effective teacher/student relationships.

Summary

Martin Buber's relational philosophy influenced humanistic
educators through the impetus lead by Carl Rogers and other psycho-
therapists. Humanistic education began as a reaction against the
Behavioralist psychologies that do not seem to develop man's high
abilities. Its major focus is on educating the "whole person." Traditionally,
schools have ignored the emotions and feeling of individuals
and have concentrated on the cognitive domain of learning, particularly
the memorization level. The humanistic critic does not wish to dispose
of the cognitive domain, but wishes to make the affective domain equally
as important.

Because the goals of education do not seem to meet current needs
in society, education needs to revise its goals. Educators need to be
more aware of changes in society. Some of the most important needs are
the needs to live together harmoniously, to be open to change, and to
make learning a continuous experience. Too often, the goals of education
have become traditions and customs, such as the Seven Cardinal Principals
of Education determined by the Commission of 1918.

Carl Rogers suggests that to be a humanistic educator the traditional
role of teacher as the prescriber of learning must be significantly
changed. The teacher should become the facilitator of learning, the resource person, and the counselor. Since the power of the teacher has always made students sensitive to his presence, the teacher, as facilitator, must make every effort to set a mood in the classroom that will allow students to play a more significant role in their own learning. Students must be trusted to be responsible to determine the information that will have most meaning to them. The teacher, as resource person, must know his subject matter area very well so that he can guide the student to explore every available opportunity for learning. The teacher, as counselor, must be aware of and sensitive to the emotionalized expressions of every student. Buber's criteria for the teacher is similar to Rogers' but involves more participation with the student than Rogers seems to suggest.

Rogers' and Maslow's goal for society is to produce mature persons, and educators need to be self-actualized in order to more effectively guide students. Self-actualization is a process of becoming mature with characteristics indicative of a person willing to make a positive and constructive contribution to society. Institutions of education should strive to teach all individuals to be internally socialized because of their inherent need for positive interaction with others. Cooperation rather than competition should be promoted. As a result of self-actualization, society should expect to have many more individuals able to make worthwhile and constructive contributions to its culture. Buber's philosophy supports the idea of restructuring society through improving human relationships.

Schools have traditionally sought to socialize the individual, to help him be acclimated to society. However, schools have fragmented
the socialization process by the methods they use for socialization.

Currently, in most schools, socialization is based on externals exemplified by following rules, not getting into trouble in the community, and participating in school goals without questions. These are the criteria for external socialization. The rewards for conformity under the system has been sufficiently high to allow the system to promote its own cycle. For those who seek higher rewards, internalize their goals, and wish to develop higher mental abilities, the fragmentation of the socialization process has been a destructive influence. The persons who seek goals that inadvertently lead them to self-actualization tend to continue to strive for societal change that would develop more constructive processes for socialization.

Humanistic educators reacted against current educational practices because schools were becoming more and more inhumane. Much of the cause for the inhumanity is the current choice of structure in which the school is housed. In order to seem to be more efficient, schools have consolidated into huge, unfeeling bureaucracies where both students and teachers feel lost identity. Buber clearly indicated that institutions alienate the persons in them. The functioning of institutions seems to come first on the list of priorities, while feelings of people seem to be ignored. As a result, students and teachers feel less loyalty or concern for the goals of the institution. "Red-tape" keeps them from suggesting or bringing about satisfactory changes.

Administrators who supervise these huge, unfeeling institutions are often more concerned about efficient operation of the school than
about the feelings of the people who live and work there. "Defend the status quo" seems to be the battle cry of most administrators. Enforcement of the rules and control of students and teachers are usually the major concern of administrators. Buber's philosophy rejects the notion that institutions promote personal growth and productivity.

Teachers add to the institutional problems and are frequently inhumane in the classroom. The typical classroom majors on prescriptive directions from the teacher with regard to both academic and social behavior. Teachers themselves perpetuate the cycle of negativism in the classroom. The teacher's negative or passive attitude toward students creates anxiety in the students. The students are constantly on the defensive. Most students conform in the classroom in order to get through the day with fewer pains.

Teacher/student relationships have been under research in the recent past and much of the data indicates that, although the majority of current teacher behavior is having a negative effect on students, improvement can occur if the teacher recognizes the negative strategies he is implementing. Much of the problem of inhumane schools can be solved by a humanistic approach which involves a change in attitudes by those in authority in the classroom and the school.

The relational focus of humanistic education corresponds to that in dialogical communication and both tend to extend major criteria from Martin Buber's philosophy. The humanistic educator seeks to improve education through genuine and honest encounter with students. While change is often difficult in education, the relational emphasis of
humanistic education could become a fruitful change of focus. Martin Buber's influence could become even more pronounced in future educational practice.
CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS

Many questions can be raised concerning teaching effectiveness from the relational focus in dialogical communication theories and humanistic educational theories. When these two areas of concern are linked, they seem to offer an enlargement of theory that is useful for teachers. The writer is interested in dealing with several questions: 1. Can teacher effectiveness be associated with the relational elements influenced by Martin Buber's I-Thou theory? 2. Do the relational elements constitute a starting point for understanding teacher effectiveness? 3. Does the integration of dialogical communication theories and humanistic education theories offer new insights for instructional effectiveness? These questions seem basic in analyzing the significance of the relational focus for teachers. More questions will surface throughout the development of the analysis in this chapter.

The basic premise and the current precept of the relational focus is Martin Buber's assumption that relations are the starting point for the question of man. There is nothing below man's relationship to another being. For Buber, in man's relation to another being, all meaning is created. Following that reasoning, he defined education and described the genuine educator.

A number of educators have adopted Martin Buber's stance, or portions of it. Marjorie Reeves, an English educator, applied the
I-Thou philosophy in her educational theory in a book she wrote in 1946. At this early date, she was concerned that objectivity in education was questionable because knowledge is mainly mediated through subjective interaction. Two other English thinkers applied the theory from two different directions, one from authoritarianism and one from permissiveness, yet they agreed on Buber's thought. Sir Fred Clark used Buber's thought in redefining education as a "creative conquest of freedom through tension and responsibility."¹ He influenced Sir Herbert Read to write about his experience in utilizing Buber's thought in the teaching of art.² James Britton cites his influence through Marjorie Hord's book, The Education of the Poetic Spirit. Hord had used Buber's thoughts on education. Britton used the Buber reference to argue against Skinnerian influence.³ Goodlad and Tyler use Buber's influence in the assumption they make for educators that the I-Thou relationship is more correctly termed the "educational relationship."⁴ Edward Kiner, in his 1968 dissertation which studied the implications for education from Martin Buber's existential philosophy, states that the teacher's primary function is to develop human relationship with pupils.⁵

²Ibid., p. 179.
Educational theorists tend to agree on the relational basis of Buber's educational theory.

**Teacher/Student Relations**

In the relational criteria, the teacher/student relationship is an encounter of two beings who are consciously aware of each other and are not merely in the presence of each other. Does the teacher need to establish a genuine dialogical relationship with students and, if so, what does the decision imply? The dialogical teacher's task is to initiate the relationship as the first and most important professional obligation. The teacher accepts all students who come to the classroom, regardless of their problems and habits, their mental abilities, or their physical appearance. However, many classes do not begin at zero-history. At the elementary level, more than other levels, it is the general practice of many institutions to keep cumulative records of each student to inform the student's new teachers from year to year of student histories. Too frequently these files contain damaging information. The information can contaminate the opportunity of the student to have a fresh start in a new school year and creates, instead, a self-fulfilling prophesy for the student. Students whose cumulative records reflect failure are expected to create problems in the coming school year. If the teacher's file on new classes contains too many "problem" students, the teacher is less likely to have a positive attitude toward the class as a whole and will initially be prepared for the worst, which will, of course, be mirrored by students. All of this negativism does not create a healthy classroom potential and is certain to thwart the development of I-Thou relationships. On the other hand, if teachers
begin the school year at a truly zero-history level, without checking the files or not having files available, both the teacher and students have a better opportunity to begin fresh without prejudice, or at least with less of it.

According to Buber, what matters most is the relationship, not the products of analysis and reflection. To the teacher, then, the relationship is more important than the tasks to be accomplished. Students who are treated less importantly than their tasks, or treated as "Its," have difficulty believing in themselves enough to get involved in the tasks. Those who get involved not only learn more, but become more independent learners and build self-esteem.

Dialogic teachers are empathic communicators. To be an empathic communicator, the teacher experiences the position of the student. That is, the teacher recognizes experientially the student's vulnerabilities and fears. Past experiences in school have left their marks upon even the youngest students. Older students may have even greater vulnerabilities because negative past experiences have created low self-concepts.

When the initial encounter between the teacher and student is empathic, the relationship has an opportunity to begin from a constructive position.

Although the teacher is the initiator of the relationship and has empathy for the student, the student is not yet capable or able to respond reciprocally. The student cannot experience the educator in the same way the educator experiences the student because their

---

responsibilities and levels of experience are different. The student has not yet developed any need to be responsive to the educator. But trust, mutuality, reciprocity, and empathy can begin to develop toward the educator when the student experiences no barriers to being accepted by him. The beginning of the relationship depends on the teacher's ability to accept the student by being consciously present, being sincere and honest, and having unconditional positive regard.

If the teacher is unable to be dialogic initially, there is less likelihood for positive outcomes later, although, as Buber indicated, the I-Thou can exist anytime the consciousness wills it. If the teacher understands the necessity of establishing a high quality relationship and a dialogical attitude immediately with students and it is the basic pattern of the teacher, the teaching relationship is likely to be established very early. Because of the varied experiences of students and multiple influences on each, they will initially respond differently to the overtures of the teacher. Even the most experienced and mature dialogical teacher recognizes the delicate balance of relationship development and the immense responsibility of effective moment by moment decisions in responding to student needs. With even the best intentions evident on the part of the teacher, there are moments of ambiguity and tensions experienced from the ambiguity which must be resolved as the teacher develops the type of relationship with each student that will raise the student's potential of becoming all he can be.

In further examination of the teacher/student relationship, John Poulakos' amplification of the Self and the Other seems helpful.
Poulakos' definition of dialogue is as follows:

"A mode of existence manifested in the intersubjective activity between two partners, who in their quest for meaning in life, stand before each other prepared to meet the uniqueness of their situation and follow it wherever it may lead."

The definition implies a goal for the relationship, that of adapting to the uniqueness of situations. While the classroom environment seems to have typifiable characteristics, each classroom situation is unique beyond the surface behaviors. The intersubjective activity of the partners is very complex, because it is a collective of individuals interacting on a relational basis. The group's interaction, however, is secondary to the relationship between the teacher and the student. In the socialization process, the teacher is a significant other to each student in the classroom.

In analyzing each partner in the dialogue, first, the component of Self will be analyzed. There is the teacher's Self and the student's Self. Both types of Selves require discussion, because each has a unique role in the dialogue.

The teacher's Self is the most important dimension of the dialogue, because the teacher's self-concepts influence whether the teacher will have adequate skill to communicate effectively and initiate the relationship. As was indicated earlier, the teacher's role in the classroom determines most of the classroom climate and, subsequently, the quality of learning that may occur. The teacher's role also determines the future learning of students, because it can influence the student's

anticipation of future learning situations. The attitudes and values students hold toward each other and toward school are greatly influenced by the teacher's role as the significant other in the socialization process.

The teacher is the only adult in the classroom and should, as a professional, have a healthy self-concept and present a Self with a mature point of view. Within this framework, the teacher extends the Self to students in an unthreatened way. The teacher who is self-actualized responds positively and does not feel vulnerable in dealing with any persons in the educational setting.

With regard to student problems, often referred to as "discipline problems," the mature teacher's view of student problems is that the student owns the problem, not the teacher. The teacher's role, then, is to assist the student in solving the problem, not to feel threatened by them. The goal of both the teacher and the student in growth-promoting situations would be to solve problems cooperatively. If the teacher is immature and feels threatened by student owned problems, there is very little that can be done to solve problems. If too many students appear to have problems in the class of an immature teacher, the teacher will likely create more distance with students, thus amplifying the students' problems and increasing tensions. If tensions surge too high, both the teacher and the students are likely to fail in the learning/teaching process. Potential for future learning is also disrupted; therefore, careful consideration needs to be given to the teacher's level of maturity in any classroom enterprise.
The student's Self is usually vulnerable in the classroom, as has already been discussed. Unless the student is extremely naive, no matter what age, he is likely to be aware of his vulnerability and the power of the teacher. This understanding is "caught" not "taught" in socialization and it is deeply embedded by experiences in school. From the youngest child to the oldest adult in school, each recognizes the overwhelming influence of the teacher, even though, with sophistication, some students mask the reality. The sophistication is developed from experience. In the early stages of classes, the sophisticated student's response is very cautious. The least vulnerable position seems to be to withhold information. Dead pan facial expression, subdued submissiveness, and general lack of response to the environment, plus many more cues, are evidences of the vulnerable Self feeling overexposed in classroom situations. Over time and in a growth-promoting trusting environment, the student Self gradually reveals itself and bears its vulnerability to the teacher, who, in order to establish a teaching relationship, treats the vulnerability with respect. The teacher assures the student Self that there is not only understanding of the vulnerability, but also a caring teacher Self. This assurance is often tested before the student Self withdraws the defences entirely. The more destructive past experiences have been to the student Self, the longer it takes to establish a constructive teaching/learning relationship no matter how mature a teacher Self may be. The student Self seems best understood by understanding its vulnerability.

An analysis of the Other requires attention to both the teacher's Other and the student's Other. Each are unique sub-components within
the component of the Other. Perceptions of the Other, in each case, seem to develop from a wide variety of sources.

The teacher's Other is, of course, the student. The student is the major responsibility of the teacher and must be thoroughly understood before there can be a relationship. In order to understand their Other, the potential teacher, in teacher education, is required to be academically and intellectually exposed through education and psychology courses. In addition, their training usually involves some observation and supervised direct contact with the type of student the teacher expects to teach. The young teacher's exposure to the student Other in an entirely new role, the teaching role, has diverse affects on them. Prospective teachers may have little foreknowledge of their aptitude for teaching. Their attitudes toward teaching and toward students develop more specificity in their re-entry into the school environment. From the perspective of their new role, they face their Other with some uncertainties.

As a student-teacher supervisor, it has been the writer's experience to observe, first hand, a variety of pre-teaching attitudes. The most common response of potential teachers has been the feeling of approach/avoidance, initially. Most pre-teachers feel an uncertain degree of separation from these strange young creatures called students. Even though they are only a few years advanced in age and experience, their college life marks a drastic departure from their not so much earlier attitudes about school. Their own socialization in the system of higher education seems to make them unaware of what it had been like to be a younger student. From this initial anticipation of contact, comes
anxiety and fear in the form of a personal threat to them. In most sessions in pre-teaching education courses with these young pre-teachers, the question of discipline invariably surfaces first. Some always seem to be concerned about how to exert their authority to control students. Some of their answers to their own questions seem interesting to analyze.

First, many feel that the best way to control students is through the grade. While it is the writer's observation that many practicing and so called "experienced" teachers do, in fact, use grades as a threat, it is an unwise, inappropriate, and an educationally unsound rationale for controlling the Other. Even if the approach works, students are "Its" as Others and the relationship is negatively affected, frequently to such a high degree that the teacher loses all influence in meaningful teaching. Future learning for the Other is disrupted. Another major weakness of using grades as motivation is that many students do not value grades anyway. The students who bring the most severe problems to the teacher, those students who own problems, are so overwrought with these problems that they respond negatively to additional tensions created by teachers. As the teacher acts on negatively perceived values and as students are forced to submit involuntarily, they become hostile. Their hostility is usually met with further teacher hostility until the situation escalates into a vicious cycle and a "no win" situation. The classroom experience is highly destructive to the point of complete chaos. The writer has seen this chaos erupt on numerous occasions with young pre-teachers. Many
young teachers have some very serious teaching problems because they do not understand their Other.

In contrast, a few pre-teachers seem to understand their Other well enough to develop some successful relationships in their brief early contact with students. After their initial anxiety and feeling of personal threat, the more successful pre-teachers very carefully observe the Other and begin to put themselves in a position to have positive types of personal contact with some students. In fact, it has been the writer's experience to observe some very fruitful relations develop when young teachers become highly aware of the value of the Other as whole persons and "Thous." They have overcome alienation and fear and move to positive forms of relating and identifying with the Other and their needs. It is beautiful to witness the successful young pre-teacher develop positive attitudes toward their Other.

The student's Other is the teacher. The student usually does not choose the teacher, but must submit to institutional and curriculum requirements, accepting whatever teacher he happens to get. The student must also study the Other, but experientially rather than intellectually. Most students have learned about their past Others effectively and process the information in quite sophisticated ways. Students' initial responses toward the Other can range from cautious curiosity to alienation and fear. They initially watch and listen to their Other, but usually think the worst because they lack information. Even if they may anticipate positive outcomes, they take a "wait and see" attitude. As the drama of the classroom interaction unfolds, they begin to observe confirming or disconfirming behaviors from their Other. Then their
anticipation begins to mount. In their impatience, they begin taking risks to test their Other. If they receive confirming behaviors, they begin developing positive attitudes toward the Other. If confirmation does not occur, interaction is directed toward more testing. Disconfirmation from their Other means the struggle is beginning. It means that success will be difficult and failure almost certain. Their attitude toward the Other is usually "if we're gonna fail, you're gonna fail, too." With this attitude, most students join in on a school year's struggle with the Other. Once the disconfirming patterns are established, the task of reversing or modifying the pattern is nearly impossible. Genuine meeting of the Other, when it has never been established, makes the presence of the Other an unbearable plight and high quality communication a virtual impossibility. How students perceive the Other determines their reality in school.

Developing the teacher/student relationship is a complex process, especially the initiation. It must be carefully analyzed. The influences and associations of multiple variables need to be within the range of teacher awareness. Teachers must be capable of initiating the relationship. Poulakos' components of Self and Other helpfully extends the analysis of the teacher/student relationship. Greater knowledge and understanding of the relationship may assist beginning and experienced teachers to have greater insight in their important role as initiators of learning.

**Trust**

For relationships to develop, there must be the establishment of positive trust and reciprocity. Buber phrases the idea clearly when
he commented: "Relation is reciprocity. Our students teach us, our works form us." It is through a positive attitude from the teacher that students feel trusted and will reciprocate.

Both Buber and Rogers agreed that trust is the most important relational element in establishing the teacher/student relationship. Extending trust to students confirms them and gives them growth potential. There is high risk in trusting students, but this is the only route to reciprocity. Teachers initiate trust and students reciprocate. Trust takes time to develop. It requires complete acceptance of the other person and is tested again and again.

Building trust is difficult because the rewards for being trustworthy are never as great as the punishment and hurt for being untrustworthy. A teacher may extend trust on a very discriminating basis and administer punishment for failure to be trustworthy. Only those students who remain constantly trustworthy are not punished. Conditional trust is pseudo trust. It can never create relationships. Therefore, conditional trust is not acceptable in the teacher/student relationship.

The dialogically sensitive teacher extends trust to all students. Some students have never been fully trusted in their experiences in school and, possibly, in no other environment either. They do not know what it feels like to be trustworthy, only what it feels like to be untrustworthy. This is what Buber seemed to mean in explaining the necessity to accept and trust all students in the classroom.

\[\text{Kaufmann, op. cit., p. 67.}\]
What happens to students when they are all totally and genuinely trusted? When the teacher extends trust to each student, there is no discrimination between which students seem more trustworthy and which do not. The trust is extended even though some students fail. The teacher who punishes the failure by total rejection of the student is, in essence, telling some students they are not worthy human beings. Students are aware of this inequity and it is unacceptable to them.

The teacher who equitably extends trust is constantly aware that some students are failing to become trustworthy. However, through closer participation with the student, more participation in each life and more caring and empathy, the teacher continues to extend trust. The teacher is not passively passing judgment, but actively engaged in developing a relationship. The possibilities for a break through are continuously present and that is what the equitable extension of trust allows. It is the potential, the ray of hope, for each student. The teacher who is developing a dialogical relationship always believes in the redeemable qualities of each student. For some students, it takes longer to develop trustworthiness. Trust is then extended over a longer period of time and more persistently. The teacher uses every available resource in the environment to enable him to demonstrate concretely that he trusts all students.

The teacher does not announce to students that trust is possible or impossible, but spontaneously acts and speaks, living the possibility. The dialogical teacher has the depth of knowledge, skill, and understanding to recognize that no meaningful learning or growth will ever occur until the relationship is established and maintained with all
students in the classroom. Reaching a portion of the students is not the goal of a dialogical teacher, though it may be his reality. Reaching all the students is his goal and he will not rest until that goal is reached and maintained. It is a difficult goal requiring great character, wisdom, and patience. The rewards, however, are enormous and the stakes high.

Students themselves do not have to understand the technicalities of the relationship. They are not responsible for the initiation of the relationship, but they demonstrate their feeling of being trustworthy through the quality of their response to the teacher and the class. As Buber pointed out, they begin to ask. They begin to respond with interest and concern. They begin to become involved, as Makay and Gaw indicate, by being intensely active in the events around them, finding them meaningful. The trust relationship motivates them internally. They rise to the occasion of learning and begin to grow synergetically with other involved persons, especially the teacher. As the teacher makes selections to focus on, to learn from, the students begin to respond mutually and reciprocally with the teacher in every venture. They venture together in a bond of reciprocity.

Character Building

Martin Buber believed that character building is the major task of the educator. The teacher can begin to build character only after he has established a genuine relationship with students. Moreover, Buber stated that character building is achieved without the teacher imposing too much from "above." How does the dialogical teacher avoid intruding too much?
Carl Rogers suggested that the teacher should take a new role, that of facilitator, counselor, and resource person, to allow students to participate more in their own learning.

Genuine character to Buber meant that students would develop the ability to solve problems through independent reasoning and justify beliefs and values through what has meaning to the self. He did not believe that students should be forced to accept traditional values or ideological practices without finding personal meaning in them for himself. Meaning should develop from internalizations by the students.

The dialogical teacher uses the whole environment as the frame of reference out of which to develop students' characters. The subject matter, occasion, or situation becomes the context for learning great character. The context is not an end in itself, but the means to the objective. It would not matter if the context were a math class, a music class, a ball game, a play, a field trip, or a party. All school activities and curriculum involve the potential to learn great character.

Much of the learning of character comes through conflict and problems. Again, the dialogical teacher does not intrude too much. As conflicts or problems arise, each situation is examined for its own uniqueness. Students freely examine, inquire, and reason through their own frames of reference. The teacher probes and elicits responses without imposing too much in the process and without absolute "right" answers. The teacher does not impose external "oughts" but encourages free and open search for personal truths and meaning. Traditional answers might be tossed aside for fresh, new, spontaneous insights. Knowledge would not be sought as an end in itself, but to develop great character.
Students possessing great character act responsibly. However, responsibility is defined differently for the dialogical teacher than for most. For the dialogical teacher, according to Buber, responsibility is characterized by the quality of the response to a genuinely felt need to respond. When a situation arises which demands a response, it is the genuine great character who responds in an appropriate way. What this means is that responsibility does not arise as an externally imposed, prescribed behavior.

Rules externally imposed and not felt to be needed or meaningful to students are bound to be broken in school. They teach nothing but dependence on external guidance for life and weaken character development. Many American educators believe that requiring strict adherence to rules is "preparation for life." For the dialogical teacher, this is simply not true. There is inconsistency with democratic principles involved in the way rules are made and administered and students are aware of the inconsistencies. The passing on of traditions and rules through forced demands may be acceptable in other societies, but not in a democratic society. The democratic society depends on the development of great characters for its survival.

Real responsibility exhibited by great characters is genuine. response to a felt need. It is internally motivated and rewarded. It arises from the I-Thou relationship, the genuine caring for other persons. No externally imposed rule can dictate caring or I-Thou response. Neither can it build character in students. Students become responsible when they act freely to become confirmed. Then, they can respond
genuinely and responsibly to society. The dialogic teacher works to
achieve this goal.

**Climate**

Buber made reference to the importance of a favorable classroom
atmosphere. The atmosphere or climate refers to the generalized
attitudes of participants. Johannesen referred to the necessity of a
"supportive psychological climate" for dialogical encounters. Poulakos' indentification of the "Between" seems to be useful to describe the
necessary psychological climate.

Classroom climate tends to remain constant after it has been
established. This does not mean that it is always a positive climate.
Because of the obligatory nature of interaction in the classroom,
there is usually some regular exchange usually described as students
answering questions or in some matter—accounting for themselves, if the
teacher requests or demands an accounting. What the writer perceives
in the classroom condition is that there can exist a truncation of the
components for dialogue by the participants. The Between may, in fact,
ever be established, subsequently, dialogic communication may never
occur in the classroom. It has been the experience of the critic to
observe many such classroom environments.

When no dialogic communication occurs, what characterizes the class-
room climate? Both the Self and the Other are seeming to interact. From
the standpoint of the behavioralist researcher, interaction can be
quantified, but since the researcher is not interested in the internal
states of the participants, the Between is never missed. In relying on
descriptive data alone, there is no way of accounting for the richness possible in classroom climates, the internalized processing that the participants experience, or the feelings that the participants have about the meaningfulness of what is taking place in the interaction. In short, the researcher cannot account for the variables which influence the quality of communication that creates meaning for individuals and classes. It is this richness which seems void in current research.

What lies beneath the surface, then, is more important than that which can be observed through artificial categories. The Between, being an invisible entity, exists experientially on a highly personal level. The being, rather than the seeming, of the interactants is determined in the internalized perceptions of the participants. How, then, can it be determined that the Between exists in the classroom? What characterizes knowledge that the Between does exist? It is the contention of this writer that it is possible to recognize the existence of dialogic communication in the classroom when some subjective sensitivity is applied. Two concepts seem to apply, mutual awareness and the willingness to be influenced.

First, cues for mutual awareness seem to be relationally revealed. If the participants seem to be mutually aware, there is an atmosphere of meaningful sensitivity between the participants. The teacher and students seem to understand where each is coming from, as evidenced by congruent messages. They seem to know what emotions are typical of each, so that there is a certain comfortableness in prolonged eye contact, movement, bodily posture, gestures, and physical contact. When interactants
approach each other, spatial arrangement is closer than in ordinary conversation. The students and teacher may feel quite free to have physical contact if they are working closely on something. Touching may occur in the interaction which is not necessarily task-oriented but support oriented. Tone of voice may be modulated to the mood appropriate for the interaction. Transactions may occur, that is, the teacher may engage a student privately in some manner, perhaps a task, a favor, or a request for some personal information, a recognition of life outside the classroom situation. The student, too, may feel free to make private transactions with the teacher. All of the relational behaviors can reveal to a sensitive observer that there is meaningful communication between the participants.

Second, willingness for each participant to influence and be influenced by the other is likely to occur in a number of specific ways. In this mutual exchange of influence, there is legitimization of teacher power and, also, confirmation of the students' Selves. As an example, there are instances where students ask for "face-saving" commitment from the teacher. When a student feels unsure or has engaged in a high risk task, but failed in some way, he may communicate that he desires that this failure be overlooked or mitigated by the teacher. The exchange allows the teacher to control future risk-taking behaviors on the part of students through the attitude the teacher takes. If the student feels that the teacher encourages risk and privately confirms the value of the student, then, there is a willingness to give the teacher more influence. Teachers, also, sometimes make "face-saving" gestures to students which
indicate a need for reciprocity. To build relations, each needs the reciprocity of the other.

In classrooms where the Between has been established, it is likely to be permanent, though there will be occasional crises and variations in the climate. No specific crisis will destroy the generalized climate, however. Where trust has become a pattern and not a pseudo attempt, the teacher/student-relationship is highly likely to endure in a stable fashion. When outside observers encounter such a climate, they may feel like intruders because of the close nature of the closed system created in the Between. It is like being in a room with intimate lovers or friends, as a third party, and only able to get a glimpse of the aesthetic nature of the experience. Involvement abounds in such a classroom. Relations are strongly established in the Between and sensitive observers subjectively feel the warmth and empathy generated. It is a celebration to be a participant in such a classroom.

This celebration in the classroom is the development of community. The multiple collection of persons in the classroom form a "reciprocal bond," not only a Between, but also an "Among." The caring is demonstrated through cooperation between the students rather than competition. The achievements of individual students are perceived to enhance each rather than detract from anyone. Participants find helping others to be growth-promoting and satisfying to themselves. By giving psychological support to others they receive support. This is the final goal of the dialogical teacher, to build a healthy living classroom community of great characters. This kind of community can be promoted throughout
the school, but it is highly dependent on enlarging the sense of community beyond a single classroom.

Buber's goal for the I-Thou relationship included the development of real communities in institutions. He believed institutions do not promote fellowship as they should and, in fact, alienate people. Humanistic educators attacked the bureaucratic structure of schools which keeps persons from developing. Schools can create a sense of community through a relational focus.

Summary

In this chapter, questions were raised concerning the relational focus and the implications for classroom teaching. Buber's relational theory formed the basis for his educational theory. His influence on communication education and humanistic education lead to a relational focus for both. Integrating theories from these two areas has lead the writer to examine the implications for teacher effectiveness.

First, the influence of the I-Thou theory indicates that dialogical teachers make relationship development the starting point for the practice of teaching. In the relational frame of reference, teachers accept students and treat them as "I"s not "Its." They empathically experience the student, though the student is not yet able to reciprocate. Mutuality develops from the teacher's initiation of acceptance. To the dialogic teacher, the importance of the personhood of the student is greater than the accomplishment of his tasks. Even though the teacher Self is capable and mature, he studies the student Self and takes responsibility for him. The student Self has potential, but has more
growing to do. The student's Other, the teacher, is learned experientially. The student waits to respond reciprocally until he is confirmed. Mutuality and genuine meeting occurs when the student feels confirmed and accepted.

Second, the dialogical teacher establishes trust. The goal of the teacher is to extend trust to all students equitably. Pseudo trust is based on external motivation and students recognize the deficiency. The teacher who extends genuine trust takes a high risk and accepts that some students will fail to be trustworthy. The teacher continues to actively participate in the student's life, believing in his potentialities. Although trust is hard to develop and easily destroyed, dialogical teachers realize the necessity of the goal.

Third, the major task of the dialogical teacher, according to Buber, is to build character. Teachers can begin to build character in their students after they establish the relationship and gain the confidence of students. Students are influenced as soon as the teacher gains their confidence. The teacher influences the student by not intruding too much and allowing students to create meaning for themselves, making independent but responsible judgments. When students learn to examine the uniqueness of each situation and come to justifiable and meaningful conclusions themselves, they have begun to develop great character. They become responsible when they respond to situations from a genuine felt need.

Fourth, classroom climate or atmosphere develops from the quality of the relationships between participants. Climate confirms or denies
growing to do. The student's Other, the teacher, is learned experientially. The student waits to respond reciprocally until he is confirmed. Mutuality and genuine meeting occurs when the student feels confirmed and accepted.

Second, the dialogical teacher establishes trust. The goal of the teacher is to extend trust to all students equitably. Pseudo trust is based on external motivation and students recognize the deficiency. The teacher who extends genuine trust takes a high risk and accepts that some students will fail to be trustworthy. The teacher continues to actively participate in the student's life, believing in his potentialities. Although trust is hard to develop and easily destroyed, dialogical teachers realize the necessity of the goal.

Third, the major task of the dialogical teacher, according to Buber, is to build character. Teachers can begin to build character in their students after they establish the relationship and gain the confidence of students. Students are influenced as soon as the teacher gains their confidence. The teacher influences the student by not intruding too much and allowing students to create meaning for themselves, making independent but responsible judgments. When students learn to examine the uniqueness of each situation and come to justifiable and meaningful conclusions themselves, they have begun to develop great character. They become responsible when they respond to situations from a genuine felt need.

Fourth, classroom climate or atmosphere develops from the quality of the relationships between participants. Climate confirms or denies
the existence of the Between. Although it is an invisible entity, the
Between can be identified through subjective sensitivity in concrete
ways. The Between, when established, is permanent even though there may
be interruptions at times. The stability of the Between always returns
in dialogic environments. Students and teachers experience a celebration
of real, living community in the Between. Living community has the
potential for restructuring society.

Dialogic communication theories and humanistic education theories
developed from the relational philosophy of Buber offer new insights
into teacher effectiveness. If teachers start with relationship develop­
ment, extend trust, build character, and create a living community in the
classroom, they will have met the basic criteria suggested by the
relational focus
CHAPTER VI
IMPLEMENTATION

For many educators, theories have little usefulness if they cannot be applied. Gephart and Ingle indicate that educators align themselves in this position. However, the most ideal position is that theories should have practical value and practice should have theoretical basis. ¹ Does Martin Buber's relational theory have practical value? Can the relational approach be implemented and evaluated? Answers to these questions will be the focus of this chapter. The relational focus can be implemented more effectively in a more open environment in the school and the classroom.

Opening the School

Silberman observed that many of the problems in school are related to the regimented system of compulsory education:

our children are locked into a regimented system that attempts to stamp them all in the same mold. The student is filled with facts and figures which only accidentally and infrequently have anything whatsoever to do with the problems and conflicts of modern life or his own inner concerns. What he needs and wants are matters of no apparent interest to anyone associated with the schools.


The law provides that the student cannot petition to withdraw even if the school treats him badly and does not provide an adequate education. The student is a conscript who is somewhat protected but cannot terminate his obligation. As a student, a child and young person has few rights.\(^3\)

Frank Brown's concern was as follows:

> What is wrong with compulsory education? Forced schooling makes a captive audience. Too many students are in school because they are constrained to be there. The result is that, for many students, schooling is a place of confinement. The consequence is that an uneasy truce exists between many students and their teachers. The schools have been modeled after the jail, the church, and the factory, and the students have been victims of academic imperialism.

Some suggestions of alternative paths to education were offered by the National Commission of Reform of the Secondary School, 1973. They recommended that the alternatives be funded by the school and that students be given credit for the experience. The Commission believed that learning takes place in many settings and that non-traditional, non-classroom experiences provide valid learning.\(^5\)

The Arlie House conference held in Washington D. C. in 1972 designed some alternatives for high schools which included the following ones by Harold Howe:

1. Education is not something that takes place only inside a building called a school. It takes place all the time through direct experience, as well as through the vicarious experience of learning. School therefore, must recognize

---

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 223-224.


as education the time young people spend outside of school, help them plan its best use, and give credit for it.

2. Schools must take a much enlarged responsibility for helping young people find jobs and significant volunteer opportunities that have real value to society during the secondary school years, and schools must give credit toward graduation for these activities.

3. The baby-sitting function of the high schools should cease. There are no babies in them. As they drop the custodial function, high schools must take a renewed responsibility for the career interests and choices of young people.

Alternative programs may be made flexible by altering time schedules. Gay Luce, a noted science writer, suggested that based on experiments, students learn better at varied times of day. Their individual nervous systems determine when maximum learning occurs. Based upon her research, indications are that there is a need for alternative time schedules for school. One school inadvertently discovered that many of its students preferred school in the evening. In the 1970-71 school year, Las Vegas operated a unique school called the Urban High School that began late in the afternoon and ran through the early evening. The school had problems with the state law forbidding "night schools" but was able to get it approved, finally. The reason for the formation of the school was that a sizeable number of students preferred going to school at night.

Initially, the administrator asked the students what they did not like about their school, and one young man said he did not like going to school in the morning. As a result, a night school was established with 600 students participating. Most of those were fair to excellent

---

6 Weinstock, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
students who came because they were night people and they found school much easier.7

Although there are a number of schools that offer alternative programs that modify the rigid patterns of past traditional schools, there are few schools that have turned to the ideas and principles of progressive education as it has been pioneered in England, such as the open schools.8 The open school and the open classroom difficulties in American schools are described by Patterson when he observes:

The difficulties of developing really open classrooms and open schools in America lie in a basic conflict between the philosophy and goals of the traditional American school... Real humanistic education involves personalization and teacher concern for the individual as a person whose stage of development and interests lead to the creation of his own curriculum...

American education has been obsessed with narrow, limited, specific, concrete, measurable—and almost always short-term—objectives...an approach inconsistent, as we have seen, with the naturalistic, humanistic approach to education.9

Martin Buber's philosophy indicated little faith that relationships could develop in institutional settings; yet, he recognized the absolute necessity for dialogical teacher/student relationships in the educational process. Buber would likely agree with Silberman, Brown, the Arlie House group, and Luce because they articulated concerns over what Buber would lament as the treatment of students as "Its" rather than "Thous" in

7Ibid., pp. 39-40.
9Ibid., pp. 58-59.
school settings. By opening the institutional setting, educators would be more likely to create a social environment where persons could respond to each other in a more positive and constructive way.

**Opening the Classroom**

An open and positive institutional climate should also encourage a more open classroom environment. There are numerous techniques for opening the classroom, but most of them depend on the teacher's attitude and willingness to seek alternatives and make decisions. In order to demonstrate that this can be accomplished, the writer will present a number of examples and reactions to the strategies.

Martin Buber made his own application of his theory in an adult education program in Israel in the 1950's. He did not believe that adult education should be an extension of professional training in universities, but should create the type of person Israel needed for the situations the country would face in the future. The problem was to integrate people from multiple cultures and backgrounds who had immigrated to Israel. He set up an institute to train teachers to go out to the immigration camps and create personal contact with the people there. The focus of his training was to develop teachers who could foster a living community. The instruction was individualized according to each person's needs. Teachers were trained to lead and direct truly reciprocal conversation and encounter students without restraint. They were to elicit responses experientially and to reply from the depths of their own personal experience. Teachers would participate in the personal lives of their students. Students were expected to learn and obtain so called
"objective" knowledge, but they did so to become genuine persons, build character, and influence others. 10

Buber's own application affirmed the practice of personal contact and participation in the lives of students. It included a balance between affective and cognitive objectives, but the starting point was the relationship. The final goal was the development of a better society, a society of great character, where each contributed influentially and constructively to the lives of others.

Carl Rogers documented several educators' relational approaches to education in his writings. He included his own approach for facilitating learning; yet, he noted that each effective educator must develop his own style. He indicated that his own technique need not be a model, only an example.

In the example, Rogers gave students the opportunity in an initial informal session to get acquainted, consider plans for the course, and examine the reading list. The course meetings were designed around themes that were value oriented. One requirement of the course was to hand in a list of readings done and the manner in which the reading was handled. For example, was a book totally read, skimmed, or portions read? A second requirement was to write a paper about significant personal values and how they had changed or not changed in the course. The third requirement was a self evaluation, including the grade and justification. The final requirement was a course and instructor evaluation.

Rogers emphasized freedom and trust throughout his approach. He summarized the experience of students and the multiple reactions he received about his approach. Major outcomes were that students invested more of themselves and learned more when they had freedom to choose their own goals. The greatest deficiency the students expressed they experienced was the lack of time to share their reactions from their independent readings. From the class sessions, students learned to accept and express themselves better, they felt. They reported that they learned to apply the concepts they were reading. Rogers was satisfied from the feedback he received that significant learning had occurred.\textsuperscript{11}

Rogers utilized a relational focus in allowing students to participate in their own learning. Students became resources for each other in class meetings and developed caring and concern. What developed from his facilitation seemed to allow students to grow. They did not experience an artificial acquisition of knowledge.

Clark and Kadis in the book \textit{Humanistic Teaching} totally devoted their ideas to the problem of teacher attitudes toward student problems and alternatives to change these attitudes. In the following, they refer to their alternative guidelines as "rules of thumb:"

1. When faced with problem behavior, ask more than "Why?"

2. If you are not sure what to do, say so, and delay significant action if possible.

3. There is no such thing as a problem child.


5. There is no right answer.

6. When troubled by a youngster's behavior, look into your own feelings and behavior in the same area at the same age.

7. The class is a community in which you are a leader but not a ruler.\(^\text{12}\)

Clark and Kadis offer a long list of specific strategies for handling specific problems humanely in the school. One of the most common concerns of teachers is discipline in the classroom. According to these authors, schools should aim toward developing the individual's self-discipline, so that he can use freedom more discriminately. He can accept responsibility to a higher degree. Self-discipline means that the individual cannot escape the consequences of his actions in order to obtain his goals, he must please himself. When teaching and learning is based on a real relationship of concern, there are few, if any, confrontations and conflicts between the teacher and student.\(^\text{13}\)

One of the recently published examples of a very liberal experiment in humanistic education comes from the teaching of J. T. Dillon. Dillon, as has already been explained in Chapter IV, was disenchanted with his teaching early in his career, after about five years. He began a new humanistic teaching approach in a Catholic secondary school. He believed his old way of teaching was easier and his new way of teaching proved to be far less secure for him, but he believed it was more


\(^\text{13}\)Ibid., p. 45.
educational for the students. He changed his style partly because of
his attraction to students, partly because of his reading, and partly
because of a personal experience. He developed his newer approaches,
not in an experimental school, but in regular classrooms with required
courses and no additional funds or support, even from the administration.
He took the position of a practitioner, not a theorist.  

Dillon's changes in teaching strategies included self-evaluation
by students, volunteer participation in class assignments and dicussions,
and no teacher imposed discipline. Student response surprised Dillon.
Students were not prepared for their liberation; consequently, they
seemed to have difficulty interpreting Dillon's educational intent.
Their liberation and response seemed to support most educators' belief
that students who are allowed too much freedom act irresponsibly. Dillon
interpreted responsibility much the same as Buber, an internalized need
to act from real concern and meaning. Dillon believed that teachers
should take risks in caring for students by extending freedom to them so
that they can learn to be responsible in the true sense of the word.

J. T. Dillon's approach was extremely unusual in the literature involving
alternative methods, but he was committed to improving his teaching at
the expense of being rejected by the system. He desired to have a more
meaningful experience with students and he had the courage to try it.

14 J. T. Dillon, Personal Teaching, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E.

15 Ibid., pp. 17-153.
In communication education, Paul Friedman in his book *Interpersonal Communication: Innovations in Instruction* illustrated his method for teaching interpersonal communication using a relational focus. Friedman suggested that use of dyads, two person face-to-face conversation, brought more enjoyment and learning to students than any exercise he used. Because students felt small groups were artificial and he felt his own intrusion on the groups added to the artificiality, Friedman began using dyads outside of the classroom after lecture sessions as a method to individualize and personalize his teaching. The dyads could take place at the convenience of students in any location they preferred. Students subjectively reported on what they learned from the dyads with other class members. They stated that dyads:

1. Seemed more relevant to their daily lives...
2. Seemed a more potent, intimate, memorable context for interaction...
3. Provided the kind of contact with fascinating people they would ordinarily never get to know...
4. Developed deeper sensitivity to others with these new contacts...
5. Provoked new insights into self-awareness as well...
6. Allowed the processes of interaction to emerge more clearly...
7. Usually turned out to be far more absorbing and intense than expected.

---


17 Ibid., p. 141.
The approach Friedman used involved the unique position the 
communication teacher has, that of teaching relational skills and being 
a dialogical teacher. Friedman's class in interpersonal communication 
became a laboratory as well as a lecture audience. Students listened 
to the concepts in his lectures and then practice them in planned encoun-
ters with others who were also learning. Students made associations 
between the theory and the practice. Through practice, the theory 
became more meaningful.

**Personal Experiments**

The writer was a Supervisor of Speech and English in the laboratory 
school at Central Missouri State University in Warrensburg for ten years, 
1966-1976. During that time, the writer sought to improve teacher 
effectiveness by use of the humanistic and relational approaches. The 
main focus was to improve the quality of the teacher/student relationship. 
The experiments made use of pencil and paper data, as well as personal 
observation and evaluation.

Since the experiments were conducted in a laboratory school setting, 
incentives for innovation are somewhat higher than the public school. 
However, the writer experienced anxieties over the experiments with 
administrators, students, and university students. These anxieties will 
be discussed further in context with the experiments.

The laboratory school was in an area which served conservative 
clientel. The writer took this into consideration while designing the 
experiment. Teachers who were inclined to innovate in the laboratory 
school usually had organizational limitations to consider and were not 
free to alter the structure of the school. The structure of the
experiment, as much as possible, fit the school structure. As a result, the approach with adaptation would likely be useful in many schools.

The classes selected were two required courses, a literature class, and an oral communication class. The literature course could be taken anytime after the ninth grade, and the oral communication was required of all ninth graders.

The writer had previously taught the literature course in a traditional style, with prescriptive activities, a textbook, and a rigid classroom atmosphere. Students responded in much the same way as they did in most traditional classrooms, anxiety about grades and passing the class to meet graduation requirements, passively doing assignments (or not doing them), and making every effort to assess the teacher's reward and punishment system. To liberate students from their own biases and conditioning required special attention in the planning.

The year the experiment was conducted, there were two sections of the literature class. One was first hour in the morning and the second was fourth hour, the first hour after lunch. Both classes were large for the laboratory school with a total enrollment of 70 students. The morning hour and the afternoon hour variation influenced student behavior.

The first day of the experimental literature classes, the writer selected warm up activities. Students frequently feel inhibited and restrained on the first day of school. Since these students knew each other's names already, the ice-breaker activity, a touching game, was for establishing an informal atmosphere with less inhibitions. Both classes responded with enjoyment, but a lack of understanding of the purpose of such an activity in a literature class. They were quite
unaccustomed to actively participating in initiating a relationally conducive atmosphere in the classroom.

Next, an important relational concept was introduced, the trust concept. The teacher explained that trust was necessary before maturity could develop. It was explained that trust is a choice a free individual makes and it is based on acceptance by the other individual. The individual who extends trust does so at a greater risk than reward to himself for trusting. Some discussion and role playing illustrated the concept. It was also pointed out by the teacher that trust is hard to build, but easy to destroy. Some games were played to illustrate the trust concept. Nothing was said directly about the influence on the atmosphere of the class. Later, on a pencil and paper attitude test, students drew the analogy.

Following the above activities, an assignment sheet was given to the students. The assignments involved individual study. Each student was assigned to make a reading list of 7-10 books of their choice in the area of world, British, or American literature. They were to rotate areas each term. The teacher made general suggestions about where to locate books. If students were college bound, it was suggested that they read the type of books that would be preparation for college reading. If they did not plan to attend college, they were guided to read in their career choice or some vocational interest. Students were able to make free use of the library to select materials. The list was required to be submitted and approved by the teacher in about a week.

Students were told that minimum requirements for reading were five hours per week, and they were to account for reading time in a log. They
did not have to read every day during literature hour, but they were not
to interfere with the activities of others. There were at least four
stations for their activities. The stations were unused areas of the
school or the library.

Next, students were to write reaction papers at the completion of
a book or a segment of reading. The reaction papers were to express the
student's feelings about the material and to summarize and analyze
appropriately. Another option for reaction papers were oral conferences
with the teacher or a participating teacher, a university pre-student
teacher. All of the material, the reaction papers, the logs, the reading
lists, was to be kept in portfolio form to be handed in about every three
weeks. In addition, the teacher developed an essay test based on the
portfolio material. Also, one creative project was required at the end
of each term. Grades were developed from a point system with 60% based
on the portfolios, 10% on the test, and 30% on the creative project.

The rationale for most of the structure was developed around
relational philosophy. First, students were made aware of the affective
atmosphere of the class. Students were to be trusted. Second, the
selection of books left the matter of meaningful learning to the decision
of the student. The teacher acted as a resource person in the selection
of materials. Students were allowed to set their own goals and determine
their own use of the resources. Third, students were allowed to select
the time and place (within limitations, admittedly) of their learning.
On this basis the class was an open class as much as could be created
with the limitation of the school's structure. Students did not have
to wait for an assembly of the whole class before they went to their
activity station. They merely informed the teacher where they were going and what they would be doing. Fourth, the portfolio requirement, including the reaction papers, was an effort to create an opportunity for students to practice cognitive skills of expressing their affective concerns in an honest fashion without having to agree with the teacher or some authority. The log gave them the opportunity to be responsible for an honest accounting of their use of time. Fifth, the essay test was to develop the higher mental abilities of analysis and synthesis. Sixth, the creative project encouraged the students to develop the cognitive skill of application, which is an often overlooked level of learning in many schools.

Since a considerable amount of care and concern went into the development of the structure, the writer determined that it should not be abandoned at some discouraging point. There were a number of points of crises. A few students interpreted the trust as a license to leave school during the class hour, which was unauthorized. After talking with students who needed help, the teacher "spot checked" the activity stations. Most of the time, all students were in their designated stations or at some station.

Another crisis came as a result of use of the library. Students were allowed to socialize in reasonable group activities except in the library. Some students would attempt to use the library for group activities and cause distractions. The librarian informed the teacher of these distractions and the students had to be restrained, for certain periods of time, from using the library.
Some problems occurred in an activity station where some french fry sacks were found. The custodian found the sacks and told the principal. The principal informed the teacher that the room could no longer be used by students. The students were quite upset. One of the students admitted that he had eaten the french fries in the room after school one day. He apologized to the principal, but the principal did not allow the use of the room again. Many times in school, students are punished in mass and on a permanent basis for what one or a few students do in the way of carelessness or destructiveness.

There were other disappointments, but the ones which drew the most attention were social behaviors that deviated from traditional structure of the school organization. These were expected disappointments.

Other disappointments which were far more serious concerns to the teacher related to individual growth and development. The system of evaluation, giving grades, was still the major motivating factor for most students. They were still looking for ways to get grades regardless of what they did or did not learn. Especially disappointing were the majority of the creative projects. They were not really creative. They simply aped each other when they found that someone's project gained teacher approval. With the teacher's traditional role as sole evaluator, the relational atmosphere was destructively affected. Learning seemed secondary to grades.

These were not all the disappointments, but they illustrated the problem of changing the learning procedures and the socialization process. It is a complex task. One teacher alone is limited in affecting a change
which is drastically different from the long, reinforced patterns of behavior valued in a school culture.

Much encouragement also occurred. Students felt trusted. This was supported by responses on pencil and paper attitude tests. There were some who did not feel that they always lived up to the trust, but the majority, by far, felt that trust was extended by the teacher. Most students were trustworthy and the trust could grow in a freer atmosphere. The teacher felt that the attempt to create an accepting atmosphere, giving students freedom to learn within the planned structure, seemed to create a positive environment and a positive student/teacher relationship.

Several questions were posed on the attitude test concerning trust. The first question related trust to the student's self-concept and development of self-discipline. Many student's do not know whether or not they can trust themselves to be responsible. They must learn self-trust before they can act responsibly. Following is the first question and the sample responses:

Question: Did you learn more about yourself, your ability to be trusted?

Answers:

- I learned I could carry on and do the work on my own if I made up my mind to do it.

- No, I already felt that I was a trustworthy person.

- Sort of. I knew that I could be trusted, but I think this helped prove it to other people.

- No, but it helped strengthen me.

- Yes, the hardest part for me was to make myself get to work everyday so I wouldn't get behind.
- Yes, I learned I could be trusted.

- I think so, because I really never had a class like this. I know now what I can and can't do.

- I think I learned a lot more about myself.

- Yes, I have grown more responsible.

- Yes, it felt good to have someone trust me and let me be free.

- Yes, I learned that when you know you are trusted to do your work, you will try harder.

- A little more, I didn't goof off as much as I thought I would.

- Yes, if I'm interested in my work, I'll stick around and do it, if not, I'm not very trustworthy. Usually, I'll do the work anyway but it won't be as good.

- Yes. At first I couldn't be trusted at all, but as the year went on I learned to take my responsibilities.

- I learned I will have to apply myself more to get self-satisfaction.

- I learned that I could do things without being told every move to make.

- No, not really. I felt that I was capable of being trusted before.

- Yes, you do learn by experience of being trusted by people.

- Yes, it gave me a good feeling inside to know that someone would take my word for it without having to chase after me.

- Yes, because I realized that I could go to a place and work when lots of times I wouldn't in earlier years.

- I felt more freely but I don't believe I learned too much but I did practice "trust" alot.

The second question was developed to address a problem reflected in Buber's concern that the teacher must accept all students and demonstrate equitable behavior toward each. Problems that resulted from this acceptance and trust, according to Buber, could and should provide realistic
experiences for seeking solutions. The question was phrased to allow students to demonstrate their insight into teacher strategies and the effects. It seemed that the majority of students recognized the need for the teacher to be equitable and were able to delineate equitable and inequitable teacher behavior. The second question and sample responses follow:

Question: Should teachers not extend trust to some students, but extend trust to others?

Answers:

- Teachers should extend trust so far and then measures should be taken.
- No. We're all in the same world.
- No. I think it makes a teacher rotten.
- Yes. Because some are more responsible.
- Yes. Because there are some students you can't trust.
- No. It wouldn't be fair.
- I think you should trust everyone at first but warn them about what might happen if they mess up.
- No, should trust them all.
- I think that you should trust them all and keep trying to trust them.
- In a way they should extend trust because a student might feel that he should be trustworthy, but a student could also take advantage of the trust.
- I won't answer.
- If they have shown they can or cannot be trusted.
- Yes. No two people are alike. Some can be trusted, others can't.
- No, just help the others and watch them a little closer.
- It depends on the student.
- They should give all students the same amount of trust. Otherwise some would feel left out.

- No, I think if a teacher is going to at all that they should extend it to everybody.

- Teachers should extend trust to all students though it is hard sometimes.

The third question dealt with possible inconsistencies from the previous question. Students who stated that they did not believe that all students should be trusted had to confront their own feelings about being the person who was judged by the teacher as not trustworthy. Most students in the sample agreed that it would be a negative and destructive experience to be targeted by someone as untrustworthy. While a student might not identify his own inconsistency, he had to confront his own feelings of not being considered a trustworthy person. The third question and the sample answers follow:

Question: How do you feel when you are not trusted?

Answers:

- I feel people don't treat me for my age and they think I will do something that I know I shouldn't.

- Very let down, I feel like maybe it's my fault and that maybe I'm doing something wrong that I don't know about.

- Bad. I feel like I never will go anywhere or be anything.

- Unable to do anything!

- Hurt because I feel that everyone should have a chance at last.

- I feel badly because it takes a long time to build your trust up once someone loses it.

- Feel down like I don't belong there.

- That someone is always checking what I say and do. It bugs me because I can be trusted about 95% of the time.

- I don't think I have ever been "not trusted."
Like a caged animal.

Terrible.

Sad, I want people to trust me.

It makes you feel bad toward the person that doesn't trust you.

Guilty.

A little hostile toward the person.

Let down, hurt.

Like a child.

I wonder why, I wonder what impression I put on them that they wouldn't trust me. I sort of feel hurt.

It depends on what the situation is.

Like a criminal, someone who would take advantage.

Mad.

Sometimes I think it is good. I wouldn't get as much done if I was completely trusted.

Hurt usually. It depends why I'm not being trusted though. If I'm working with something that could be dangerous, it doesn't really bother me not to be trusted, it is for my own safety.

I don't feel secure around the person who doesn't trust me.

Small.

I feel like one of the lowest things on the earth.

Moving to a new area of concern, one major effective concept of the humanistic teacher was that most students are willing to work and learn. They want to be responsible. Here are some responses to a question about high cognitive goals:

Question: Did you strive to meet minimum standard set by the teacher, or did you do more—set higher goals, do more work?

Answers:

I tried to meet your standards so I could graduate.
- I set higher goals so I could get more learning out of the class.

- I tried to do more, because I like to try to do more.

- I always strived to meet minimum standards and when I was particularly interested in a subject I was reading about, I would read more.

- I did more because I like to read.

- I set higher goals so I could get more learning out of the class.

Humanistic critics feel that too much time and motivation is wasted in the classroom by students being required to "wait." The next two questions involve how students feel about "time" and "waiting." Most students seemed to indicate that time was important to them. As some were nearing the completion of high school, they prized time even more. Some even felt that there was not enough time for them to accomplish their goals. Most students regarded "waiting" as a negative affect upon the learning process. Following are the two questions and sample responses:

Question: Is "time" important to you? Do you use it to accomplish what you wish to accomplish or are you merely waiting "until I get out of high school?"

Answers:

- No, waiting.

- Yes, I use it to accomplish things.

- Yes, half and half. I like to do stuff but I don't like to do stuff I don't like.

- Yes, I think that you should make the most of high school because it prepares you for what is after high school.

- Yes, it depends on what I want to accomplish.

- I try to use my time wisely and I feel that all I learn in high school will help me as I get older.
- Yes, at times I feel now I could use my time better but I learned from books. I love to read.

- I usually use my time to accomplish something, but I want to get out of high school, too.

- I'd say time is important to me. I usually don't have enough time to do everything I would like to do.

- Yes, because since high school is four years long you might as well not just sit around, but get involved in things.

- Some of both—to accomplish things, and wish I was out of high school—you only live once.

- I try and use it to accomplish things to the best of my ability because after you get out of high school you will be on your own and need to know how to use time wisely.

- Yes. I try to learn but some classes do not give me what I want.

- I feel I can accomplish what I want to in a certain amount of time but I do feel this school year is a waste for me as a Senior.

- I think I used to be waiting but this school year I'll work on school work about every night and still don't seem to be enough time.

- Yes. I'm trying to accomplish and all out of school I can.

- Not really.

- Time is important however school teaches to the contrary. After school is the first time you have any say over your life schedule.

- I don't know. I think I'm waiting until I get our of high school but I really have to change because if I wait, I will not have anything to wait for (college).

- Yes. I have two more years of high school and I plan on going on to college after high school. And I need to learn all I can NOW!!

Question: Do you enjoy being able to work without waiting in line or in a chair for teacher's directions? Why is not waiting better than waiting in some learning experiences?

Answers:

- Yes. Because you can get to work faster and get more done.

- Yes. Move at your own speed.
- Yes. When you wait you run out of time.

- Yes. Because it gives you more time on your own and you can think more for yourself.

- Yes. Not waiting is better because of the freedom of doing your own work.

- Yes. You can learn more.

- Yes. You can get more done when you don't have to waist time to talk to the teacher.

- Yes because it was faster. Because you can get into your work.

- Yes. Sometimes if you have to wait you lose time that could be used for something else.

- Yes, very much. Some people need help then some don't and so their being held back.

- Yes. You are all ready to do something and if you have to wait you lose some of your "enthusiasm."

- Yes, I am not that good at it but the situation is more relaxed. If you are moving faster than other students then you shouldn't be made to wait.

- Yes. Because you might have an idea, or be eager to do something and you couldn't.

- Yes. If you wait you get tired and lose interest in what your doing.

- Yes. It isn't forced upon you.

- Yes. Because you can advance in your studies. You don't have to compete with anyone.

- Yes. Because when kids wait they have a tendency to get bored and then they blame adults and tune teachers out.

- Yes. Because there are some things that a teacher can't help you with anyway, and if you're sitting in a chair, it isn't any easier to get things done.

- Yes very much. I think students get more done that way instead of a teacher hassling you.

- Most of the time but sometimes not. Because sometimes the kids are excited and if you make them wait they become bored.
The entire questionnaire and student responses strongly supported Buber's concept of trust and the value of a meaningful environment for learning. Trust was perceived by Buber to be the most important basic ingredient for any relationship. The writer's experiment focused on the feelings of students about teacher trust. Students were more positive when they felt trusted. Teacher trust encouraged growth and resulted in more responsible and responsive student behavior. Although it was primarily humanistic educators who focused on the problem of "waiting" and the use and value of "time" to students, Buber's thoughts would seem to suggest that these two problem areas do influence whether or not students feel motivated to learn. Better use of student time, from the student responses, indicated higher positive motivation and better feelings toward school and teachers.

The next experiment was in an oral communication class. In previous years the teacher had emphasized performance activities such as public speaking, oral interpretation, story-telling, panel discussion, and radio and T.V. production. An approach based on the dialogic communication rationale was implemented, the interpersonal communication approach. Units of study included dialogical communication concepts and a new textbook was adopted, Person to Person by Galvin and Book (1974). The procedure for teaching usually involved explaining a communication concept, participation in a game or activity followed by a "debriefing" or analysis of what happened and how the students felt about what happened.

In addition to class work, there were some outside projects which required students to go not only beyond the classroom for contacts,
but beyond their own age group as well. To teach the levels of communication and to practice interpersonal contacts, the writer asked students to provide a service for someone older and someone younger who was a stranger. The students were asked to describe their projects, keep a log of the time spent, and answer some questions about their experience. Following are the assignment sheet, the sample projects and responses by girls and boys to both younger and older persons:

**Assignment Sheet**

Describe your projects by keeping a log or daily diary of your schedule and time spent, and what special service you rendered in detailed explanation.

Answer the following questions:

1. List the alternative that you considered for projects. Why did you select the ones you finally decided upon? Why did you rule out the others?

2. What frustrations did you experience with the project? Were there certain situations you avoided?

3. What barriers to communication did you experience with people older and younger than yourself?

4. In establishing communication with a stranger or strangers, describe your feelings at the beginning of the relationship.

5. Did the relationship progress? What levels of communication dominated your communication?

6. Did you feel more at ease after the beginning? What indications did you have? Was there any touching, smiling, nodding, etc.?

7. Describe how you feel about working with strangers in a different situation.

8. Do you welcome future situations like the ones you experienced? Do you feel more confident with older and younger people? Explain.
Projects For Older People

A. First student (A Girl)

It was winter and very cold so it took about 15 minutes to walk downtown. We spent about 30-35 minutes in the nursing home, visiting with some of the older people we came upon. On everyday, Robin and I helped wheel some people to the elevator, so they could go to lunch, this was about 11:30. Then we stood around and talked with them a little longer, until they had to leave. About 11:40 we left to walk back to the school. And, again, since it was cold it took us about 15 minutes to walk back.

1. Nursing Home
Childrens Home
Home for the Retarded

The reason we took the nursing home was because there was one pretty close, and we weren't for sure if there was a childrens home of Home for the Retarded in Warrensburg.

2. Some of the older people couldn't hear properly, and so causing us to repeat things more than once. The only other frustrations there were, was the bad smell and warm climate. This made me very restless and uptight. Yes.

3. I don't know about Robin, but I had a hard time thinking of something to say and talk about. Certain subjects like the outside world, being young, and the bad situation they were in were avoided. I thought these subjects would depress them.

4. At first we would just come in and say hi, then talk about their nice looking clothes they had on. I felt very shy and almost scared because I thought I might say something wrong or something to make them upset.

5. Slowly but surely. At first lots of small talk, but later progressing to almost a total level of communication.

6. Oh yes!! We were able to talk more freely, they were able to talk to us about more personal things. Yes, lots of each. I have found that old people like to touch younger people, especially their hair, and even more so if its long.

7. I think it can be very rewarding, especially if you go back several times. At first it may seem not worth it, but later you'll learn differently.

8. Yes. Yes, if you've been around young and old people more, its alot easier to find conversation.
B. Second Student (A Boy)

A Service to an Older Person

First of all, I will admit, this particular service wasn't planned, it just happened.

One day about a month and a half ago, a friend and I were playing ping-pong at the Student Union, when two elderly black gentlemen came in and started playing at the table beside us. After a while one asked if we would mind to switch partners. We switched and I started playing with this man, probably in his late 60's and he was beating me! We talked quite a bit, played ping-pong and had fun for about an hour. I think I enjoyed this a lot more than planning something, because I felt like I wanted to do it instead of having to do it.

1. I considered going to an old folks home or a nursing home or something like that, but I think I enjoyed my project more because I wanted to do it instead of being made to do it.

2. I found it very enjoyable and the only frustration to me was that I lost every game. I am not in the least bit prejudice, but since he was black I tried to think and not say anything that might possibly offend him.

3. I found no barriers in communication with him. We both seemed to talk on the same level.

4. I was shy at first and then we started talking and I felt like I'd known him all my life.

5. Yes, we got to know a lot about one another after a while. It progressed from small talk to opinion to public information and then to revealed feelings.

6. Yes. We would tell each other of some funny experiences we'd had and we really started laughing a lot.

7. At first I thought it would be scary talking to an older person, especially a stranger. I didn't think that we'd have any common interests, but I found out he basically liked to do things I do, like fishing, bowling, and ping-pong.

8. Yes. Yes. I found that all people are basically alike, they were all young once, and if you dig deep enough you can find a common interest to talk about.
A Service to a Younger Person

My project started out to be reading stories to a child, but things didn't end that way.

One day my mother had to go to the doctor and I went along to see if I could find a child to read to in the waiting room. The building housed more than one doctor, and I found a child whose mother was in the doctor's at the same time mine was. He seemed to have nothing to do and so I asked him if he wanted me to read to him. He said yes and I proceeded, but after a while he lost interest and we began talking. We talked for about 15 minutes and then it was time to go.

1. I considered helping mentally or physically handicapped children or helping slow learning children with their homework. I thought that doing any of the others you would be helping more than one and you wouldn't spend enough time with each one of them.

2. A child's attention is very hard to hold and unless you let him talk about what he wants to, he doesn't care. Yes. I avoided subjects that he couldn't understand and hard words.

3. I found this child very intelligent, but I did find it hard to seem interested when he would ramble on about things even after the subject was changed.

4. At first I felt stupid going up to a little kid and asking if I could read to him, but as time went by I felt more comfortable.

5. Yes. Maybe some public information and opinion.

6. Yes. He talked to me just like he would a friend.

7. I liked working with older people a lot more than younger people because you can talk to them on your level and you have more in common with them.

8. No. Not with younger people. I had nothing in common with the younger person. Many times he went on about things that I didn't even know what he was talking about. Frankly, I found it kind of boring.
Projects For Younger People

A. First student (A Girl)

1. The reason I selected the little children is because I love children and I like to take care of them, too. The reason I didn't pick old people is because I was afraid that they would have brought back memories of my grandparents and I feel sorry for old people.

2. The read frustrations I experienced were that I couldn't talk to them and it was so hard to make them understand you.

3. I didn't talk to them very much but I held them and hugged them and played with them.

4. Well, I was really scared at first because I thought I would do something wrong. But it got easier toward the end because I knew what to do.

5. Yes the relationship progressed, because I grew to love the baby. The level of Communication I used was really Love because really all I could do was care for him and play with him.

6. Yes, I felt more at ease after the beginning, because I felt like I knew him and he knew me and we would get along.

7. I really like working with strange people because I grow to like people and children so very much after I know them for a while.

8. Yes, I welcome future situations like the ones I experienced because I like meeting new people and I like all children. I don't think I feel as confident with older people as much as younger people because I can start talking to younger people more than older people. Like people 45 or younger I have no problem but people older I don't really know what to say to them.

B. Second Student (A Boy)

It was a lot easier finding a younger person than an older person. I considered three or four, but I picked Jimmy Molencapp mainly because he seemed kind of like a shy little kid and wouldn't be too onery. I ruled out the other because they seemed like onery little kids and a couple lived too far away.

I spent about ten to fifteen minutes a day with Jimmy, who will be seven years old in four days.
I didn't face as many barriers of communication as I expected. The main one was his mind sometimes didn't want to listen, and he would always want to play.

My feelings toward this little boy were warm because he was so cute and shy. The relationship did progress. We got so he would always want me to play ball with him. The level of communication was mostly small talk.

I felt more at ease after the beginning because I found out he was fun to pick up and do tricks with.

I feel pretty good about working with younger people because you can really have a lot of fun.

I welcome future situations like this because they can really be interesting and fun if you just be yourself and they be themselves.

Although each project was unique, it was a strong indication to the writer that the student understood much about communication concepts through their relational experiences outside the classroom. In the projects, each student set his own goals and evaluated his own experiences and each seemed to find meaning in ways that were important to him.

**Evaluation of Personal Experiment**

Any philosophy of education needs to be evaluated in order to assess whether it effectively achieves what it claims to achieve. When proponents of a new philosophy make claims, they should seek to support the claims by valid evaluation. The strategies and techniques of the relational philosophy need to be evaluated with appropriate tools if the philosophy is to become widely accepted in education.

The basis of the writer's evaluation of the experiments was both relational and subjective. The pencil and paper attitude tests given students were one concrete way of getting feedback. As the writer observed the students' spontaneous emotionalized reactions, the
administrative reactions, and her own reactions, it became increasingly clear that even in a modified, limited experiment with humanistic and relational strategies, emotions get highly aroused as to justification for the changes. Most of the experiences of educators in the laboratory school involved the traditional technique of tightening already rigid discipline and control as a means to solve problems. Certainly, few lab school educators seemed to agree with a more open classroom concept. Students had problems with accepting an open system, too.

The change in classroom emphasis from purely cognitive learning to adding planned affective experiences aroused concern. One student refused to continue in the course after the first day of warm ups and affective concept activities. While most students liked the informal structure, they tested the system in much the same ways that they tested the traditional system. To their surprise, the writer's reactions were much different than they expected. As some students met with emotional acceptance and support from the teacher, but failed to meet their cognitive responsibilities, they began to retrench and consider other alternatives to "beat the system" or to accept it as genuine. In this situation empathic and caring conversation and easy accessibility to the teacher seemed to be the best acceptance tool to create a positive teacher/student relationship.

Administrators, confused by the approach, but not wishing to be hostile, found subtle means to deal with students who were conforming to the class structure, but not the usual school structure. On one particular absence of the writer, students reported that the assistant principal who substituted in the class not only spent the entire hour
"preaching" to students concerning their responsibilities to the school, but also, without referring to any names, openly dismissed the class as worthless.

Although the method challenged traditional assumptions and caused some organizational problems, it was worthwhile from most of the student's point of view. Lyons seems very accurate when he states that humanistic educators get "hooked." This was not only a formalized effort on the part of the writer to research a body of information, but the philosophy has also become a way of life and a commitment. The rewards for implementing relational concepts and techniques are as numerous as the numbers of students who pass through the classroom door. Each student becomes a commitment and a deep concern. Valid influence in the lives of young people comes only after the formation of a real relationship based on trust. To this critic, it is the major strength of the relational focus.

The weaknesses of the philosophy lie in the need for more empirical data and more experimentation and research. The writer has been introducing the concepts of relational education to university students who take the writer's Methods of Teaching Speech course. Most of the university students plan to do more with relational strategies as they become more secure in teaching. A few university students have been repelled by the philosophy, but these seem to be individuals who are the most insecure prospects for teaching. Relational strategies cannot be implemented simply as techniques; they are based on honest concern. The teacher who asserts that students should be open and honest must also
be open and honest. The educator who strives to develop an atmosphere of trust avoids destroying trust.

Summary

Most educators demand that theories have practical value. In an effort to demonstrate the pragmatic value of Buber's relational educational theory, the writer documented some implementation and evaluation of the theory in actual practice.

The relational focus encourages a more open atmosphere in schools and classrooms. Schools can seek alternatives in their structure which offer students opportunities to develop their personhood and learning simultaneously. Classrooms can become more open through high quality teacher/student relationships and the courage of dialogical teachers to give students the opportunity to develop responsibility through freedom, trust, and participation in their own learning.

Martin Buber trained teachers to become involved in the lives of their students and give subjective responses to student inquiries. Carl Rogers encouraged students to learn experientially and to evaluate their own learning through its meaningfulness to them. Clark and Kadis taught that teachers should alter their attitudes toward student problems and allow students to develop self-discipline. Dillon discovered many problems in changing his teaching style and liberating students, but he felt more satisfied about his relationship with students. The personal experience of the writer emphasized trust of students while they participated in their own learning. In seeking to integrate and balance the affective and cognitive objectives, the teacher/student relationship
seemed to improve. Students seemed to learn interpersonal concepts and to develop self-trust and self-discipline.

Evaluation of a relational approach in teaching is somewhat difficult. By using Buber's criteria and by implementing strategies such as those included in the examples in this chapter, evaluation can be quite concrete and definitive. Most current evaluation procedures in the accountability paradigm discount variable experiences, individual attitudes and values as by-products of the learning environment. The focus on achievement scores and other objective assessment, including behavioral objectives, has artificially fragmented the evaluation tools for teaching and learning. The value of the relational focus lies in the recognition that learning begins where meaning begins, within the individual. As has been emphasized previously, the starting point for teaching and learning or research on either is the teacher/student relationship. Presently, the relational focus seems to be too subjective for the current ideology of education and the values emphasized in the relational criteria seem to conflict with current school structure. The approach will require much more investigation by researchers and experimentation by classroom teachers. However, the teachers who understand and use the relational approach seem to find it fruitful and satisfying.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

Martin Buber began the development of his theory at a very early age, showing a consciousness of genuine encounter and a thrust toward understanding man's relationship with man in the I-Thou theory. His assumptions lead him to reject man's creation of paradoxes, artificial dichotomies, and absolutes. He resolved these conflicts through his philosophy. To Buber, man's I-Thou meeting determines the frame of reference for each and is, therefore, concrete. While objectification does occur in man's experiences, it occurs from a more personal level of concrete reality. Objective reality always returns to subjective reality. All ways of knowing, all knowledge, all perceptions, all interpretations of life, and all sense making is unique to each person. This existential outcome is determined by past and present experiences of the I-Thou relationship.

Buber's relational philosophy was developed into an educational philosophy. Buber seemed content that the genuine educator is not concerned with transmission of any given culture per se, but interested in the higher good of human potential, particularly through the I-Thou relationship. Culture tends to be biased in the values it holds and may not be meaningful to students. Cultures focus on the It, the object, the thing, or the political and not on the I-Thou. Every genuine educator goes beyond the culture. He develops a certain aloofness to
conviviality in order to participate with students who are developing character. In a free and trusting atmosphere, students can find meaningfulness for themselves and become responsive and responsible. Through the atmosphere created by the genuine educator, a real, living community is experienced. It is through the experience of real community that Buber believed a restructuring of society can occur. Educators seem to have an important role in that potential.

Buber's relational philosophy was traced to the study of dialogical communication theories. Stewart directly linked the teaching of interpersonal communication, the major dialogical concepts, to Buber's precepts. Buber's precepts were also directly related to the theories developing the characteristics, components, and conditions for dialogue. A second impetus for dialogical theories came through psychotherapy, particularly influential was Carl Rogers' client-centered therapy which developed from Buber's influence.

Humanistic educators were influenced through Carl Rogers' educational philosophy. Proponents desired to change the direction and focus of schools away from the purely objective education and cognitive emphasis to a more affective, person centered orientation. Humanistic education critics sought alternatives to the inhumane conditions they perceived as they examined schools and classrooms through research studies, conferences, commissions, seminars, and actual practice. From these efforts developed more emphasis on the teacher's role in improving the teacher/student relationship. Particularly influential in humanistic education was Carl Rogers' redefinition of the teaching role as that of a facilitator, counselor, and resource person.
In integrating the relational theories, there are several important implications for teachers. Dialogical teachers seek to initiate an I-Thou relationship with students as early as possible in the classroom. To accomplish this, they accept and trust all students, working toward confirming the personhood and value of each unique individual. In winning the students' confidence through the relationship, dialogic teachers are in a position to influence the development of character in their students, which is their major task. The students of dialogical teachers are of great value to society because they are internally motivated to respond. They respond from real and genuine caring. Unlike weak characters who respond from external motivation and control, genuine characters make decisions from an internal position of strength and self-determination.

Most educators prefer to evaluate an educational theory from actual practice. Several educators, including Buber and Rogers, selected different ways to implement the theory. In seeking to put the theory into practice, some teachers experienced a number of obstacles from administrators, colleagues, and students themselves. Any change of procedure or reorientation of emphasis that is not understood in the current ideology is certain to draw attention to itself. Evaluation and implementation of relational strategies are difficult but possible in the present ideology of education.

Educators, in dire need of an explanatory theory for the development of social climate in the classroom, seem to be underestimating the potential of the relational theory. Communication educators are teaching relational theories and skills. If communication educators are
successfully teaching relational skills and defining the importance of high quality relationships, why is it that other educators would not also profit from the knowledge and skill? Educational researchers do not seem to have discovered the importance of such a theory in the present ideology and continue to use artificial labels to explain communication in classrooms.

As a result of the ideology's misemphasis, educators have become educational technicians. Researchers focus on activities and methods of teaching rather than the relational. As a teacher of educational methods, the writer has noted many problems with an emphasis on methods and activities. Teacher trainees seem to be looking for techniques of teaching which will insure their success. Most seem to perceive shallowly the complexities of effective teaching and are unwilling to go beyond the surface context. They seem particularly concerned about student "control" so that they can incur fewer problems for themselves. Unfortunately, many of their models have the same notions and possess volumes of materials containing activities and methods to keep students' time and minds occupied while they are in school. This is a mistake and debilitates meaningful learning.

Humanistic educators, as has been analyzed in this study, are protesting the inhumanity of schools. According to them, the school has become a very undesirable place for young people to go, where genuine and meaningful learning is not possible. To humanistic educators, the school as an institution has developed alienation and hostility rather than fellowship and community. Buber would concur with that conclusion.
Dialogical communication educators, on the other hand, seem to have developed a relational approach, since they also teach relational skills. They seem to exemplify their own theory and content which emphasizes that quality relationships are basic to growth, learning, and mental health. To them, relationships form an important basis for both communicating and teaching. It seems possible that the relational emphasis in both theory and skill would be valuable for all teachers.

With a relational emphasis in teaching, educational objectives would be significantly altered. Rather than focus on the activities of teaching, researchers and teachers would seek answers to how relationships seem to be developed in classrooms. They would seek ways to identify, describe, and explain relational phenomena and its effects on outcomes of learning. If the relational focus were broadly adopted and the philosophy clear to educational leaders, students of education could more definitively understand the complexity of teaching and their role as communicators. They could engage in learning interpersonal skills in the classroom. Teacher trainees could engage in attempts to understand not only the methods for teaching, but also, more importantly, the relational rationale for the method. Relational theory has clearly pointed to a starting point for the practice of teaching.

Curriculum, school organization, administration, methods, and all other segments of studies in education would be evaluated not as fragmented ends in themselves, which indeed they are not, but as parts of a whole area of study which has its basis in I-Thou meaning. Questions could be raised as to how each of these parts of the whole contribute to building relationships, developing character, and creating a sense of
community in school. The results would be closer to what Buber called for, a restructuring of society. That call has never been perfected, and it is likely it will not be perfected, but influences are at work incorpo-
ating the goals.

Who can determine the total influence of Buber's theory? The probabilities of influence seem apparent to this writer as is demonstrated in the study, but the limitations of any one study are great. Many more studies are needed to further enlarge the body of research which supports the assumptions of this study.

To summarize, it is not the knowledge products alone which interests the dialogic educational critic, although knowledge is evident in effective teaching. It is not the activities or methods of effective teaching which interests the critic, though these are influential. It is the relationship that is the starting point of effective teaching. It is necessary to understand that the starting point is going to provide the basis for reaching the goal and that the grounds will lead to full access of what is desired.
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