THE EFFECTS OF HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING ON WASPS
(White's Attitudes and Self-concept Perceptions)

by

Judy Carter
B.S., Southern Illinois University, 1967
M.S., Southern Illinois University, 1968

Submitted to the Department of Speech
and Drama and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of
Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

L9 7 3

DEDICATION

To my Mom and Dad

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee for their continual support throughout the course of this study. My committee members are: Dr. Kim Giffin, Dr. Dean Kerkman, Dr. Walter Crockett, Dr. Jon Blubaugh, Dr. Bobby Patton and Dr. William Conboy.

I would like to thank Tom Hayalian, Herb Simmons and Ramona Anschutz for letting me use their classes. Especially I would like to thank all the people in my 141 class.

I would like to thank Mike Lynott for developing a scoring program for the Interaction Inventory. I would like to thank Jean Welborn for helping with the editing and proofreading of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Background of Human Relations Training:

History and Goals

Human relations training is experience-based learning. Many question its worth as an approach to learning and challenge it as a vehicle of change. This controversy brings obvious complications to the appraisal of the effects of such training.

This study attempts to analyze the effects of human relations training on self-concept and attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact. Two aspects of human relations training are reviewed in order to provide the reader with a better understanding of these effects. First, the history of human relations training as it relates to social action issues is surveyed. Second, the goals and meta-goals of human relations training are identified and explained.

History

Human relations training developed in 1946 from an organized body of theory and research. As early as the 1920's and 1930's, the nature of groups and the psychological and social forces involved therein were being studied as part of the field of group dynamics. The socialization of the Polish peasant (W. I. Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918), the sociological dynamics of juvenile gangs (Thrasher, 1927), the factors

involved in the relationship of the powerful and the powerless (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939) and the racial context of American society (Myrdal, 1944) are a few examples.

One of the more important researchers and participants in the field of group dynamics was Kurt Lewin. Lewin (1948) developed field theory and later used it as a basis for a research model called action-research. The most accurate definition of action-research is reflected in his own philosophy that social action cannot be stifled while research tries to eradicate ignorance.

Lewin and his associates were present at the genesis meeting of human relations training in 1946 at the State Teachers College in New Britain, Connecticut (Bradford, Gibb, & Benne, 1964). The goal of the workshop was to develop more effective local leaders to facilitate understanding of and compliance with the Fair Employment Practices Act under which the Interracial Commission had been recently created (Bradford et al., 1964). Lewin (1948) later described this meeting as "an example of a change experiment on minority problems (p. 208)."

Human relations training initially included two specific types of learning: (a) the learning to understand and to help with group growth and development and (b) the learning of change-agent skills and concepts (Bradford et al., 1964). The group growth and development focus centered on interpersonal and group skills as they applied to the variables and participants directly involved in "here-and-now (Bradford, et al., 1964. p. 83)" issues. The change-agent focus of human relations training centered on the application of interpersonal and group skills to a back-home or "there-and-then (Bradford et al., 1964, p. 83)" problem.

For example, the 1946 workshop facilitated racial attitudes and behavior in conjunction with local implementation of the Fair Employment Practices Act.

The change-agent focus increasingly became the province of those individuals and groups interested in the application of T-group (T for training) skills and concepts to social action issues. These individuals and groups found themselves somewhat outside the province of the specific objectives of the more strict T-group experience. The dichotomy between those interested in social action and those interested in a strict T-group experience resulted in a change of orientation. The there-and-then orientation within the T-group setting decreased while the here-and-now orientation increased.

However, in 1957 and 1958 a direct attempt was made by the National Training Laboratories (NTL) in Bethel, Maine to re-integrate social action issues and the T-group experience. This re-integration step contributed to subsequent designs of basic human relations groups to develop, practice, diagnose and plan change-agent skills applicable to back-home problems.

In July of 1968 the Black Caucus issued a statement containing the following:

> It would appear to us that the NTL Institute has two broad obligations. First, to begin to respond to white racism in some meaningful way, and secondly to become as relevant as possible to Black training needs.
>
> Believing that the training assumptions of NTL can be helpful to Black people and believing that NTL's laboratory methods are appropriate for and apparently desperately needed by whites, we demand the following:
>
> 1. More Black trainers in the NTL network
> 2. Black staff in Washington in professional and secretarial positions

3. Jobs for Blacks at Bethel in the summer
4. More Black participants at Bethel, Cedar City, Missouri, and other approved NTL training centers
5. NTL would not be involved in training in communities without consultation and planning of local people (Black Caucus, personal communication, 1968).

In response to these demands an Ad Hoc Committee composed and circulated a "Black Working Paper (Ad Hoc Committee, personal communication, 1970)" which suggested changes in objectives and the development of Black resources, professionals and programs. A Black Affairs Center was added to the central organization of NTL; several programs were implemented to recruit, train and inform Black people; and PRIOR (Program for the Reduction of Individual and Organizational Racism) was created.

Human relations training has undergone many changes throughout its history. As an approach to learning and change its various effects have not been totally explored. Therefore this study attempts to look at those effects.

Goals

In any field of study almost every practitioner has his own way of stating the goals. The field of Human Relations is no exception. However, the goals and meta-goals of human relations training compiled by Warren Bennis (1968) form the most comprehensive list cited within the field. The list of goals compiled by Bennis includes:

1. self-insight or some variation of learning related to increased self-knowledge,

2. understanding the conditions which inhibit or
   facilitate effective group functioning,

3. understanding interpersonal operations in
   groups (Bennis, 1968, pp. 680-687).

The list of meta-goals compiled by Bennis includes:

1. expanded consciousness and recognition of choice,

2. a "spirit of inquiry,"

3. authenticity in interpersonal relations,

4. a collaborative conception of the authority rela-
   tionship (Bennis, 1968, pp. 680-687).

The meta-goals transcend the stated goals and imply an unspoken
value orientation which directly affects the participant. To understand
human relations training is to understand the meta-goals. The first
meta-goal is expanded consciousness and recognition of choice. Goffman
(1959) talks of "performances (pp. 17-76)" acted out to control and
predict the behavior of the actor and his audience. Parsons (1951)
explains the intricate framework of social roles played within various
environmental settings. Both of these authors are talking about
routinized decision-making which may inhibit consciousness and recogni-
tion of choice.

Human relations training removes the individual from this routine
and places him in a state of behavioral ambiguity. The awareness of
this cultural vacuum creates the exciting paradox of self-hood. The
individual begins to experience powerlessness as his self-hood is
revealed, scrutinized and questioned. On the other hand, he is in a
powerful position to clarify his own self-hood by exploring his own
identity.

The "spirit of inquiry" meta-goal embodies the more specific aspects of self-concept. The training participant is free to think, ask questions and try out new behavior. He is encouraged to do all these as part of the experiential nature of human relations training. The experiential nature of the training aids in the clarification of self-concept as the need to define and organize become important. All of this contributes to the congruity of the individual and the human relations experience. As Rogers has stated:

> With some individuals we realize that in most areas this person not only consciously means exactly what he says, but that his deepest feelings also match what he is expressing, whether it is anger or competitiveness or affection or cooperativeness (Rogers, 1961, p. 342).

The third meta-goal is authenticity of interpersonal relations. Openness, honesty, presentation of feelings and feedback are important aspects of human relations training. Authenticity in interpersonal relations is grounded in a recognition of feelings as a neutral element within the human existence. Maslow stated:

> Each person's inner nature is in part unique to himself and in part species-wide. . .This inner nature, as much as we know of it so far, seems not to be intrinsically or primarily or necessarily evil. The basic needs (for life, for safety and security, for belongingness and affection, for respect and self-respect, and for self-actualization), the basic human emotions, and the basic human capacities are on their face either neutral, pre-moral, or positively good (Maslow, 1968, p. 3).

When an individual can express himself within a psychologically comfortable environment of support and respect, inhibitions decrease, a sense of alienation decreases and the need to defend oneself is usually reduced. The wall between the outer self and the inner self slowly erodes.

Herein lies the core of the self-concept and the key to authenticity
in interpersonal relationships.

The fourth meta-goal, a collaborative conception of the authority
relationship, represents the most obvious break from the traditional
educational model. The human relations trainer can legitimately be
seen as an expert because of his background of experience, research and
reading. This experience should not, however, be pushed to the point
of accepting all the responsibility for the group members and their
individual learning experience. Each participant is expected to direct
his own learning process. "What a person learns depends upon his own
style, readiness, and the relationships he develops with other members
of the laboratory group (Seashore, 1970, p. 16)."

The goals and meta-goals of human relations training are designed
so that each participant can explore his self-hood. This exploration
may affect his self-concept. The effect of human relations training on
self-concept is pursued through the procedures of this study.

Definitions

The general purpose of this study is to measure the effects of
human relations training at the University of Kansas. The two types
of effects are: (a) self-concept; (b) attitudes of white participants
toward others with whom they interact. To investigate these training
effects certain terms need to be defined, such as: human relations
training, self-concept and attitudes concerning interaction with others.

Human Relations Training

Human relations training at the University of Kansas combines some
of the elements of a T-group and an encounter group. A T-group is a

relatively unstructured group of 8 to 15 members whose major agenda
develops from here-and-now data. Participants learn about groups through
the process of building one. As group members interact with each other,
they learn about their own feelings, motives, behaviors and the reactions
they produce in each other. This is accomplished through open, give-and-
take feedback (Bradford et al., 1964).

The trainer's role is one of consultant, helping the group become
an effective learning environment for all its members (Bradford et al.,
1964). He functions somewhere between the traditional authority figure,
who avoids revealing all his feelings, and a model group member, who is
open about all his feelings, attitudes and opinions. Usually various
group process issues become the major group agendas, such as leadership,
competition, goal formation and achievement, norm setting, etc. Individual
member issues are considered within the context of group behavior. Group
interaction remains largely on a verbal level.

An encounter group has the same general make-up as a T-group.
Both the T-group and encounter group adhere to the goals and meta-goals
defined earlier in this chapter. The difference between these two
approaches concerns an increase in feelings expressed, trainer input
and non-verbal interaction.

In an encounter group personal feelings of group members are explored
and group process then proceeds to whatever and wherever the group members
take it. An emphasis is placed on an open and honest expression of feelings.
"Usually, strong group solidarity develops and members are able to use
each other profitably (Schutz, 1967, p. 21)."

The trainer in an encounter group is more directly involved than in a T-group. His purpose is to do whatever is necessary to help members achieve growth goals; he may be silent, supportive, challenging, disclosing, aggressive or tender (Schutz, 1967). Usually the trainer is seen as a model of open expression of feelings and treated more like a group member than in the T-group approach.

In an encounter group verbal exchange is only one aspect of the group's interaction. Non-verbal exercises may be used with an emphasis placed on the use and appreciation of all the senses. These exercises provide the participants an opportunity to act out here-and-now feelings and emotions. Usually an encounter group becomes more emotional, intense and involving than the T-group.

The human relations training program at the University of Kansas is flexible enough to allow for combining elements of both the T-group approach and the encounter group approach. Most of these decisions are based on individual trainer style and the particular needs of each individual group. According to Dr. Paul Friedman, Director of the Human Relations Training Program at the University of Kansas the common elements which unite all sections of human relations training at the University of Kansas are the following:

1. The registration for each section is limited
   to eighteen, and an effort is made to balance enroll-
   ment between men and women, all upperclassmen.

2. Meetings are limited to two or three hours for a total
   of forty-five hours a semester.

3. Students are required to read Encounter by Gerard Egan.

4. Group Processes by Joseph Luft is recommended reading.

5. The drawing of relationships between in-class experiences
   and the reading is encouraged. (Friedman, personal
   communication, 1972).

In addition to these common elements all sections operate with a grading contract which is introduced and negotiated at the beginning of the training experience.

Self-concept

The concept an individual has of himself has been demonstrated to be very influential in much of his behavior and also to be directly related to his general personality and state of mental health. Jung (1958), Freud (1936), May (1953), and Cooley (1909), are a few of the writers who strongly emphasize the importance of one's self-concept. Knowing how an individual perceives himself is useful in attempting to help that individual or in making evaluations of him (Fitts, 1965).

Human relations training literature includes acceptance of self, self-esteem, congruity of actual self and ideal self, and feelings of confidence as positive outcomes of training. Within a human relations training framework, one's concept of himself is of major importance. It is therefore important to this study to measure the effect human relations training has on the self-concept of white participants.

Attitudes Concerning Interaction With Others

A relationship seems to exist between an individual's attitudes and his interaction behavior with others. Man seems to have a basic need to establish and maintain satisfactory, fulfilling relationships with others. However, a degree of balance between needs and expressions is very important to insure that relationships are mutually gratifying.

One area of theory and research which considers the relationship between attitude and interaction behavior is interpersonal relations.

The theory of interpersonal relations developed by William C. Schutz (1958) posits that people need people and that from childhood on each person develops a fundamental interpersonal relations orientation. Thus an understanding of interaction behavior comes from an awareness of the characteristic ways people orient themselves toward others.

Another area of theory and research which considers the relationship between attitude and interaction behavior is interaction process analysis. The theory of interaction processes developed by Robert F. Bales (1950) posits that within any dyad or small group certain problems or conditions exist which illicit specific behaviors. Thus an understanding of interaction behavior comes from an awareness of the interpersonal problems or conditions present among people.

Both of these theories contend that individuals do interact with each other in particular ways depending on their personal orientations and other interpersonal characteristics involved in the interaction. Very few individuals deliberately choose not to relate to other human beings. An individual is usually free to choose the specific people he will relate to, and if he is not afforded this freedom he can make some decisions as to the nature of the relationship.

Not only does human relations training involve an individual's attitudes and interaction behavior, it also involves the relationship between the two. More specifically, decreased authoritarianism, greater acceptance of others and reduced prejudice are mentioned in the training literature as possible training outcomes. It is therefore important to this study to measure the effect human relations training has on attitudes of whites towards others with whom they interact.

Statement of the Problem

It is extremely difficult to assess the effects of human relations training. One difficulty is conceptual as training outcomes are hard to define. Another difficulty is the provision of adequate control groups for research on training (Harrison, 1971). A third difficulty is the identification of specific training input--"whether the design, the type of participant, the behavior of training staff, or whatever (Harrison, 1971, p. 74)." These three elements--definition of training outcomes, provision of adequate control groups and identification of specific training input--are central to the measurement of the effects of human relations training.

One of the aims of this study is to explore the relationship between these three central elements and the consequent effect human relations training has on self-concept and attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact. The training outcomes are defined in the first and second hypotheses of this study. The training inputs relevant to this study are included in the third hypothesis. The control groups are described in Chapter II.

The Department of Speech and Drama, Division of Speech Communication and Human Relations, at the University of Kansas, offers an upper division three semester-hour course entitled, Human Relations in Group Interaction I, Speech 141. This course fits into the human relations training framework: no pre-designed class structure, the group's behavior providing the experiential data, and the group determining the agenda. Two sections of Human Relations in Group Interaction I, Speech 141 are used in this study. One section forms Experimental Group I and the other section forms Experimental Group II.

This human relations training experience does not include a social action issue orientation. Furthermore, limited research concerning social action issues has been conducted. This creates some questions concerning the relationship between social action issues and human relations training offered in an academic setting. Are social action issues an important priority for academic training? Can social action issues be justified as a priority for training? Can these issues be ignored? Is training conducive to a social action issue orientation? Can training be effectively used for this orientation? Since human relations training is a unique approach to learning and change, these questions seem important.

This study directs itself to the measurement of two types of effects of human relations training. The two types of effects are: (a) self-concept; (b) attitudes of white participants toward others with whom they interact. The hypotheses of this study are the following:

1. There will be a significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Null form: There will be no significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

2. There will be a significant difference after training between attitudes toward others with whom they interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as reported on an Interaction Inventory (II). Attitudes will be analyzed in terms of four behavioral components: (a) giving positive reactions; (b) attempting to give answers; (c) asking

questions; (d) giving negative reactions. Null form: There will be no significant difference after training between attitudes toward others with whom they interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as reported on an Interaction Inventory (II). Attitudes will be analyzed in terms of four behavioral components: (a) giving positive reactions; (b) attempting to give answers; (c) asking questions; (d) giving negative reactions.

3. There will be a statistically significant positive correlation coefficient between the following pairs of elements for the subjects in Experimental Group I.

(a) Amount of attendance as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept;

(b) Amount of participation as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept;

(c) Amount of reported integrated reading with pre-post changes in self-concept.

(d) Amount of progress toward a personal growth goal as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept.

Human relations training is reported to significantly effect changes in self-concept (Bunker, 1961; Burke & Bennis, 1961; Stock, 1958; M. Thomas, 1970; Zimet & Fine, 1955). Some studies report positive and/or negative changes (Bass, 1962; M. Thomas, 1970). Few studies indicate the specific training input correlated with these changes. Therefore, the measurement and analysis of the third hypothesis will be reported in terms of pre-post changes in self-concept and the specific training input for subjects in Experimental Group I. The specific training inputs

for Experimental Group I are the following: attendance, participation, integrated reading and progress toward a personal growth goal.

Previous Research

The review of previous research consists of three parts: first, a review of research concerned with change in self-concept during human relations training; second, a review of research concerned with attitude change during human relations training; third, a review of research concerned with the use of human relations training to facilitate Black-white relations.

Self-concept Research

Several studies measured self-concept by assessing the discrepancies between the participant's descriptions of actual self, ideal self and others. Burke and Bennis (1961) found significant changes in the direction of greater agreement between actual and ideal self-descriptions and toward seeing themselves more nearly as others saw them. The 84 subjects responded to 19 bipolar adjectives on a rating scale to describe actual self, ideal self, and others. There was no control group. Gassner, Gold and Snadowsky (1964) found significant changes similar to those measured by Burke and Bennis, but in the control as well as the experimental groups. Bennis, Burke, Cutter, Harrington and Hoffman (1957) found no significant differences in the experimental group when measuring students' self-perceptions as more adequate after training.

Several studies have reported significant changes in self-concept of human relations training participants. Using a format of two-hour sessions twice a week over a period of sixteen weeks, G.L. Bunker (1961)

found a significant change in self-concept of the laboratory participants.
Bunker used a Q-sort technique--"a sophisticated form of rank-ordering
objects. . .and then assigning numerals to subsets of the objects for
statistical purposes (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 581)," to measure changes in
the discrepancies of ideal and real self-concepts. Also using a Q-sort,
Stock (1958) discovered some interesting changes in the self-percepts
of T-group members. Subjects were asked to describe themselves in
reference to feelings and behaviors concerning warmth, withdrawal,
aggression, dependency and counter-dependency. Pre-post self-percepts
were collected and categorized into most changed and least changed members.
The least changed members seemed to have more clearly defined self-concepts,
while the members that changed the most seemed to be unsure about their
self-concepts. Had a control group been used in this study, it might
have shed some light on the somewhat confusing experimental data.

Bass (1962) asked 30 trainees participating in a 10-day T-group
to describe their mood at five different times during the training
period. The subjects responded on a four-point scale of 27 adjectives
which corresponded to nine different moods. The data showed significant
trends for four of the nine moods. Although there was no control group,
the experimental data indicated: both depression and concentration
increased and then declined; skepticism decreased; and activation decreased,
increased, and then decreased.

M. Thomas (1970) found the "experienced-based (p. 100)" groups
showed more pre-post changes in terms of a more improved self-concept,
less defensiveness, less similarity to neurotic patients and less deviant
features than those in a case study and control group. The experience-based

grouping consisted of one encounter group, one T-group and three instru-
mented groups. The T-group alone showed more pre-post changes than
either the case study or control group.

Zimet and Fine (1955) used a picture study technique consisting
of 24 selected pictures in their study. They measured attitudes toward
self, attitudes toward other adults and attitudes toward children of 15
public school administrators. There was no control group, and all 15
experimental subjects were participating in a 16-week T-group which met
once each week for a five-hour session. Significant positive changes
occurred in the individuals' attitudes toward self, other adults and
children.

Of the eight studies reported, five showed a signficant change
in self-concept; one showed an improvement in self-concept; one showed
a change in participants' moods; and one found no significant change in
self-concept during human relations training. Only two of the eight
studies used adequate control groups. One of these studies, however,
showed significant change in self-concept in both the experimental and
control subjects. There is some evidence, then, to indicate that human
relations training does effect a change in self-concept.

Attitude Change Research

Attitude change measurement is difficult because of the methodo-
logical considerations. Few measures of attitude change provide meaningful
data. One widely used measurement is Schutz's Fundamental Interpersonal
Relations Orientation-Behavior questionnaire, FIRO-B (Schutz, 1958). W. C.
Shutz developed the questionnaire to measure six relatively homogeneous

dimensions related to three major types of an individual's behavior in groups:

1. Control--attempting to influence group proceedings,

2. Inclusion--initiating contacts with others in the group,

3. Affection--moving toward others in a group (Schutz, 1967, pp. 18-19).

The subject responds to each of these behaviors on two scales. One scale indicates his own tendency or desire to show the behavior; the other indicates how much he wants others in the group to show it toward him.

Using only four scales of FIRO-B measuring attitudes toward affection and control, P. B. Smith (1964) obtained responses from 108 subjects before and after they had been trained in T-Groups and compared them with responses obtained from a control group of 44 subjects who merely took part in a series of discussions. The experimental subjects showed an overall decrease in disparity between their own behavior tendencies and those desired from others. The control groups showed no change. The greatest amount of change occurred for those who initially showed strong control and weak affection tendencies and who desired low control and high affection from others.

Schutz and Allen (1966) used FIRO-B to study possible attitude changes among 72 persons of widely varied backgrounds who participated in a Western Training Laboratories sensitivity program. An education class of 30 students was used as a control group. The pre- and post-test correlations indicated that the training induced greater changes for the experimentals in the attitudes measured by FIRO-B. FIRO-B was administered prior to training, after a two-week session, and by mail six months after

training. The most change was obtained between the pretest and six-month posttest scores. These results would be even more significant if the specific behavioral changes had been outlined.

Baumgartel and Goldstein (1967) also used FIRO-B, in addition to the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (1960), in a study using 100 students in five sections of a semester-long human relations course. Although the investigators found a significant increase in wanted control and significant decrease in wanted affection, two methodology problems seem inherent in this study. First, there was no control group. Second, the human relations course included reading assignments, non-verbal exercises, term papers and examinations which may also have contributed to the changes for the experimental subjects.

Kernon (1963) used the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and the F-scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Stanford, 1950) to study possible attitude changes resulting from T-group training. The LOQ yields scores on two dimensions--"Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" (Fleishman, Harris & Burtt, 1955). Both experimental and control subjects were engineering supervisors in a single organization. The pre-post-test comparisons, after a three-day training period, showed no significant differences for either group on either measure.

Kassarjian (1965) attempted to assess changes in inner- versus other-directedness in four student and six adult extension T-groups (N=125) and observed no significant differences. His criterion measure was a 36-item forced-choice inventory. Control groups somewhat similar to the experimental groups were also used and also showed no significant differences.

Irwin Rubin (1967) tested and confirmed the following: the higher an individual's level of self-acceptance, the lower will be his level of prejudice; participation in a sensitivity training laboratory will increase an individual's level of self-acceptance and decrease his level of prejudice; changes in self-acceptance will be associated with changes in prejudice. The control group was composed of 14 of the program delegates who were pretested two weeks prior to arrival and posttested on arrival. The experimental group was composed of the remainder of the delegates who were pretested on arrival and posttested on the last day of the program. This type of control group accounted for the motivational factor influencing a subject to attend the program. Rubin also checked for significant trainer effects and found none.

Of the six studies reported, three showed a significant change in attitude; one showed a greater change in attitude for experimental subjects than for control subjects; and two showed no difference between experimental subjects' and control subjects' attitudes during human relations training. Only one study did not use an adequate control group. Most of the studies measured interpersonal attitudes and involved some form of interaction behavior. One study also measured the level of prejudice. There is some evidence, then, to indicate that human relations training does effect a change in attitude toward others.

Black-white Relations Research

Human relations training has been used to facilitate better relations between Black people and white people in this country. However, little research has been done in connection with these programs, or

that which has been done has not been reported. This review includes

reports both on programs which have been statistically measured and

those that have not been statistically measured to provide the reader

with a better understanding of Black-white relations programs. Speci-

fic training inputs and outcomes are also presented to provide a better

understanding of the hypotheses measured and analyzed in this study.

Kinnick and Platter (1967) measured the reduction in participants'

authoritarian and ethnocentric tendencies as a result of an 11-week

graduate training institute. There were 46 subjects in the experimental

group; 29 students enrolled in a graduate seminar in education composed

the control group. The F-scale (Adorno, et al., 1950), a 30-item desegre-

gation scale, and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (1960)

were administered prior to, immediately after, and three months after

the institute. The experimental subjects decreased in authoritarian,

ethnocentric and segregationist attitudes. Kinnick and Platter concluded

that the training institute had been able to facilitate the anticipated

changes. The institute included both Black people and white people. Most

of the training input centered on educational issues involving racial

matters. The positive attitude changes toward Blacks did not generalize

toward any other minority group.

Rubin's study (cited under Attitude Change Research) found that

participants in a sensitivity training laboratory increased their level

of self-acceptance and decreased their level of prejudice. The laboratory

was an integrated group.

A two-day interracial community training project in Charleston,

West Virginia was held in 1970 to facilitate more collaboration between

Blacks and whites and the powerful and powerless (Woodall, 1971). A split design was used with one day devoted to the opening of communication channels, increasing trust and learning of group decision-making skills. The second day concentrated on important community problems. The during-training and after-training results can be found in Table 1.

Denham and Thornton (1970) structured a weekend of training for an organization called "Operation Understanding (p. 3)" made up of whites and Blacks who had banded together to understand their own racism and work more cooperatively to combat racism in their community. The trainers evaluated their own training design in terms of the perceived and expressed needs of the participants and found the following outcomes:

1. The design seemed to help the participants move from their "mental set" as well-informed, action-oriented, good intentioned, concerned liberals to interaction with one another that brought to the surface authentic residual feelings of "whiteness and Blackness."

2. The reversed second try of the game (part of the design included a game which reversed racial roles) seemed to help the participants work through to "good feelings" of self-affirmation, strength, collaborative potential, and creative reality-testing with one another.

3. The design provided a climate that enabled the level of commitment to the group goal to deepen and provided the impetus for strengthening interpersonal support and trust (Denham and Thornton, 1970, pp. 5-6).

Lee and Schmidt (1969) claim they have identified assumptions and behaviors which facilitate and block authentic interpersonal relations between Blacks and whites. The assumptions and behaviors were drawn from an analysis of tapes of T-group sessions in which the Black-white issue was confronted. The groups were integrated. See Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 for the lists of assumptions and behaviors.

TABLE 1

During Training and After Training Results
of the Charleston, West Virginia Project

_____

During Training

1. Plans were made to involve policy makers in business, industry and labor in alleviating the plight of the jobless in Charleston.

2. The mayor made a commitment to work closely with the Community Council of Churches in obtaining the support of business and industrial leaders in an all-out effort to create more jobs.

3. Both Blacks and whites expressed deepenened perspectives and increased understanding which resulted in new communication linkages being formed.

4. Many of the previously hostile participants were now talking to each other.

5. Many of the powerless had been able to taste a sense of the potential of collaboration with the power structure.

After Training

1. No major disruptions through the summer of 1970.

2. Jobs in stores, factories and government departments were opened up to ghetto youngsters.

3. An advisory committee was created of Black and white parents to maintain communication with the commission on potentially troublesome racial issues.

4. Interracial student advisory committees were organized in each city high school to work closely with the people and the administration.

5. The Chief of Police initiated a community relations training program for his force, utilizing a laboratory training program approach and involving community leaders from both the ghetto and the white community.

_____

TABLE 2

Assumptions Which Block Authentic Relations

Assumptions Whites Make

1. Color is unimportant in interpersonal relations.

2. Blacks will always welcome and appreciate inclusion in white society.

3. Open recognition of color may embarrass Blacks.

4. Blacks are trying to use whites.

5. Blacks can be stereotyped.

6. White society is superior to Black society.

7. "Liberal" whites are free of racism.

8. All Blacks are alike in their attitudes and behavior.

9. Blacks are oversensitive.

10. Blacks must be controlled.

Assumptions Blacks Make

1. All whites are alike.

2. There are no "soul brothers" among whites.

3. Honkies have all the power.

4. Whites are always trying to use Blacks.

5. Whites are united in their attitude toward Blacks.

6. All whites are racists.

7. Whites are not really trying to understand the situation of the Blacks.

8. Whitey's got to deal on Black terms.

9. Silence is the sign of hostility.

TABLE 2 (Cont.)

10. Whites cannot and will not change except by force.

11. The only way to gain attention is through confrontation.

12. All whites are deceptive.

13. All whites will let you down in the "crunch."

Note.--Table 2 reprinted from an article by Bertram M. Lee and Warren H. Schmidt published in Human Relations Training News, Volume 13, Number 4, 1969. Copyrighted by the National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science Association with the National Education Association, 1969.

TABLE 3

Assumptions Which Facilitate Authentic Relations

Assumptions Whites Make

1. People count as individuals.

2. Blacks are human--with individual feelings, aspirations and attitudes.

3. Blacks have a.heritage of which they are proud.

4. Interdependence is needed between whites and Blacks.

5. Blacks are angry.

6. Whites cannot fully understand what it means to be Black.

7. Whiteness/Blackness is a real difference but not the basis on which to determine behavior.

8. Most Blacks can handle whites' authentic behavior and feelings.

9. Blacks want a responsible society.

10. Blacks are capable of managerial maturity.

11. I may be part of the problem.

Assumptions Blacks Make

1. Openness is healthy.

2. Interdependence is needed between Blacks and whites.

3. People count as individuals.

4. Negotiation and collaboration are possible strategies.

5. Whites are human beings and whether they should or not, do have their own hang-ups.

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

6. Some whites can help and "do their own thing."

7. Some whites have "soul."

Note.--Table 3 reprinted from an article by Bertram M. Lee and Warren H. Schmidt published in Human Relations Training News, Volume 13, Number 4, 1969. Copyrighted by the National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science Association with the National Education Association, 1969.

TABLE 4

Behaviors Which Block Authentic Relations

Behaviors of Whites

1. Interruptions.

2. Condescending behavior.

3. Offering help where not needed or wanted.

4. Avoidance of contact (eye-to-eye and physical).

5. Verbal focus on Black behavior rather than white behavior.

6. Insisting on playing games according to white rules.

7. Showing annoyance at Black behavior which differs from their own.

8. Expression of too-easy acceptance and friendship.

9. Talking about, rather than to, Blacks who are present.

Behaviors of Blacks

1. Confrontation too early and too harshly.

2. Rejection of honest expressions of acceptance and friendship.

3. Pushing whites into such a defensive posture that learning and re-examination is impossible.

4. Failure to keep a commitment and then offering no explanation.

5. "In-group" joking, laughing at whites--in Black culture language.

6. Giving answers Blacks think whites want to hear.

TABLE 4 (Cont.)

7. Using confrontation as the primary relationship style.

8. Isolationism.

Note.--Table 4 reprinted from an article by Bertram M. Lee and Warren H. Schmidt published in Human Relations Training News, Volume 13, Number 4, 1969. Copyrighted by the National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science Association with the National Education Association, 1969.

TABLE 5

Behaviors Which Facilitate Authentic Relations

===

Behaviors of Whites

1. Directness and openness in expressing feelings.

2. Assisting other white brothers to understand and confront feelings.

3. Supporting self-initiated moves of Black people.

4. Listening without interrupting.

5. Demonstration of interest in learning about Black perceptions, culture.

6. Staying with and working through difficult confrontations.

7. Taking a risk (e.g., being first to confront the differences).

8. Assuming responsibility for examining own motives--and where they are.

Behaviors of Blacks

1. Showing interest in understanding white's point of view.

2. Acknowledging that there are some committed whites.

3. Acting as if "we have some power" and don't need to prove it.

4. Allowing whites to experience unaware areas of racism.

5. Openness.

6. Expression of real feelings.

7. Dealing with whites where they are.

8. Meeting whites half-way.

9. Treating whites on one-to-one basis.

10. Telling it like it is.

TABLE 5 (Cont.)

11. Realistic goal-sharing.

12. Showing pride in their heritage.

Note.--Table 5 reprinted from an article by Bertram M. Lee and Warren H. Schmidt published in Human Relations Training News, Volume 14, Number 4, 1969. Copyrighted by the National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science Association with the National Education Association, 1969.

In 1968, Max Birnbaum and his colleagues (Cottle, 1969) developed a sensitivity training program for the Bristol Township, Pennsylvania public school system. The program was based on the following assumptions:

1. The training program must be strongly and consistently supported by the district's educational leaders--the superintendent and his top staff.

2. The program must include the entire school community.

3. Training must be focused on personal growth for organizational adaptation to change, rather than on personal growth alone (Cottle, 1969, p. 27).

The major goal of the program was to help administrators and teachers recognize and decrease resistance to their own fears in reference to needed changes within teacher-administrator, teacher-pupil and administrator-student relationships. This program was integrated.

Of the six studies reported, two used some type of statistical measurement. One study showed a greater decrease in authoritarian, ethnocentric, segregationist attitudes for experimental subjects than for control subjects during human relations training. The other study found that participants in a sensitivity training laboratory decreased their level of prejudice. The four remaining studies used no statistical measurement. Specific training inputs varied from program to program with the exception that all programs included both Black people and white people. Specific training outcomes varied throughout the programs. Obviously there is a need to further research and measure the effect of human relations training on whites' attitudes toward Blacks. This study attempts to investigate and measure that effect.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Methodology of the Measurement Instruments

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (see Appendix A) consists of 100 self-descriptive statements that an individual uses to describe his own self image. The scale was originally developed from a large pool of self-descriptive items derived from several other self-concept measures, including those constructed by Balester (1956), Engel (1956), and Taylor (1953). Seven clinical psychologists judged the edited self-descriptive items for positive and negative content. The scale finally consisted of only those items on which there was perfect agreement by the judges.

A broad sample of 626 people was used to standardize norms for the scale. The sample included people from various parts of the country ranging in age from 12 to 68. There were approximately equal numbers of both sexes, Black and white subjects, and various social, economic, intellectual and educational levels.

The scale yields 46 total scores in different areas of the self-concept. To minimize the mathematical computation of this study and to maximize the use of the instrument for the general aim of this study only seven of those scores were used. The following is a list of the seven scores used in this study.

1. The Self-Criticism Score (SC). This scale is composed of ten items taken from the L-Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Hathaway & McKinley, 1951). All items are mildly derogatory statements most people admit as being true for them. High scores indicate a normal, healthy openness and capacity for self criticism. Low scores indicate defensiveness and a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of oneself. Normal mean score is 35.54 with a standard deviation of 6.70.

2. True/False Ratio (T/F). This is a measure of response set or response bias, an indication of the subject's approach to doing the scale. A high T/F ratio suggests a person with a weak ego and poor controls over individual behavior. Normal mean score is 1.03 with a standard deviation of 0.29.

3. The total Positive Score (P). This score reflects the overall level of self-esteem and is the most important single score on the scale. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel depressed and unhappy. Normal mean score is 345.57 with a standard deviation of 30.70.

4. The Total Variability Score (V). This score represents the total amount of variability or inconsistency from one area of self-perception to another. High scores mean the person's self-concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or integration. Well-integrated persons generally score below the mean which is 48.53. The standard deviation is 12.42.

5. The Defensive Positive Scale (DP). This scale is a more subtle measure of defensiveness than the SC score. A high DP score indicates a positive self-description stemming from defensive distortion. The mean is 54.50 with a standard deviation of 12.38.

6. The Neurosis Scale (N). This is an inverse scale composed of 27 items. Low scores indicate a high similarity to neurotic patients. The mean is 84.31 with a standard deviation of 11.10.

7. The Personality Integration Scale (PI). The PI Scale establishes norms other than the one previously mentioned. A group of 75 people judged above average in terms of adjustment level or degree of personality integration formed the norm group. This scale differentiates the PI group from the other groups; higher scores indicate good integration. The mean is 10.42 with a standard deviation of 3.88.

In using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Fitts (1965) found high validity and reliability, both on test-retest coefficients and with other personality measurements. Also, norms were established by comparing scores of the standardization group (N=626), the group high in personality integration (N=75) and a group of patients under psychiatric care (N=63). See Table 6 for the comparisons.

The Triandis Behavior Differential

The behavior differential was developed by Harry C. Triandis (1964) as a method for analyzing the behavioral component of social attitudes. The behavioral component is viewed as consisting of variables which form what Triandis called a "cube of data (H. Triandis, 1964, p. 421)." One side of the cube is formed by a stimulus person with specified

TABLE 6

Means and Standard Deviations on the Seven Scores
Used in This Study for Three Groups Along
the Mental Health Continuum

SCORE	Groups					
	Patient Group (63)		Norm Group (626)		P. I. Group (75)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-criticism	36.0	6.8	35.54	6.70	36.87	5.98
T/F Ratio	1.17	0.40	1.03	0.29	0.93	0.12
Total Positive	323.0	44.5	345.57	30.70	376.01	25.46
Total Variability	51.6	14.2	48.53	12.42	37.04	7.30
Defensive Positive	51.2	14.6	54.50	12.38	58.70	8.61
Neurosis Scale	73.2	16.1	84.31	11.10	91.72	7.14
P. I. Scale	6.74	4.17	10.42	3.88	15.0	3.22

Note.--Reprinted from the Tennessee Self Concept Scale manual by William H. Fitts. Copyrighted by the Tennessee Department of Mental Health, 1965.

characteristics such as race, religion, age, sex, etc. These then are the factors which seem to influence behavior.

A second face of Triandis' cube is formed by behaviors a person might perform with a stimulus person. Typical behaviors might include work with, be commanded by, marry and others. The third face of the cube consists of the subject who reports his likely behavior with the stimulus person. Usually this face of the cube is the subject of the study.

Triandis suggested a fourth face of the cube--the situation or behavior setting. However, the situation can be combined with the stimulus persons into a category called "environmental factors (M. Heider, 1970, p. 39)."

Subjects report their behavioral intentions on a nine-interval bi-polar scale. The behavior differential allows a respondent to indicate on the rating scale the extent to which he "would or would not (H. Triandis, 1964, p. 421)" participate in various behaviors with a given stimulus person. The differential is scored by summing the responses to items. This sum is the subject's behavioral "intent (H. Triandis, 1964, p. 423)" score. The larger the score, the greater the degree of intent.

The Triandis Behavior Differential is constructed to allow for the characteristics of the stimulus person to be presented on two or more levels. A respondent may be asked to indicate his behavioral intentions toward a 30 year old female physician, introverted (H. Triandis, 1964) and then toward a 30 year old female physician, extroverted (H. Triandis, 1964). These responses would provide information about the

influence of a personality characteristic upon behavioral intent. This kind of information permits the analysis of the influence of stimulus characteristics on behavior and provides for a factorial design. For example, the use of two levels with each of three stimulus characteristics provides a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design.

In addition to the characteristics which influence behavior, Triandis also wanted to discover if various behaviors were viewed as similar by subjects (H. Triandis, 1964). Those behaviors viewed similarly would form "clusters (H. Triandis, 1964, p. 438)."

Thus, the use of the Triandis Behavior Differential allows for the identification of behavioral factors and presentation of stimulus person characteristics on various levels which can then be factor analyzed. The factor analysis can determine the extent to which variance in a subject's reported behavioral intent on each behavioral factor is controlled by variations in the stimulus person characteristics.

Procedure

The Triandis Behavior Differential Modification

The Triandis Behavior Differential is used in this study to measure whites' attitudes toward others with whom they interact. To measure these attitudes the variables which form the "cube of data (H. Triandis, 1964, p. 421)" must include appropriate behavioral components and environmental factors. The behavior differential used in this study is a modified form of the Triandis Behavior Differential called an Interaction Inventory (II) (see Appendix B). All modifications were based on previous research findings so as not to alter the original methodology of the measuring instrument.

Behavioral Components

The behavioral components of the differential were taken from the Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) system (see Appendix C) developed by Robert F. Bales (1950). The IPA system includes 12 topic-free sub-categories of communication behavior. The categories have been grouped in terms of four types of interactions present: (a) positive reactions, (b) attempted answers, (c) questions and (d) negative reactions.

Numerous investigations of small group behavior have used the IPA system (Hare, 1962). Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) cited the IPA as one of the most widely used and best known interaction analysis systems. Newcomb, Turner and Converse (1965) described the IPA as "by far the most highly developed and widely used method of describing interaction (p. 553)."

The recent development of a Communication Behavior Differential (CBD) was of special significance to this study (M. Heider, 1970). The CBD was modeled after the Triandis Behavior Differential. The 12 behavioral components of the CBD were derived from the 12 categories of communication behavior of the Bales' Interaction Process Analysis system. Reliability and validity checks were made on the CBD. The reliability check indicated an adequate degree of stability for the CBD (M. Heider, 1970). All but one of four validity checks obtained a fair to satisfactory validity coefficient.

The 12 behavioral components of the Interaction Inventory are identical to the 12 behavioral components of the CBD. See Table 7 for the 12 categories of the IPA and the 12 derived behavioral components of the Interaction Inventory.

TABLE 7

Behavioral Components of the Interaction Inventory (II)
Derived from Bales'
Interaction Process Analysis (IPA)
System

Categories of the IPA	Behavioral Components of the II
A. GIVING POSITIVE REACTIONS	
1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status gives help, reward	1. Show friendliness toward that person/them
2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction	2. Show satisfaction with that person/them
3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies	3. Show my agreement with that person/them
B. ATTEMPTING TO GIVE ANSWERS	
4. Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other	4. Give suggestions to that person/them
5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish	5. Give my opinions to that person/them
6. Gives orientation, information, repeats clarifies, confirms	6. Give information to that person/them
C. ASKING QUESTIONS	
7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation	7. Ask for information from that person/them

TABLE 7 (Cont.)

Categories of the IPA	Behavioral Components of the II
8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling	8. Ask for opinions from that person/them
9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action	9. Ask for suggestions from that person/them

D. GIVING NEGATIVE REACTIONS

10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help	10. Show my disagreement with that person/them
11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field	11. Refrain from talking with that person/them
12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self	12. Show antagonism toward that person/them

Environmental Factors

The variables used to represent the environmental factors influencing the behavioral components were selected by combining findings from previous research and from an open-ended questionnaire. Previous research has shown the effects of size, race and feedback on interaction behavior.

Size. A large body of small group research reported that the size of a group has an effect on individual and group participation. Gibb (1951) found increased group size relates to increased threat experienced by members engaged in problem-solving. Findings also indicated that as group size increases, the more communicative members become even more talkative while the less communicative become even less communicative (Hare, 1962; Bales & Borgatta, 1955). The research of Bass and Norton (1951) and Bales (1950) all indicated that communication processes change with increased size. In addition, maximum participation and satisfaction for all members was reported in groups of four to six members (Slater, 1958). Five member groups seem to be the most effective and satisfying.

Race. Numerous studies of social distance reported that race has an effect on individual and group interaction behavior. Results of Bogardus' work (1928) showed social distance was greatest when the stimulus person differed from the subjects in race. More important, however, are the results of recent studies conducted by Harry C. Triandis and his associates (H. Triandis & L. Triandis, 1960, 1962; H. Triandis, Davis & Takezawa, 1965).

Some of the first studies done in the development of the Triandis Behavior Differential were concerned with social distance. In the first social distance study the differential was given to white American subjects. The analysis showed that of the controlled variance in the social distance scores 77% was accounted for by race (H. Triandis & L. Triandis, 1960). Likewise in a 1962 study, Triandis and Triandis found of the four characteristics--race, occupation, religion and nationality--American weighted race 86%. A study conducted in 1965 (H. Triandis et al., 1965) also indicated the most important determinant of social distance for Americans was race. These findings clearly indicated that in the American culture race is the most important determinant of social distance.

Feedback. Another important factor which has been shown to influence a person's behavior is feedback. Gordon Lippitt (1960) studied the effects of feedback on changes in individual behavior. Thirteen out of 14 in a group receiving feedback changed in the direction the group wanted them to change, while only 8 out of 14 in a non-feedback group changed. Gibb, Smith and Roberts (1955) found that groups which received feedback differed from those who did not, in that members felt more favorable toward the group, displayed a more ambitious level of aspiration for their group and expressed more negative feelings.

The findings of Mary Heider, who developed and used the Communication Behavior Differential in her investigation, are particularly important to this study. Of the four environmental factors (audience size, audience feedback, audience expertise and subjects' familiarity

with the topic of discussion), audience feedback had the most extensive effect on subjects' communicative behavior (M. Heider, 1970, p. 103). Communication was avoided significantly more with a critical audience than with an accepting audience except when giving negative responses (M. Heider, 1970).

The results of an open-ended questionnaire tend to support the previous research findings that size, race and feedback are important environmental factors influencing behavior. The questionnaire was administered to two Liberal Arts and Sciences undergraduate classes at the University of Kansas: Topics and Problems in Human Relations I and one undergraduate education class: Social Studies Methods in December 1971.

Forty-eight white subjects responded to the questions, 31 from the Liberal Arts and Sciences Classes and 17 from the education class. The open-ended questionnaire asked the following questions: (a) What characteristics of a Black person lead you to avoid interacting (conversing) with that person? (b) What characteristics of an inter-action situation involving Black people lead you to avoid interacting (conversing) in that situation? The questions were oriented toward avoidance in an attempt to discover those factors which seemed important prior to an interaction situation, thus simulating social distance. Factors reported by the 48 white subjects were grouped by the researcher according to similarity.

Four broad categories emerged from the open-ended responses to question one. In order of importance the four categories were: (a) critical feedback, (b) appearance, (c) lack of acceptance feedback and

(d) traits of the subjects. The most frequently mentioned category was critical feedback. Twenty times a hostile, angry or violent factor was listed as a cause for avoidance of interaction.

The second ranked category for avoidance of interaction was appearance. Factors pertaining to color, race or looks were listed 14 times. Lack of acceptance feedback, such as, "ignores me," "resents me" or "hates me" made up the third category. Ten lack of acceptance factors were listed. Particular traits of the subjects were listed six times, such as, "personal insecurity" or "personal inability" as leading to interaction avoidance. In order, then, critical feedback, appearance, lack of acceptance feedback and traits of the subjects were listed as characteristics of a Black person which would lead to avoiding interaction with that person.

Three broad categories emerged from the open-ended responses to question two. The most frequently mentioned category was again critical feedback. Nineteen subjects listed this category. The second-ranked cause for avoidance of an interaction situation involving Black people was size. Group size was listed 12 times. The third-ranked category was the subject's unfamiliarity, lack of interest or knowledge related to the discussion topic. Seven listed this category.

Based on the information from the open-ended questionnaire as well as the results of previous research, environmental factors on two levels were chosen for the Interaction Inventory. A feedback variable was chosen. The two feedback levels chosen were "hostile" or "friendly." Race was the second variable chosen with "Black" or "white" representing the two levels. Size was the third variable. The two levels chosen were "1" or "5."

The selection of the levels of the third variable, size, was
based on three considerations. First, the interaction categories of
the IPA which were used as the behavioral components of the Interaction
Inventory were originally developed to measure interaction in dyads and
small groups. Second, research findings indicated five-member groups
were the most desirable. Finally, the open-ended responses clearly
showed group size affected whites' avoidance interaction behavior.

The following then is a sample item used in the Interaction
Inventory:

When I am with 1 friendly white person,

I would____:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:would not

give information to that person

The three environmental factors used in this sample item are, respectively,
size, feedback and race. The IPA category used is that of "gives orienta-
tion, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms (Bales, 1950, p. 1)"
represented by "give information to that person." Subjects respond on
a nine-interval bi-polar scale. Scores can range from 96 for least
degree of intent to 864 for greatest degree of intent. The lower the
score is, the greater is the intent to perform the specific behavior.
For analysis purposes the twelve behavioral components are divided into
the four specific behavioral categories: (a) giving positive reactions;
(b) attempting to give answers; (c) asking questions; (d) giving negative
reactions.

The Pilot Study

Once variables forming the II were selected, the 12 behavioral
components were randomly arranged for each of the eight interaction

settings. Randomness was obtained using a table of random numbers.
The complete II was then collated and administered to approximately
25 trainers attending a Racial Awareness Weekend Workshop.

Most of the trainers thought the II was a useful and much needed
measuring instrument for racial awareness training. Some of the trainers
expressed concern about the nine-interval scale and suggested the use
of either five or seven intervals. Since the original Triandis Behavior
Differential included a nine-interval scale, the same interval scale
was maintained for the modified measuring instrument, the II.

Measurement of Attendance, Participation,
Integrated Reading and Progress Toward
A Personal Growth Goal

The third hypothesis of this study proposed to measure the correla-
tion between the amount of perceived attendance, perceived participation,
reported integrated reading and perceived progress toward a personal
growth goal with pre-post changes in self-concept of subjects in Experi-
mental Group I. Attendance, participation, integrated reading and
progress toward a personal growth goal were defined as the training
input for Experimental Group I. The amount of attendance, participation
and progress were measured in terms of perceptions by each member of
Experimental Group I, including himself. The amount of integrated reading
was assessed in terms of numerical grades assigned to 11 reaction papers
submitted to the trainer by each group member. Therefore, a linear
scale was devised to measure these various amounts (see Appendix D).

The linear scale consists of five categories allowing a rating
ranging from "very high" to "very low." A "very high" was scored "five"

and a "very low" rating "one" so that the higher the score the greater the amount.

The Design of the Study

The Solomon Four-Group Design was used in this study (Kerlinger, 1964). The design is pictured in the following manner:

Y_b	X	Y_a	(Experimental Group I)
Y_b	(-X)	Y_a	(Control Group I)
	X	Y_a	(Experimental Group II)
	(-X)	Y_a	(Control Group II)

Specifically, the four groups used in this study were:

(a) Experimental Group I was one section (N=15) of Human Relations in Group Interaction I, Speech 141. Both the trainer and subjects were white.

(b) Control Group I was one section (N=18) of Science Methods, Education 63, an upper division undergraduate course in the Department of Education at the University of Kansas. Both the teacher and subjects were white.

(c) Experimental Group II was one section (N=15) of Human Relations in Group Interaction I, Speech 141. Both the trainer and subjects were white.

(d) Control Group II was one section (N=24) of Science Methods, Education 63, an upper division undergraduate course in the Department of Education at the University of Kansas. Both the teacher and subjects were white. Therefore, all subjects and teachers in all four groups were white.

Data Analysis

The statistical approach suggested by Solomon (1949) for the four-group design was used in this study. Solomon suggested a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance, using the four Y_a (see <u>The Design of the Study</u>) sets of measures. The 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance is pictured in the following manner:

	X	-X
Pretested	Y_a, Experimental I	Y_a, Control I
Not Pretested	Y_a, Experimental II	Y_a, Control II

Specifically, with this analysis the main effects of X and -X, and pretested and Not Pretested were analyzed. The interaction of pretesting and X were also analyzed.

Therefore, the statistical approach used in analyzing the data for the first two hypotheses was analysis of variance. Data for hypothesis one, concerning self-concept, were analyzed using the BMDX 64 program from the Program Library of the University of Kansas Computation Center. Data for hypothesis two, concerning the attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact, were analyzed using the ANOVAT program from the Program Library of the University of Kansas Computation Center.

The third hypothesis, concerning pre-post changes in self-concept and specific training input, involved only the subjects in Experimental Group I. The statistical approach used in analyzing the data for the third hypothesis was correlation. Data for this hypothesis were analyzed using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Bruning, 1968). The basic computation formula for the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation is:

$$r = \frac{N\Sigma XY - (\Sigma X)\ (\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2]\ [N\Sigma Y^2 - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

where   N = number of pairs of scores

ΣXY = sum of the products of the paired scores

ΣX = sum of scores on one variable

ΣY = sum of scores on the other variable

ΣX^2 = sum of the squared scores on the X variable

ΣY^2 = sum of the squared scores on the Y variable

(Bruning, 1968, p. 153).

Attrition was a minor problem in the post data collection. Since all subjects completed all research instruments on a voluntary basis, some subjects were not available for posttesting. Some subjects had dropped the respective course or were unwilling to participate in the research project. The posttest group breakdown was as follows:

Experimental Group I	(N=15)	loss of 1 subject
Control Group I	(N=18)	loss of 2 subjects
Experimental Group II	(N=15)	loss of 4 subjects
Control Group II	(N=24)	no loss

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Results for Research Question I: Self-Concept

The first hypothesis proposed there would be a significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Self-concept was analyzed in terms of seven scores yielded by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: the Self-Criticism Score, the True/False Ratio, the Total Positive Score, the Total Variability Score, the Defensive Positive Scale, the Neurosis Scale and the Personality Integration Scale. Table 8 presents the analysis of variance data for all seven self-concept scores.

There was no significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, across all seven scores. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

On the other hand, there was a significant first-order interaction between the training and the pretest for the Neurosis Score (see Table 9). Experimental subjects in Experimental Group I scored significantly lower on the neurosis Scale than did subjects in the three other training-testing conditions. Low Neurosis scores, indicate similarities to neurotic patients. However, the posttest means for all

51

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance for Tennessee Self Concept Scores

Self-Criticism Score

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	2045.48	71		
Treatment (A)	0.77	1	0.77	<1.00
Pretest (B)	12.69	1	12.69	<1.00
AXB	74.90	1	74.90	2.60
Error	1957.11	68	28.78	

True/False Ratio

Total	6.06	71		
Treatment (A)	0.08	1	0.08	<1.00
Pretest (B)	0.10	1	0.10	1.25
AXB	0.02	1	0.02	<1.00
Error	5.85	68	0.08	

Total Positive Score

Total	61008.88	71		
Treatment (A)	889.35	1	889.35	1.09
Pretest (B)	2105.11	1	2105.11	2.59
AXB	2747.71	1	2747.71	3.38
Error	55266.70	68	812.74	

TABLE 8 (Cont.)

Total Variability Score

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	10747.97	71		
Treatment (A)	78.44	1	78.44	<1.00
Pretest (B)	3.49	1	3.49	<1.00
AXB	8.13	1	8.13	<1.00
Error	10657.90	68	156.73	

Defensive Positive Scale

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	6724.85	71		
Treatment (A)	37.67	1	37.67	<1.00
Pretest (B)	128.17	1	128.17	1.39
AXB	298.60	1	298.60	3.24
Error	6260.40	68	92.06	

Neurosis Scale

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	7855.13	71		
Treatment (A)	131.86	1	131.86	1.31
Pretest (B)	378.05	1	378.05	3.77
AXB	833.67	1	833.67	8.32**
Error	6511.53	68	100.16	

Personality Integration Scale

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Total	1234.15	71		
Treatment (A)	37.24	1	37.24	2.12
Pretest (B)	4.75	1	4.75	<1.00
AXB	2.04	1	2.04	<1.00
Error	1190.10	68	17.50	

***$p < .001$
**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$

TABLE 9

Means for the Interaction Between Training and
Pretest for the Neurosis Score

	Pretest	
	Yes	No
Experimental	76.53	88.13
Control	86.22	83.95

four groups on the Neurosis Scale were within the normal group range

contained on the Mental Health Continuum (see Table 6).

Results for Research Question II: Attitudes

The second hypothesis proposed there would be a significant dif-

ference after training between attitudes toward others with whom they

interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects,

as reported on an Interaction Inventory (II). Attitudes were analyzed

in terms of four behavioral categories: (a) giving positive reactions;

(b) attempting to give answers; (c) asking questions; (d) giving

negative reactions.

Analysis of variance tables are included which present the following

data: (a) the effects of the treatment--experimental and control; (b)

the effects of the testing--pretested and not pretested; (c) the effects

of the environmental factors--size, feedback and race. The purpose of

the second research question was to assess the effects of human relations

training on attitudes. Therefore, only the above analysis of variance

data relevant to the effects of the experimental treatment (human relations

training) are reported in the results.

Giving Positive Reactions

The behavioral components of show friendliness, show satisfaction,

and show agreement were included in the category of giving positive

reactions. Table 10 presents the analysis of variance data for giving

positive reactions.

The main effect of the training was clearly significant. In all

conditions of feedback, size and race there was a significant difference

TABLE 10

Analysis of Variance for Giving Positive Reactions

Source	df	MS	F
Total	575	39.06	
Between Subjects	71	46.58	
Treatment (A)	1	354.31	8.16**
Pretest (B)	1	2.05	<1.00
AXB	1	4.09	<1.00
Within Subjects	504	38.00	
Feedback (C)	1	1195.81	104.43***
AXC	1	39.76	3.47
BXC	1	3.81	<1.00
AXBXC	1	8.61	<1.00
Size (D)	1	681.66	47.32***
AXD	1	2.44	<1.00
BXD	1	11.18	<1.00
AXBXD	1	0.34	<1.00
Race (E)	1	1886.04	64.78***
AXE	1	139.61	4.79*
BXE	1	7.01	<1.00
AXBXE	1	1.63	<1.00
CXD	1	1434.39	76.15***
AXCXD	1	74.25	3.94
BXCXD	1	19.60	·1.04
AXBXCXD	1	0.25	< 1.00
CXE	1	168.84	15.82***
AXCXE	1	0.89	< 1.00
BXCXE	1	16.21	1.52
AXBXCXE	1	11.80	1.10
DXE	1	4121.77	340.10***
AXDXE	1	3.10	<1.00
BXDXE	1	17.77	1.46
AXBXDXE	1	45.80	3.78
CXDXE	1	417.92	22.76***
AXCXDXE	1	0.65	<1.00
BXCXDXE	1	25.96	1.41
AXBXCXDXE	1	17.08	<1.00

***p < .001
**p < .01
*p < .05

after training between attitudes of white experimental subjects and white control subjects. Experimental subjects were significantly more willing to give positive reactions than were control subjects. There was no significant main effect for the pretest.

The means for the significant first-order interaction between the training and race are presented in Table 11. Experimental subjects were more willing than control subjects to give positive reactions with both other whites and Blacks, and the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for Black others than for white others.

There was a significant difference between white experimental subjects' and white control subjects' attitudes toward others with whom they interact in terms of giving positive reactions. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

Attempting To Give Answers

The category of attempting to give answers consisted of the behavioral components give suggestions, give opinions and give information. Analysis of variance data for attempting to give answers are presented in Table 12.

The main effect of the training was clearly significant. In all conditions of feedback, size and race, there was a significant difference after training between attitudes of white experimental subjects and white control subjects. Experimental subjects were significantly more willing to attempt to give answers than were control subjects. There was no significant main effect for the pretest.

The means for the significant first-order interaction between the training and race are presented in Table 13. Experimental subjects

TABLE 11

Mean Willingness To Give Positive Reactions With
White and Black Others As a Function of Training

	White	Black
Experimental	10.35	13.04
Control	10.95	15.64

TABLE 12

Analysis of Variance for Attempting To Give Answers

Source	df	MS	F
Total	575	32.23	
Between Subjects	71	61.38	
Treatment (A)	1	401.36	6.99*
Pretest (B)	1	19.90	<1.00
AXB	1	33.05	<1.00
Within Subjects	504	32.23	
Feedback (C)	1	3121.27	173.77***
AXC	1	23.20	1.29
BXC	1	31.93	1.77
AXBXC	1	20.00	1.11
Size (D)	1	40.80	3.18
AXD	1	10.53	<1.00
BXD	1	3.32	<1.00
AXBXD	1	19.90	1.55
Race (E)	1	405.14	17.48***
AXE	1	98.36	4.24*
BXE	1	10.58	<1.00
AXBXE	1	48.39	2.08
CXD	1	187.40	10.52**
AXCXD	1	111.25	6.24*
BXCXD	1	13.96	<1.00
AXBXCXD	1	8.63	<1.00
CXE	1	6.88	<1.00
AXCXE	1	0.26	<1.00
BXCXE	1	16.28	2.09
AXBXCXE	1	8.16	1.04
DXE	1	1234.30	88.42***
AXDXE	1	47.03	3.37
BXDXE	1	6.50	<1.00
AXBXDXE	1	4.67	<1.00
CXDXE	1	639.40	46.44***
AXCXDXE	1	41.43	3.00
BXCXDXE	1	0.15	<1.00
AXBXCXDXE	1	5.58	<1.00

***p < .001
**p < .01
*p < .05

TABLE 13

Mean Willingness To Attempt To Give Answers With
White and Black Others As a Function of Training

	White	Black
Experimental	11.56	12.43
Control	12.42	14.97

were more willing than control subjects to attempt answers with both other whites and Blacks, and the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for Black others than for white others. These results were similar to those for the same interaction of variables for giving positive reactions.

The means for the significant second-order interaction between training, feedback and size are presented in Table 14. In all conditions of feedback and size, experimental subjects were more willing to attempt answers than were control subjects. When with one other person, the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for friendly feedback than for hostile feedback. When with five other people, the opposite result occurred. The difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for hostile feedback than for friendly feedback.

There was a significant difference between white experimental subjects' and white control subjects' attitudes toward others with whom they interact in terms of attempting to give answers. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

Asking Questions

The category of asking questions consisted of the behavioral components ask for information, ask for suggestions and ask for opinions. Analysis of variance data for asking questions are presented in Table 15.

There was no significant main effect for either training or the pretest. However the training did have an effect in the significant second-order interaction which occurred because training interacted with

TABLE 14

Mean Willingness To Attempt To Give Answers With
Friendly and Hostile, One and Five Others As a
Function of Training

	One Other		Five Others	
	Friendly	Hostile	Friendly	Hostile
Experimental	10.10	14.16	9.56	14.16
Control	12.56	15.65	9.68	16.89

TABLE 15

Analysis of Variance For Asking Questions

Source	df	MS	F
Total	575	47.90	
Between Subjects	71	80.48	
Treatment (A)	1	221.89	2.76
Pretest (B)	1	1.73	⟨1.00
AXB	1	38.99	⟨1.00
Within Subjects	504	43.31	
Feedback (C)	1	1503.06	82.54***
AXC	1	61.52	3.37
BXC	1	0.58	⟨1.00
AXBXC	1	8.23	⟨1.00
Size (D)	1	314.39	23.36***
AXD	1	46.69	3.47
BXD	1	16.78	1.24
AXBXD	1	29.44	2.18
Race (E)	1	6194.72	233.09***
AXE	1	50.92	1.91
BXE	1	22.84	⟨1.00
AXBXE	1	12.27	⟨1.00
CXD	1	2884.15	119.79***
AXCXD	1	52.81	2.19
BXCXD	1	16.48	⟨1.00
AXBXCXD	1	0.12	⟨1.00
CXE	1	117.28	16.36***
AXCXE	1	19.79	2.76
BXCXE	1	4.12	⟨1.00
AXBXCXE	1	6.67	⟨1.00
DXE	1	1234.88	88.20***
AXDXE	1	160.24	11.44**
BXDXE	1	47.31	3.38
AXBXDXE	1	13.14	⟨1.00
CXDXE	1	170.12	23.01***
AXCXDXE	1	8.58	1.16
BXCXDXE	1	0.20	⟨1.00
AXBXCXDXE	1	7.39	⟨1.00

***p ⟨.001
**p ⟨.01
*p ⟨.05

size and race (see Table 16). In three of the four conditions of size and race, experimental subjects were more willing to ask questions than were control subjects. Experimental subjects were more willing with five white people, with one Black person and with five Black people. Control subjects were more willing to ask questions when with one white person than were experimental subjects. When with one person, the difference was greater for a Black than for a white. When with a five member group, the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was approximately the same for Blacks and whites.

There was no significant difference between white experimental subjects' and white control subjects' attitudes toward others with whom they interact in terms of asking questions. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

Giving Negative Reactions

The behavioral components of show disagreement, refrain from talking and show antagonism were included in the category giving negative reactions. Table 17 presents the analysis of variance data for giving negative reactions.

The main effect of the training was clearly significant. In all conditions of feedback, size and race there was a significant difference after training between attitudes of white experimental subjects and white control subjects. Experimental subjects were significantly more willing to give negative reactions than were control subjects. There was no significant main effect for the pretest.

The means for the significant second-order interaction between training, size and race are presented in Table 18. In three of the four

TABLE 16

Mean Willingness To Ask Questions With White and Black,
One and Five Others As a Function of Training

	One Other		Five Others	
	White	Black	White	Black
Experimental	7.85	15.83	10.68	14.85
Control	6.85	18.19	12.99	16.22

TABLE 17

Analysis of Variance For Giving Negative Reactions

Source	df	MS	F
Total	575	32.45	
Between Subjects	71	36.61	
Treatment (A)	1	414.49	13.06***
Pretest (B)	1	3.61	<1.00
AXB	1	5.72	<1.00
Within Subjects	504	31.87	
Feedback (C)	1	674.95	30.47***
AXC	1	0.02	<1.00
BXC	1	10.89	<1.00
AXBCX	1	0.52	<1.00
Size (D)	1	256.48	21.34***
AXD	1	14.01	1.16
BXD	1	2.20	<1.00
AXBXD	1	5.49	<1.00
Race (E)	1	13.64	<1.00
AXE	1	22.79	1.36
BXE	1	1.79	<1.00
AXBXE	1	31.72	1.90
CXD	1	2085.21	136.80***
AXCXD	1	2.50	<1.00
BXCXD	1	0.09	<1.00
AXBXCXD	1	0.64	<1.00
CXE	1	187.23	15.93***
AXCXE	1	85.84	7.30**
BXCXE	1	14.37	1.22
AXBXCXE	1	0.05	<1.00
DXE	1	294.76	16.95***
AXDXE	1	153.32	8.81**
BXDXE	1	4.61	<1.00
AXBXDXE	1	1.66	<1.00
CXDXE	1	2555.97	63.80***
AXCXDXE	1	13.89	<1.00
BXCXDXE	1	66.87	1.66
AXBXCXDXE	1	39.11	<1.00

***p < .001
**p < .01
*p < .05

TABLE 18

Mean Willingness To Give Negative Reactions With White
and Black, One and Five Others As a Function of Training

	One Other		Five Others	
	White	Black	White	Black
Experimental	15.35	12.93	11.80	14.40
Control	16.75	15.62	14.66	14.35

conditions of size and race experimental subjects were more willing to give negative reactions than were control subjects. Experimental subjects were more willing with one white person, with five white people and with one Black person. Control subjects were slightly more willing to give negative reactions when with five Black people than were experimental subjects. When with one other person, the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for a Black than for a white. These results were similar to those for the same interaction of variables for asking questions. When with five other people, the opposite result occurred: the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for whites than for Blacks.

The means for the significant second-order interaction between training, feedback and race are presented in Table 19. In all conditions of feedback and race experimental subjects were more willing to give negative reactions than were control subjects. When with friendly others, the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for whites than for Blacks. When with hostile others, the opposite result occurred: the difference between experimental subjects and control subjects was greater for Blacks than for whites.

There was a significant difference between white experimental subjects' and white control subjects' attitudes toward others with whom they interact in terms of giving negative reactions. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 19

Mean Willingness To Give Negative Reactions With Friendly
and Hostile, White and Black Others As a Function of Training

	Friendly Others		Hostile Others	
	White	Black	White	Black
Experimental	12.66	12.38	14.48	14.95
Control	15.57	12.90 *	15.84	17.07

Results for Research Question III:

Training Inputs and Training Outcomes

The third hypothesis proposed there would be a statistically significant positive correlation coefficient between the following pairs of elements for the subjects in Experimental Group I:

(a) Amount of attendance as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept;

(b) Amount of participation as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept;

(c) Amount of reported integrated reading with pre-post changes in self-concept;

(d) Amount of progress toward a personal growth goal as perceived by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept.

Table 20 presents the results of the correlations for amount of perceived attendance with pre-post changes in self-concept. Only two of the seven correlations were significant. The amount of perceived attendance was negatively correlated with pre-post changes in the Self-Criticism Score. Thus, as the amount of perceived attendance increased, the Self-Criticism Score decreased. Low Self-Criticism Scores indicate defensiveness and a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of oneself. Therefore the correlation indicated a negative relationship.

The amount of perceived attendance was also negatively correlated with pre-post changes in the Total Positive Score. Thus, as the amount of perceived attendance increased, the Total Positive Score decreased.

TABLE 20

Correlations of Amount of Perceived Attendance With
Pre-post Changes in Self-Concept

Self-Concept Scores	Amount of Perceived Attendance	
	r	P
1. The Self-Criticism Score	-.4774	<.10
2. True/False Ratio	-.3976	NS
3. The Total Positive Score	-.5071	<.10
4. The Total Variability Score	-.0760	NS
5. The Defensive Positive Score	-.1599	NS
6. The Neurosis Score	-.2871	NS
7. The Personality Integration Score	-.1258	NS

People with low Total Positive Scores are doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel depressed and unhappy. Therefore, the correlation indicated a negative relationship.

None of the seven correlations were statistically significant for the amount of perceived participation with pre-post changes in self-concept (see Table 21).

Table 22 presents the results of the correlations for amount of reported integrated reading with pre-post changes in self-concept. Only one of the seven correlations was significant. The amount of reported integrated reading was positively correlated with pre-post changes in the Personality Integration Score. Since a high Personality Integration Score indicated good integration, the correlation indicated a positive relationship.

None of the seven correlations were statistically significant for the amount of perceived progress toward a personal growth goal with pre-post changes in self-conept (see Table 23).

The results for the third research question showed the following significant relationships existed between the training inputs and training outcomes for Experimental Group I and pre-post changes in self-concept:

(a) A negative relationship between attendance and changes in the Self-Criticism Score;

(b) A negative relationship between attendance and the Total Positive Score;

(c) A positive relationship between integrated reading and the Personality Integration Score.

TABLE 21

Correlations of Amount of Perceived Participation With
Pre-post Changes in Self-Concept

Self-Concept Scores	Amount of Perceived Participation	
	r	P
1. The Self-Criticism Score	-.0927	NS
2. True/False Ratio	-.3283	NS
3. The Total Positive Score	-.2386	NS
4. The Total Variability Score	-.1273	NS
5. The Defensive Positive Score	-.1244	NS
6. The Neurosis Score	-.0232	NS
7. The Personality Integration Score	-.0088	NS

TABLE 22

Correlations of Amount of Reported Integrated Reading With
Pre-post Changes in Self-Concept

Self-Concept Scores	Amount of Integrated Reading	
	r	P
1. The Self-Criticism Score	+.3005	NS
2. True/False Ratio	-.3723	NS
3. The Total Positive Score	+.2225	NS
4. The Total Variability Score	-.0717	NS
5. The Defensive Positive Score	+.0908	NS
6. The Neurosis Score	+.2273	NS
7. The Personality Integration Score	+.4595	<.10

TABLE 23

Correlations of Amount of Perceived Progress Toward a Personal Growth
Goal With Pre-post Changes in Self-Concept

Self-Concept Scores	Amount of Perceived Growth	
	r	P
1. The Self-Criticism Score	+.1228	NS
2. True/False Ratio	-.3236	NS
3. The Total Positive Score	-.1908	NS
4. The Total Variability Score	-.1166	NS
5. The Defensive Positive Score	-.1390	NS
6. The Neurosis Score	-.0496	NS
7. The Personality Integration Score	-.0852	NS

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to analyze the effects of human relations training on self-concept and attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact. Another purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between training inputs and training outcomes.

Seven scores yielded by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were used to measure the effects of human relations training on self-concept. The seven scores are: the Self-Criticism Score, the True/False Ratio, the Total Positive Score, the Total Variability Score, the Defensive Positive Scale, the Neurosis Scale and the Personality Integration Scale.

An Interaction Inventory (II) was used to measure the effects of human relations training on attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact. The II includes twelve behavioral components and three environmental factors. For analysis purposes the twelve components were divided into four behavioral categories: giving positive reactions, attempting to give answers, asking questions and giving negative reactions. The environmental factors are: size, feedback and race. Each factor is represented on two levels so that size is either one or five, feedback is either friendly or hostile, and race is either Black or white.

76

In order to analyze the relationship between training inputs and training outcomes, four inputs were identified and included in this study. The four inputs are attendance, participation, progress toward a personal growth goal and reported integrated reading. Training outcomes were identified as the pre-post change scores on the seven scores yielded by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Generally, the results of this study are the following:

(a) Human relations training did not affect self-concept.

(b) Human relations training did affect attitudes of whites toward others with whom they interact.

(c) Few relationships exist between the training inputs and training outcomes defined in this study.

This chapter will include conclusions based on the results presented in Chapter III. This chapter will also include implications derived from the results and recommendations for future research.

Discussion of Results for
Research Question I: Self-Concept

The first research question proposed there would be a significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. It was found that there was no significant difference after training between self-concepts of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

On the other hand, the first-order interaction between training and testing was significant for the Neurosis Score. Experimental

subjects in Experimental Group I scored significantly lower on the
Neurosis Scale than did subjects in the three other training-testing
conditions. The mean score for Experimental Group I was very close
to the mean score of the patient group on the Mental Health
Continuum (see Table 6). The mean score for Experimental Group I
was 76.53 and the mean score of the patient group was 73.20. Low
Neurosis scores indicate a high similarity to neurotic patients. The
true significance of the low Neurosis scores lies in the description
of the neurotic individual and the relationship of that description
to the training style of the trainer of Experimental Group I.

Freud (1936), Adler (in Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956), Rank
(1945), and Jung (1958) are a few of the writers who describe the
neurotic individual. Freud (1936) described the neurotic as someone
whose natural growth has been blocked. The neurotic must be aided to
resume the self-actualization which was interrupted by unfavorable
social circumstances. Adler (in Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956) cited
social interest as the healthy counterpart to the neurotic search
for power. The neurotic must learn to accept a socially oriented goal
in which empathy and love of fellow man dominate.

Rank (1945), a strong believer in individual identity,
described the neurotic as a healthier type than the average man. The
average man may not assert his will and therefore adjust or conform to
society and never develop an individual identity. Thus, he will be at
harmony with society but be a victim of social change. The neurotic
is at a point where he must assert his will but is unable to do so
successfully. Therefore, he is caught by the conflict of positive

growth and individuation on the one hand and the giving up of his will on the other. He may appear more disturbed than the average man but has progressed further along the growth continuum.

Jung (1958), similar to Rank, described the neurotic as having positive growth potential. The neurotic is unconscious of his "shadow side (Jung, 1958, p.78)" but at the same time recognizes that all is not well. Therefore when he is made aware of these conflicting personalities, a union can be formed which often results in a more integrated person. Rank (1945) cited the artist as an example of this kind of integration. The artist has in common with the neurotic the commitment to be separate from the herd. But unlike the neurotic, he has been able to be an individual and still remain in harmony with his environment.

In a study of encounter group casualties (Yalom and Lieberman, 1969), high risk trainer style was linked with an increase in group casualties. Casualty was defined as an individual who, as a direct result of his group experience, became more psychologically distressed or employed more maladaptive coping mechanisms. Although the casualty factor varied among the eighteen groups in the study, 44% of the casualties occurred in groups trained by leaders labelled "aggressive stimulators (Yalom and Lieberman, 1969, p. 20)."

> Aggressive stimulators were characterized by their extremely high stimulus input. They were intrusive, confrontive, challenging, while at the same time demonstrated high positive caring; they revealed a great deal of themselves. They were the most charismatic of the leaders. They were authoritarian and often structured the events in the group, and often

> provided the individual with some cognitive
> framework with which to understand himself and
> the world. They asserted firm control and took over
> for the participants. They seemed ready, willing,
> and able to guide participants forward on the road
> to enlightenment (Yalom and Liebeman, 1969, p. 21).

The researcher of this study and the trainer for Experimental Group I are one and the same person. Therefore, in this researcher's opinion the low Neurosis scores for the subjects in Experimental Group I are linked with the trainer style employed within that group. Furthermore the apparent incongruity of the trainer style is linked with the descriptions of the neurotic individual cited earlier. The trainer style is characterized by both intrusive, challenging and confrontive behavior and a high degree of positive caring behavior. The inconsistency between these two types of behavior is similar to the conflict of positive growth and individuation on the one hand and the giving up of self will on the other. Therefore as the subjects in Experimental Group I tried to relate to the trainer style they developed similarities to neurotic patients.

Discussion of Results for

Research Question II: Attitudes

The second research question proposed there would be a significant difference after training between attitudes toward other whites and Blacks with whom they interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects, as reported on an Interaction Inventory (II). Attitudes were analyzed in terms of four behavioral categories: (a) giving positive reactions; (b) attempting to give answers; (c) asking questions; (d) giving negative reactions. It was found that there was a significant

difference after training between attitudes toward other whites and Blacks with whom they interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects in terms of giving positive reactions, attempting to give answers and giving negative reactions. The null hypotheses for these three behavioral categories were rejected. Furthermore, in addition to the general significance of these three behavioral categories, it was found that the levels of significance can be rank-ordered for the three behavioral categories. In order of importance, then, it was found that there was a significant difference after training in white experimental subjects' attitudes toward other whites and Blacks with whom they interact in terms of giving negative reactions, giving positive reactions and attempting answers.

On the other hand, it was found that there was no significant difference after training between attitudes toward other whites and Blacks with whom they interact of white experimental subjects and white control subjects in terms of asking questions. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

The true significance of these results lies within the description of the core interactions necessary for interpersonal growth.

> In any group which interpersonal growth (which obviously, must be given some operational definition) is a primary goal, there are certain core interactions that take place--self-disclosure, expression of feeling, support, confrontation, self-examination, and, inevitably, various tendencies to flee the work of the group (Egan, 1970, preface).

In this researcher's opinion the relationship between the significant results of the second research question and the core interactions

described by Egan (1970) are obvious. By juxtaposing giving negative reactions, giving positive reactions and attempting answers against self-disclosure, expression of feeling, support and confrontation the relationship becomes very clear. Likewise the nonsignificant result of the second research question is not surprising. Within a training group asking questions is usually seen as flight or avoidance behavior. When this is juxtaposed with the traditional classroom (control groups), where asking questions is at least expected and often encouraged, there was little chance the training would make a significant difference for this behavioral category. However, it is this researcher's opinion that a strict labelling of asking questions as flight behavior robs the training group of a much needed maintenance behavior. Furthermore if this maintenance behavior is taken from the group less self-examination takes place within the group. Although asking a question may very well be an attempt at avoidance, it may also be an attempt to gain understanding.

There were six significant first and second-order interactions which further substantiate the effect of human relations training on the attitudes of white experimental subjects toward other whites and Blacks with whom they interact. The results of four of these six interactions were conclusive. Experimental subjects were more willing than control subjects to give positive reactions with both other whites and Blacks. Experimental subjects were more willing than control subjects to attempt answers with both other whites and Blacks. Experimental subjects were more willing than control subjects to attempt answers regardless of the size of the group or the kind of feedback present within the group.

Experimental subjects were more willing than control subjects to give negative reactions regardless of the race of the group or the kind of feedback present within the group.

The results were almost conclusive in the significant second-order interaction for giving negative reactions where training interacted with size and race. Experimental subjects were more willing to give negative reactions with one white, five whites and one Black person. However, the mean score for willingness with five Black people for control subjects was 14.35 and the mean score for experimental subjects was 14.40.

Although the training did not significantly affect attitudes in terms of asking questions, there was a significant second-order interaction where the training interacted with size and race. The results of this interaction were also almost conclusive. Experimental subjects were more willing to ask questions with five white people, one Black person and with five Black people. Control subjects were more willing with one white person.

The true significance of these results lies in the finding that human relations training in an all white training group did affect the attitudes of the white experimental subjects not only in terms of other whites but also in terms of Blacks. It is particularly relevant that experimental subjects were willing to attempt answers with hostile people in either a five member group or with one person, give negative reactions with five whites, one Black and five Blacks, and give negative reactions with hostile whites and hostile Blacks. It would seem that all of the above situations would be quite threatening

and therefore, according to previous research (M. Heider, 1970)

and theory (Cooley, 1909; Freud, 1936; and Goffman, 1959), be avoided.

Perhaps threat or fear can also be a broadening and opening experience.

Discussion of Results for Research Question III:
Training Inputs and Training Outcomes

The third research question proposed there would be a statistically

significant positive correlation coefficient between the following

pairs of elements for the subjects in Experimental Group I:

(a) Amount of attendance as perceived by self and others with pre-post

changes in self-concept;

(b) Amount of participation as perceived by self and others with

pre-post changes in self-concept;

(c) Amount of reported integrated reading with pre-post changes in

self-concept;

(d) Amount of progress toward a personal growth goal as perceived

by self and others with pre-post changes in self-concept.

It was found that there was a negative relationship between attendance

and changes in the Self-Criticism Score. There was also a negative

relationship between attendance and the Total Positive Score. On the

other hand, there was a positive relationship between integrated

reading and the Personality Integration Score.

In this researcher's opinion these results are totally consistent

with the results for self-concept. Low Self-Criticism scores indicate

defensiveness and a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture

of oneself. Low Total Positive scores indicate people who are doubtful

about their own worth, see themselves as undesirable and often feel depressed and unhappy. The high attenders in Experimental Group I scored low on both the Self-Criticism Score and the Total Positive Score and were participants in the experimental group which scored significantly lower on the Neurosis Scale. Depression, doubtfulness and defensiveness all seem to mirror the descriptions of the neurotic individual.

Furthermore subjects in Experimental Group I were asked to read (the text--Encounter by Egan) and integrate their reading with the experiences of the training group through a series of eleven reaction papers submitted to the trainer. Thus the integrated reading provided a framework for training experiences, a point of reference for questions left unanswered by the training and a means for individual reflection. Therefore both the process and design of the reading aided the group members in bridging the conflict of the neurotic individual between positive growth and the giving up of self will. Thus the reported integrated reading helped integrate the personalities of the subjects in Experimental Group I.

Implications

The implications of this study are directly derived from the results and conclusions stated in Chapter III and Chapter IV, respectively. The implications are briefly stated and self-explanatory and therefore are listed below.

(a) Human relations training can affect attitudes toward other whites and Blacks.

(b) Human relations training can affect attitudes in terms of three behavioral categories--giving positive reactions, attempting answers and giving negative reactions.

(c) Human relations training can affect self-concept in terms of similarities to neurotic patients.

(d) Human relations training can help people be more open and direct in threatening situations.

(e) The higher attenders in a semester-long human relations training group may have their feelings of worthiness affected in a negative way.

(f) Integrating the training experience with explanatory material and life outside the group can aid in personality integration.

(g) An all white human relations training group experience can be a vehicle to affect attitudes toward Black people.

(h) The particular training style used within a human relations training group can affect the self-concept of the participants.

(i) The core interactions of human relations training suggested by Egan (1970) can influence people to perform those core interactions as interaction behavior with others.

(j) Asking questions, when strictly labelled as flight behavior, robs the human relations training group of needed maintenance behavior.

(k) A training style which is perceived as incongruous by the training participants can create incongruity within the participants.

Recommendations for Future Research

The recommendations fall into two categories. There are recommendations directly derived from this study. There are also recommendations of a more global nature. First, more research needs to be done on the relationship of trainer style and its effect on group participants and group processes. More research also needs to be done on racially homogeneous human relations training groups.

Second, a great amount of theoretical and philosophical research is needed within the field of human relations. The theoretical and philosophical void present within the field of human relations should no longer be totally filled by borrowing from other disciplines. Oftentimes the borrowed theories and philosophies are applicable to populations so different from those within human relations training groups that only superficial comparisons can be made. On the other hand, a large amount of integrated research also needs to be conducted between the field of human relations and such areas as impression formation, perception, semantics, cognitive dissonance, transracial communication, game theory and nonordinary reality.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Stanford, R.M. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Allport, G.W., Vernon, P.E., & Lindzey, G. Manual study of values. (3rd ed.) Boxton: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960.

Ansbacher, H.L., & Ansbacher, Rowena R. (Eds.) The individual-psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Bales, R.F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.

Bales, R.F., & Borgatta, E.F. (1955). Size of group as a factor in the interaction profile. In Paul Hare, E.F. Borgatta and R.F. Bales (Eds.), Small groups. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Balester, R.J. The self-concept and juvenile delinquency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

Bass, B.M. Mood changes during a management training laboratory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 361-364.

Bass, B.M., & Norton, M.F. Group size and leaderless discussion. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35, 397-400.

Baumgartel, H., & Goldstein, J.W. Need and value shifts in college training groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1967, 3, 87-101.

Bennis, W.G. Goals and meta-goals of laboratory training. In Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, Fred I. Steele and David E. Berlew (Eds.), Interpersonal dynamics: Essays and readings on human interaction. Homewood, Ill.: the Dorsey Press, 1968.

Bennis, W.G., Burke, R., Cutter, H., Harrington, H., & Hoffman, J. A note on some problems of measurement and prediction in a training group, Group Psychotherapy, 1957, 10, 328-341.

Bogardus, E.S. Immigration and race attitudes. Boston: Heath Co., 1928.

Bradford, L.P., Bigg, J., & Benne, K. T-group theory and laboratory method: Innovation in re-education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Bruning, J.L., & Kintz, B.L. Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1968.

Bunker, G.L. The effect of group perceived esteem on self and ideal concepts in an emergent group. Unpublished masters thesis, Brigham Young University, 1961.

Burke, H.L., & Bennis, W.G. Changes in perception of self and others during human relations training. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 165-182.

Cooley, C.H. Social organization. New York: Scribner's, 1909.

Cottle, T.J. Strategy for change. Saturday Review, 1969, 27.

Denham, J., & Thornton, M. Racism as game and reality. Human Relations Training News, 1970, 14, 3-6.

Egan, G. Encounter: Group processes for interpersonal growth. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.

Engel, Mary. The stability of the self concept in adolescence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College, 1956.

Fitts, W.H. Tennessee self concept scale: Manual. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Fleishman, E.A., Harris, F.F., & Burtt, H.E. Leadership and supervision in industry. Columbus: Ohoi State University, Personnel Research Board, 1955.

Freud, S. The problem of anxiety. New York: Norton, 1936.

Gassner, S., Gold, J., & Snadowsky, A.M. Changes in the phenomenal field as a result of human relations training. Journal of Psychology, 1964, 58, 33-41.

Gibb, J.R. The effects of group size and of threat reduction upon creativity in a problem-solving situation. American Psychologist. 1951, 6, 324+.

Gibb, J.R., Smith, E.E., & Roberts, A.H. Effects of positive and negative feedback upon defensive behavior in small problem-solving groups. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, September 1955.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

Hare, A.P. Interaction and consensus in different sized groups. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 261-267.

_____. Handbook of small group research. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Harrison, Roger. Research on human relations training: Design and interpretation. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971, 7, 71-85.

Hathaway, S.R., & McKinley, J.C. Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory (Revised manual). New York: The Psychological Corp., 1951.

Heider, M.L. The effects of setting variables on reported approach or avoidance of communicative interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

Jung, C.G. The undiscovered self. New York: The New American Library, 1958.

Kassarjian, H.H. Social character and sensitivity training. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1965, 1, 443-440.

Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Kernan, J.P. Laboratory human relations training: Its effect on the "personality" of supervisory engineers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1963.

Kinnick, B.C., & Platter, S.D. Attitudinal change toward Negroes and school desegregation among participants in a summer training institute. Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 73, 271-283.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R.S., & Ballachey, E.L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Lee, B.M., & Schmidt, W.H. Toward more authentic interpersonal relations between Blacks and whites. Human Relations Training News, 1969, 13, 4-5.

Lewin, K. Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

_____. Field theory in social sciences. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Lippitt, G. Effects of information about group desire for change on members of a group. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, American University, 1960.

Maslow, A. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1968.

May, R. Man's search for himself. New York: the New American Library, 1953.

Myrdal, G. An American dilemma. New York: Harper, 1944.

Newcomb, T.M., Turner, R.H., & Converse, P.E. Social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951.

Rank, O. Will therapy. Trans. by Julia Taft. New York: Knopf, 1945.

Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. Management and the worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Rogers, C. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Rubin, I. Increased self-acceptance: A means of reducing prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 233-238.

Schutz, W.C. FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958.

Schutz, W. Joy. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Schutz, W.C., & Allen, V.L. The effects of a T-group laboratory on interpersonal behavior. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 265-286.

Seashore, C. What is sensitivity training? In R. Golembiewski and A. Blumberg (Eds.), Sensitivity training and the laboratory approach: Readings about concepts and applications. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock, Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Slater, P.E. Contrasting correlates of group size. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 129-139.

Smith, P.B. Attitude changes associated with training in human relations. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1964, 3, 104-113.

Solomon, R. An extension of control group design. Psychological Bulletin, 1949, XLVI, 137-150.

Stock, D. Factors associated with change in self-percept. In D. Stock and H.A. Thelen (Eds.), Emotional dynamics and group culture. New York: University Press, 1958.

Taylor, D.M. Consistency of the self-concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1953.

Thomas, M.D. Developing human potential through group interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1970.

Thomas, W.I. & Snaniecki. F. The Polish peasant in Europe and America. Boston: Badger, 1918.

Thrasher, F.M. The gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Triandis, H.C. Exploratory factor analysis of the behavior component of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.

Triandis, H.C., & Triandis, L.M. Race, social class, religion, and nationality as determinants of social distance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 110-118.

Triandis, H.C., & Triandis, L.M. A cross-cultural study of social distance. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, no. 540.

Triandis, H.C., Davis, E.E., and Takezawa, S-I. Some determinants of social distance among American, German, and Japanese students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 540-551.

Woodall, T.E. From crisis to collaboration: Thoughts on the use of laboratory method in resolving Black-white issues. Social Change Theory and Application, 1971, 1, 1-3.

Yalom, I.D., & Liebeman, M. A study of encounter group casualties. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1971, 25, 16-30.

Zimet, C.N., & Fine, H.J. Personality changes with a group therapeutic experience in a human relations seminar. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 68-73.

APPENDIX A

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale

TENNESSEE
SELF CONCEPT SCALE

by

William H. Fitts, PhD.

	Item No.
1. I have a healthy body..	1
3. I am an attractive person.....................................	3
5. I consider myself a sloppy person............................	5
19. I am a decent sort of person.................................	19
21. I am an honest person..	21
23. I am a bad person..	23
37. I am a cheerful person.......................................	37
39. I am a calm and easy going person............................	39
41. I am a nobody..	41
55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble............	55
57. I am a member of a happy family..............................	57
59. My friends have no confidence in me..........................	59
73. I am a friendly person.......................................	73
75. I am popular with men..	75
77. I am not interested in what other people do..................	77
91. I do not always tell the truth..............................	91
93. I get angry sometimes..	93

Responses–	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

2. I like to look nice and neat all the time.. 2

4. I am full of aches and pains.. 4

6. I am a sick person.. 6

20. I am a religious person... 20

22. I am a moral failure.. 22

24. I am a morally weak person... 24

38. I have a lot of self-control... 38

40. I am a hateful person... 40

42. I am losing my mind.. 42

56. I am an important person to my friends and family.............................. 56

58. I am not loved by my family.. 58

60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.. 60

74. I am popular with women.. 74

76. I am mad at the whole world.. 76

78. I am hard to be friendly with... 78

92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.......................... 92

94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross............................... 94

Responses–	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

7. I am neither too fat nor too thin.. 7

9. I like my looks just the way they are... 9

11. I would like to change some parts of my body.............................. 11

25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior....................................... 25

27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God................................. 27

29. I ought to go to church more.. 29

43. I am satisfied to be just what I am... 43

45. I am just as nice as I should be... 45

47. I despise myself.. 47

61. I am satisfied with my family relationships................................. 61

63. I understand my family as well as I should.................................. 63

65. I should trust my family more.. 65

79. I am as sociable as I want to be.. 79

81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it................................ 81

83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint............................... 83

95. I do not like everyone I know.. 95

97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.................................... 97

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

8. I am neither too tall nor too short..98........ 8

10. I don't feel as well as I should.. 10

12. I should have more sex appeal... 12

26. I am as religious as I want to be.. 26

28. I wish I could be more trustworthy... 28

30. I shouldn't tell so many lies.. 30

44. I am as smart as I want to be... 44

46. I am not the person I would like to be....................................... 46

48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.................................... 48

62. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living). 62

64. I am too sensitive to things my family say................................. 64

66. I should love my family more.. 66

80. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people......................... 80

82. I should be more polite to others.. 82

84. I ought to get along better with other people............................ 84

96. I gossip a little at times.. 96

98. At times I feel like swearing... 98

Responses -	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

13. I take good care of myself physically..................................... 13

15. I try to be careful about my appearance................................. 15

17. I often act like I am "all thumbs"...................................... 17

31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life............................ 31

33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong............. 33

35. I sometimes do very bad things... 35

49. I can always take care of myself in any situation...................... 49

51. I take the blame for things without getting mad........................ 51

53. I do things without thinking about them first.......................... 53

67. I try to play fair with my friends and family.......................... 67

69. I take a real interest in my family.................................... 69

71. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living)......... 71

85. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view................... 85

87. I get along well with other people..................................... 87

89. I do not forgive others easily... 89

99. I would rather win than lose in a game................................. 99

Responses –	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

14. I feel good most of the time 14

16. I do poorly in sports and games 16

18. I am a poor sleeper 18

32. I do what is right most of the time 32

34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead 34

36. I have trouble doing the things that are right 36

50. I solve my problems quite easily 50

52. I change my mind a lot 52

54. I try to run away from my problems 54

68. I do my share of work at home 68

70. I quarrel with my family 70

72. I do not act like my family thinks I should 72

86. I see good points in all the people I meet 86

88. I do not feel at ease with other people 88

90. I find it hard to talk with strangers 90

100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today 100

Responses–	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

Interaction Inventory

Class: Freshman_____ Sophomore_____ Junior_____ Senior_____

Sex: Male_____ Female_____ Age_____

KU I.D. Number_____ ._____

Instructions: In the following inventory you will be asked to report
  your usual interaction behavior in a variety of interaction situations.
  The situations will be similar to many you have encountered in your
  previous experiences. If there are any situations you have not
  experienced, report your likely interaction behavior in the circum-
  stances described.

  In the interaction situations presented, it will be necessary for
  you to envision a number of situations with various characteristics.
  For instance, you will need to picture yourself with one other
  person or in a group with five other people. Sometimes the other
  person or people will be black, sometimes white. Finally, some-
  times the other person or people will be hostile, sometimes friendly.

  On the following pages, envision the interaction situation described
  at the top of each page. Then place an X at the point on each scale
  best describing the extent you would or would not engage in each of
  the interaction behaviors listed when you are in the above described
  interaction conditions.

  Work at a fairly high speed through this assignment. Do not worry
  or puzzle over individual items. It is your first response to items
  that is desired. On the other hand, please do not be careless;
  your true report of your usual interaction behavior is wanted.

When I am with <u>1</u> <u>friendly</u> <u>white</u> person,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
show antagonism toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
ask for opinions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
refrain from talking with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
show satisfaction with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
show my disagreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
show friendliness toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
give suggestions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
give my opinions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
give information to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
show my agreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
ask for suggestions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not
ask for information from that person

When I am with 1 hostile white person,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to that person

When I am with <u>1</u> <u>friendly</u> <u>black</u> person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with that person

When I am with 1 hostile black person,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with that person

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to that person

When I am with 5 friendly white people,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from them

When I am with 5 friendly black people,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with them

When I am with 5 hostile white people,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward them

When I am with 5 hostile black people,

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for suggestions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show friendliness toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for information from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show antagonism toward them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give my opinions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give information to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show satisfaction with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my disagreement with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

ask for opinions from them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

give suggestions to them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

refrain from talking with them

I would :___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___: would not

show my agreement with them

APPENDIX C

Interaction Process Analysis System

A	1. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward:
	2. Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction:
	3. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies:
B	4. Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other:
	5. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish:
	6. Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms:
C	7. Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation:
	8. Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis expression of feeling:
	9. Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action:
D	10. Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help:
	11. Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field:
	12. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self:

a b c d e f

Key

1-3=Social-emotional area: Positive

4-9=Task area: Neutral

10-12=Social-emotional area: Negative

A. Positive Reactions

B. Attempted Answers

C. Questions

D. Negative Reactions

a. Problems of Communication

b. Problems of Evaluation

c. Problems of Control

d. Problems of Decision

e. Problems of Tension Reduction

f. Problems of Reintegration

Note.--Taken from Bales, 1950, pp. 37-38.

APPENDIX D

Linear Scales

ATTENDANCE SCALE

K.U. I.D. #_____

　　　As part of the grading contract we agreed to grade ourselves and every other member of the group on attendance, participation and progress toward a personal goal. Below is a list of your group members. Also below are five categories describing amounts of attendance. Check the category which best describes the amount of attendance you perceived for each member, including yourself. On the following pages you will find the scale for participation and a scale for progress toward a personal goal.

1. Mike   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

2. Steve B.   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

3. Steve F.   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

4. Jeanne   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

5. Lois   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

6. Tom H.   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

7. Tom Hi.   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

8. Ann   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

9. Dee   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

10. Rose   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
                very high   above   average   below   very low
                       average   average

11. Paula _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

12. Jeanette _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

13. Linda _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

14. Laurie _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

15. Bruce _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

16. Pam _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

17. Sharon _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

18. Judy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
    very high   above   average   below   very low
                 average   average

PARTICIPATION SCALE

K.U. I.D. #_____

Below is a list of your group members. Also below are five categories describing amounts of participation. Check the category which best describes the amount of participation you perceived for each member, including yourself.

1. Mike

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

2. Steve B.

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

3. Steve F.

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

4. Jeanne

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

5. Lois

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

6. Tom H.

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

7. Tom Hi.

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

8. Ann

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

9. Dee

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

10. Rose

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
            average   average

11. Paula   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

12. Jeanette _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

13. Linda   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

14. Laurie   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

15. Bruce   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

16. Pam   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

17. Sharon   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

18. Judy   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
             very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

GROWTH SCALE

K.U. I.D. #_____

Below is a list of your group members. Also below are five categories describing amounts of progress toward a personal goal. Check the category which best describes <u>the amount of progress or growth you perceived for each member</u>, including yourself.

1. Mike
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

2. Steve B.
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

3. Steve F.
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

4. Jeanne
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

5. Lois
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

6. Tom H.
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

7. Tom Hi.
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

8. Ann
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

9. Dee
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

10. Rose
_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
very high   above   average   below   very low
             average   average

11. Paùla   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

12. Jeanette _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

13. Linda   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

14. Laurie   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

15. Bruce   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

16. Pam   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

17. Sharon   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average

18. Judy   _____:_____:_____:_____:_____
              very high   above   average   below   very low
                          average   average