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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The human organism as a psycho-social being is a concept that hardly needs explanation. Individual behavior is influenced by a myriad of group pressures and activities; the effects of the group on individual changes in perception and attitudes have received increasing attention in recent years. There is evidence in the laboratory and in actual life situations that the group can effectively influence changes in individual value systems and attitudes. It is most significant that these changes are most likely to occur if they are influenced by the group to which an individual wishes to belong (12, 13, 3, 1).

The attitude and value changes as a result of social influences thus far revealed have been primarily of a social nature or related to personal behavior that is connected with the group's function (13). The attitudes and values of the individual are in keeping with the norms of the group or groups to which the individual belongs or wishes to belong. In this vein Grosser states

An individual's adherence to social norms is determined not only by the initial internalization
of values but also by interaction with other individuals adhering to the same values. The group, in other words, has a definite effect on the persistence or change of norms which complements the psycho-dynamic forces working within the individual (10, p. 25).

As described by Pressey and Hanna (16), the classroom is a "psycho-social unit" where individuals affect and are affected by the interaction of their classmates. It is also evident that students form groups, friendships, and acquaintances during the school term even when not encouraged to do so in any particular class or course. Bonney (5) also holds that individuals in any group have stated preferences, and when individuals are permitted or encouraged to work in groups according to these preferences they perform better.

The cultivation of emotional and social values as well as those of intellectual values has come to be included among the important objectives of the schools (13). Many educators feel there is a need for instruction in the college classroom to assist students in making an adjustment to the world around them and to help them to gain understanding of the motives and emotions of others (15, 4, 7). To be more explicit, Axelrod feels that

General courses in a college program should not have as their primary aim the imparting of a body of facts, but the development of certain skills in the students who submit themselves for this training and, further, that the particular skills which are to be developed are those by the use of which students are enabled, now and especially in their future lives, to solve the multitude of problems which in all areas of activity are and will be confronting them—problems which they must meet as individuals and as members of a social group. It is clear that training for the
solution of problems must of course entail the imparting of whatever information is necessary in order to solve this or that problem; but it is just as clear that the acquisition of a body of facts cannot be primary, for the solution of each specific problem will involve a different set of facts, and the solution of certain specific future problems will involve sets of facts which do not yet exist. General Education, then, must consist primarily of practice under guidance, in solving a large number of different kinds of problems (2, p. 232).

Statement of the Problem

It is the basic hypothesis of this study that there exists a relationship between personal attitude and value changes and participation in group discussion. In consideration of the studies reported by Asch (1), Back (3), and Eglash (8) concerning the influence of the group on the individual to alter his judgments to conform to those of the group, the purpose of this study will be an attempt to assess how some personality variables change as a result of group discussion. The more specific null hypotheses are stated below in order to clarify the meaning of "personality variables".

1. There will be no difference in changes of self-concept between those who take part in group discussion and those who do not take part in group discussion.

2. There will be no difference in changes of generalized attitudes between those who take part in group discussion and those who do not take part in group discussion.
3. There will be no difference in changes of interpersonal behavior between those who take part in group discussion and those who do not take part in group discussion.

4. There will be no difference in the changes in sociometric status between those who take part in group discussion and those who do not take part in group discussion.

Definition of Terms

1. **Self-concept**, as defined by the total positive score on the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-concept Scale, refers to how a person rates himself with regard to how he perceives himself.

2. **Attitudes and values** are those dimensions of personality or adjustment as measured by the American Council on Education Inventory of Beliefs test.

3. **Interpersonal behavior** refers to the degree to which a person initiates interaction with people as measured by the $e^I$ and $W^I$ scales from the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (Firo-B), a scale developed by William C. Schutz.

4. **Sociometric status** and changes in sociometric status would refer to the total number of weighted choices received by an individual from his classmates in response to the question, "Who would you like to ____ with?"
Need for the Study

Most studies concerning the effects of discussion as opposed to lecture techniques or the use of case study methods of teaching evaluate the effects of these methods by comparing course grades. Any influence of these techniques on the student as an individual usually relies on questionnaires or the student's own opinions and self-evaluations. This, quite naturally, leaves a gap in the evaluation of case study or discussion methods because, in spite of the fact that students may not be able to recognize changes in their own behavior or personality, such changes could occur. This study, then, will attempt an objective evaluation of the effects of group discussions, using the case study method of teaching.

The TDMH Self-Concept Scale is a relatively new instrument which has had the major part of its application on clinical groups and is in need of the extended application to non-clinical groups. Likewise, the ACE Inventory of Beliefs and the Firo-B Study of Interpersonal Relations are also relatively new instruments for which new application is needed.
Methodology and Description of the Instruments

Subjects

Two sections of Psychology 163, a course titled "Introduction to Psychology," each containing 30 students were used as the experimental and control groups for this study. Both sections held their regular class periods for one and one-half hours on Tuesday and Thursday. The section meeting from 11:00 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. was used as the experimental group. The section meeting from 1:00 p.m. until 2:30 p.m. was the control group. All the subjects in both groups were administered the TDMH Self-Concept Scale, FIRO-B, the ACE Inventory of Beliefs, and a two-criteria sociometric test. These three tests were administered one each day for three successive days to prevent fatigue and to insure cooperation. For the sociometric, the subjects were given a form on which the criteria and instructions for making choices were stated. (See Appendix.)

Subjects in the experimental group were then assigned to five groups of 6 students each on the basis of their choices according to the method recommended by Gronlund for classroom groups (9). Both groups were then given mimeographed copies of two cases, one case during each of the meetings, to analyze. (See Appendix.) The cases were hypothetical situations similar to situations college
freshmen could expect to encounter, but the subjects were
told that the situations were real.

The experimental group was instructed to discuss the
cases among their own individual groups or between groups
if they desired. The discussion and analysis of the case
were structured only by instructions to attempt to under-
stand or have empathy with each of the characters in the
cases, to try to resolve the situation or problem as it
exists in the hypothetical case, and to write on one or
two pages a summary of what benefits they received from
discussing the cases.

The control group was given copies of the same cases but
was not permitted to discuss them with any other classmate.
The control group was given the same instructions regarding
the analysis and treatment of the cases as the experimental
group. The members of both groups were instructed to turn
in their copies of the cases at the end of the period in
order to minimize the possibility of outside discussion.

In addition to the two cases for analysis in group dis-
cussion, the experimental group spent one class period in
group discussion preparing for a regular test over the
course material and one class period discussing what they
felt were peculiarities in behavior, trying to determine
what causes them and how the peculiarities affect different
people. The experimental group spent a total of two weeks
of class periods, or six hours in discussion. The control
group received a lecture on the peculiarities of individual
behavior and was permitted to study for the test during a
class period but was not permitted group discussion at any
time between the administration of the test and retest.

Academic competition was minimized by informing the
students that their written evaluations and summaries were
not being gradad but that the summaries would be read to
determine how well the discussion progressed.

Upon completion of the discussion sessions, the ex-
perimental and control groups were administered the TDMH
Self-Concept Scale, FIRO-B, ACE Inventory of Beliefs, and
another two-criteria sociometric test using the same cri-
teria for selection.

Description of the Tennessee Department of
Mental Health Self-Concept Scale

TDMH S-C

The form of the TDMH S-C (see Appendix) used in this
study is a preliminary test designed for research purposes.
It measures how a person rates himself along the dimension
of what he is within the variation of the three sub-
categories, as follows:

1. Abstract description--a description of self as
the person perceives the self.
2. Self-satisfaction--a description of how the individual feels about the self he perceives.

3. Functioning or behavior--a description of what the person actually does; this is meant as an indirect expression of what the individual says he is (17, p. 2).

In addition to this dimension of what the individual says about himself, the statements in the scale also reveal a variation according to five major frames of reference based on

1. Physical characteristics, appearance, state of health, sexuality, and other factors.

2. Moral and ethical characteristics or the value system.

3. Psychological traits and characteristics.

4. Primary group membership or the self as perceived in relation to one's family and close friends.

5. Secondary group membership, the social self, or the self as perceived in relation to other people in general (17, p. 3).

Besides a total positive score, the scale yields a consistency score and a distribution score. These scores are primarily used for clinical and diagnostic purposes and were not regarded as necessary for the purpose of revealing obvious changes assessed in the present study.
Description of the American Council on Education Inventory of Beliefs

(ACE-IB)

The construction of the ACE-IB was based on the fundamental assumption that

the objectives of general education can serve as a base from which may be inferred the model organization characterizing the personalities of those most adaptable to the purposes of general education. The attempt has been to explore the manifestations of these personality dimensions as relevant to the problems of general education in terms of the individual's relations to (1) ideas and intellectual abstractions, (2) social groups and identifications, (3) interpersonal relations, and (4) the self (6, p. 2).

It might also be stated that "the beliefs which people have are reflections of their values and adjustments"; these are another dimension of personality, assuming that "opinions are indicators of basic personality structure." The Inventory of Beliefs, then, is constructed of items about which everyone has an opinion, and the degree to which a person agrees or disagrees with the statements embodied in the test reveal some measure of a dimension of his personality.

Form 1 of the Inventory of Beliefs is constructed of 120 short cliche-type statements collected from faculty members of certain colleges and institutions. "Students are asked to respond to the statements by means of a four-element key: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree." For the purposes of this study a test before and a retest after the discussion were necessary. According to the
instructions given in the manual, two parallel forms were derived from Form 1 and are called Forms A and B (see Appendix). Mean scores and variability of the scores on the two forms are very similar. The parallel form reliabilities of the short forms indicate that Forms A and B are adequately reliable for differentiating between groups of students (6, pp. 5, 6, 21).

Description of the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale

FIRO-B

FIRO-B (see Appendix), a scale developed by Schutz (16), measures individual behavior toward others (expressed behavior) and the behavior he wants from others (wanted behavior) for three general dimensions of interpersonal interaction. The three dimensions of interpersonal behavior are inclusion, control, and affection. Each of the six areas is measured by a nine-item Guttman scale with the scores varying from nine to zero in each dimension, the higher members indicating more of the dimension measured (11).

In this study only the dimension of inclusion is used to measure interpersonal behavior; the reasons for this are best stated by Schutz.

The interpersonal need for inclusion is defined behaviorally as the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with people with respect to interaction and association. [Italics are the writer's.]
"Satisfactory relation" includes (1) a psychologically comfortable relation with people somewhere on a dimension ranging from originating or initiating interaction with all people to not initiating interaction with anyone; (2) a psychologically comfortable relation with people with respect to eliciting behavior from them somewhere on a dimension ranging from always initiating interaction with the self to never initiating interaction with the self.

On the level of feelings the need for inclusion is defined as the need to establish and maintain a feeling of mutual interest with other people. This feeling includes (1) being able to take an interest in other people to a satisfactory degree and (2) having other people interested in the self to a satisfactory degree.

With regard to the self-concept, the need for inclusion is the need to feel that the self is significant and worth while (16, p. 18).

Therefore, the score used here is derived by adding the two scores from inclusion dimension ($e^I + w^I$) to yield the value termed interchange, inclusion interchange ($x^I$) is also defined as "the amount of interchange of interaction and contact among group members characteristic of the situation" (16, p. 155).

The established validity and reliabilities of the instruments described above have been named elsewhere (16, 6, 17) and need no further discussion here.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

The influence of the group on the individual to effect a change in the individual has probably been best demonstrated by Asch (1) and by Back (2). Asch's study revealed that individuals make judgments or opinions with regard for the group situation. However, contrary to popular belief, there is no set pattern of behavior an individual will follow as a result of group influence that permits prediction of individual behavior, unless perhaps all the factors are known. In this study an individual was asked to make a judgment about the length of a given line while every other person in the room at the same time made a judgment pre-arranged to be grossly in error. Some yielded and modified their judgments in accordance with the majority; others retained their judgments in spite of the majority pressure. It might be said that

Independence and yielding are a joint function of the following major factors: (1) The character of the stimulus situation. Variations in structural clarity have a decisive effect; with diminishing clarity of the stimulus conditions, the majority effect influence increases. (2) The character of the group forces. Individuals are highly sensitive to the structural qualities of group opposition.
I.e., whether or not the group is cohesive, has a hierarchy of leaders, prestige function, and so on. Also, the majority effect influence is a function of the size of the group. (3) The character of the individual. There were wide and, indeed, striking differences among individuals within the same experimental situation (1, pp. 10-11).

Back's (2) study involves the manner in which cohesiveness or the desire to stay in the group affects conformity or the desire to hold uniform opinions. Salient findings of this study, where subjects viewed generally similar but different material, reveal that members of highly cohesive groups make greater efforts to reach an agreement and their efforts to reach an agreement are more sincere. There are fewer individual differences in highly cohesive groups; and when differences do exist, they are on a less personal level. The discussion in the highly cohesive groups had a greater effect on changing the opinion of its members, and in the cohesive groups there is a greater range of change; i.e., one member of a highly cohesive group will change more than any member of the low cohesive groups. It was also found that the discussion in highly cohesive groups would be more pleasant and conversational while low cohesive groups would spend all their time completing the experimental task and only as much time as was necessary to try to achieve agreement. In groups where cohesiveness was at a minimum, very little interaction took place and individuals worked together as little as possible.
Pressey and Hanna (11), in describing the group as a psycho-social entity, found the conventional class actually brings about significantly fewer acquaintances than does one where sociometric grouping is used. Emphasizing this fact, at the beginning of the semester the median student knew only three other classmates with the number increasing to only five at the end of the term; 33 per cent knew none or only one other student. In contrast to this situation, the sociometrically treated class ended the term with the median student knowing eleven students and only 4 per cent who knew one or none.

Further analysis of this study revealed most students gained an understanding of those who were previously tolerated as nuisances and many became "well acquainted." Interaction outside the classroom for the sociometrically treated class became significantly greater, and teachers as well as the students gained an opportunity to help other students with their personality problems.

In trying to evaluate the effect of the study of emotions Barkley (3) found that 80 per cent of the 226 students completing the course indicated that they gained many positive values from the study of emotions. "Value" is here interpreted as any benefit, help, or gain received as a result of the course of study, or any detriment, loss, or hurt suffered. This study, however, is highly subjective
in nature. Subjects were not measured on the degree of change in them as a result of exposure to the course material about emotions but merely stated there was a change in either their understanding or their knowledge. It should be noted, however, the major topic of the course was emotions, but the concentration of this course material had no effect on changes in behavior.

At Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, Brown (6) used the case history evaluation method for the purpose of teaching personality theory in a general psychology course. Brown administered the California Psychological Inventory, Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Scale of Values, an F scale adopted from the California Public Opinion Study and Gough’s Adjective Checklist. The protocols from these tests for each student were then presented to the students, but they were told the tests were of someone else of the same background and sex. Each student was then asked to "write a personality analysis of this person performing any analysis of the data she cared to, being careful to relate by inferences to the data at all times" (6, p. 86).

After the reports were graded, the students were told they had analyzed their own test results. The students were then told to write their evaluation of this technique. There was unanimous approval and enthusiasm; most students revealed they spent a considerable amount of time on the analysis. The students revealed that they had profited as individuals
from the method but felt they did not have adequate preparation for such analysis. Many also believed it added some insight to understanding the complexity of normal personality. Here again it should be noted that no objective evaluation was made to measure the changes or effect of a particular task on the behavior of the subjects.

Pratt (10), in trying to determine the existence and role of leaders in permissive discussion-type teaching situations, found the leaders in discussion groups are most likely to come from fraternities, upper classmen, or the most frequent speakers. There is also noted a strong relationship between the status of the member and how his opinions and contributions are accepted. In the same vein Berrien states

What people learn in this course using the case analysis method is a function of the social climate of the classroom and the interrelations between students over which the instructor has little control. Remarks in class are made not simply with regard to the case under discussion, but also with regard to how the remark will affect relations with other students in the class. Students are not just case oriented; they are case-and-class oriented (4, p. 357).

In a course using the group discussion technique, Eglash (6) reports no difference between the experimental and control groups in achievement. In two classes, both taught by the same instructor, one was given instructions
to complete the course material in group discussions in any way they wished as long as they covered the material he presented in the form of certain questions and in the textbook. Material and decisions about tests and grading, which were determined in the group discussion class, were imposed upon the control class to keep the course material equal for both classes.

Both classes were administered a multiple choice quiz over the course material every two weeks. At the end of the semester both groups took the standard departmental final and filled out a teacher evaluation sheet. No significant differences between the groups was obtained for either the class tests or the departmental final. However, comments on the teacher evaluation sheet revealed that, characteristically students in the discussion group enjoyed the class more than any other they had but felt frustrated about the material they covered and even felt they did not learn very much, or as much as they could have by the regular lecture method (8, p. 266).

Faw (9) divided a class of 120 elementary psychology students into three types of discussion groups, as follows:

1. The student-centered discussion group where the instructor merely asked the students what they wanted to talk about in regard to the subject matter and exercised no other participation.
2. The instructor-centered group was handled in a directive fashion, and the instructor guided discussion by asking questions, answering questions, settling disputes, and restricting irrelevant discussion.

3. The alternating group used both student and instructor directed methods but alternated the two methods at each meeting (9, p. 104).

The number of expressions made by the students in each group was recorded at each meeting. Group 1 made the most remarks, group 2 the fewest, and group 3 made more than half as many (70 per cent more) as group 1. All the differences between the groups were significant at the .01 per cent level. In addition, it was also noted that fewer students participated in discussion in the instructor-centered group (this may have been the result of the instructor's selection). The student-centered group, with the highest number of remarks, had the lowest number of non-participants.

In the content of the discussion, the student-centered group discussed the subject material in terms of personal feelings and experiences while the instructor-centered group discussed issues in a purely intellectual way, seldom making references to personal experiences.

The students from groups 1 and 3 both preferred the student-centered method, expressing feelings of being accepted and learning to overcome fears of talking in a group.
The majority of the students felt that they received greater social and emotional value from the student-centered discussion and that greater interest was generated, but a significantly greater number felt dubious about the amount of information and knowledge received as compared with the instructor-centered group (9, p. 108).

A characteristic remark reflecting the common opinion of the students in the discussion group reads, "The free discussion class teaches me less in the way of actual facts, but it helps me to feel free and at ease with myself and other people" (9, p. 109).

Here, then, is further support, coinciding with Pressey and Hanna (11), concerning the class as a psycho-social entity, as well as agreeing with Berrien (4) on the important influence of classmates.

Faw also found, by averaging the test grades for each group, that the student-centered groups made slightly higher grades than the other groups in spite of their expressed feeling of learning less. These last findings are in agreement with some and in conflict with others; perhaps it is inherent in the design of some studies which might bias themselves to supporting the hypothesis that discussion groups are able to learn more.

Small group discussion and the analysis of case studies to aid in adjustment or gaining insight, if experimentally demonstrated to be effective, could be put to use in the manner suggested by Bixby and McCorkle (5), who have attempted using this procedure in an extreme form of "guided group
interaction." In this study, inmates of a military prison discussed, in small groups, their feelings and interpretations of their own cases. The discussions were directed by a counselor who tried to guide the group's own comments and ideas so that the individuals would gain insight into their problems with the law. The study reported was not of a refined experimental nature, and only suggests the guided group discussions as a device worthy of research and experimentation. However, observations by judges agree that an obvious change in behavior of the inmates was evident, but the lack of controls and design prevents statistical analysis or attributing cause to any single factor.

Since the cultivation of emotional and social values as well as of intellectual values has come to be included among the important objectives of the schools, this study by Ruja (12) has sought to assess these outcomes as well as the intellectual outcomes of classes taught by the two methods, lecture and discussion.

Using four groups, a psychology class taught by discussions, a psychology class taught by lecture, a philosophy class taught by discussion, and a philosophy class taught by lecture, Ruja set up the following hypotheses:

1. Students in discussion groups would surpass those in the lecture groups in subject matter mastery.
2. Students in the discussion groups would make more favorable gains in personal adjustment as a result of the discussion.

3. Discussion groups will rate the instructor more favorably than the lecture groups.

4. Students from the discussion group can be expected to get to know one another more than in the lecture groups.

The instruments used to test these hypotheses were achievement as measured by classroom grades, the Bell Adjustment Inventory, the Ruja Instructor-Rating Form, free comments by students, and social adjustment by the extent of knowledge of names of fellow members and extent of acquaintance.

The first hypothesis is not supported since all groups did equally as well. The second hypothesis was not only rejected but indicated that the lecture group had more emotional adjustment as measured by the Bell Adjustment Inventory. The third hypothesis is confirmed in part since only the discussion groups in philosophy appraised the teacher in a more favorable light, but the other groups rated the instructor about equally. As may be expected, the fourth hypothesis is supported. There is no reason, however, to believe that the discussion in itself caused more social activity, for the mere fact of interpersonal contact could have been the cause of the increased social activity (12, p. 391).
Analysis of this study, while not laden with significance in the expected directions, is rich in revealing the complex and interrelated variables of group discussion. Among the many questions brought out and unanswered in this study are the following: What are the effects of the differences in subject matter on group discussion? Are there some subjects which cannot be taught by group discussion? What are the effects of different instructors on the group discussion? Do instructors have to be trained to conduct group discussions as a teaching method? What are the effects of students' experience in group discussions? Do students also need training to take part in group discussion sessions? Other questions brought out include the effects of different social climates, the long-run effects of the two methods, and how they compare over a period of time. Such important factors as degree of directiveness or non-directiveness also need investigation and seem to be relevant to this study (12, p. 392).

In a study reported by Driver (7), eight groups covering the three levels of maturity, high-school students, college students, and adults involved in education, used the free discussion to attain a better understanding of themselves. The adult groups engaged in six discussion sessions over a three-week period. The university and high-school students held seventeen meetings over a three-month period.
The topics of discussion focused on the analysis of behavior in terms of individual differences and human relationships. All the subjects were encouraged to express their feelings and viewpoints freely; no attempt was made to limit the direction of the discussions or to prevent catharsis by "blowing off steam or griping." The experi-
mentor acted in the capacity of a mental group therapist or moderator at the group meetings. Some direction was
given to the group in the form of topics or questions directed at each group's particular maturity level, and these were to serve as the focal point for discussions.

In addition to the group discussion, each person was asked to write a self-appraisal and personality inventory as well as evaluating other members by means of a sociogram at the beginning and end of the discussions. Two interviews were held at the end of the group discussion in order to interpret the test and sociogram results and to obtain an evaluation of the project from the members.

Many of the members reported they gained confidence and skill in dealing with other people. Some also felt an improvement in their attitudes and feelings toward certain individuals and groups. Comparing the reactions of the dif-
ferent groups revealed common elements of therapy and learn-
ing for the different levels of maturity. Many of the participants, some months after participation in the
discussions, reported improvement in self and social adjustment; these included gaining tolerance of minorities and persecuted groups, overcoming shyness and feelings of inferiority, recognizing and correcting habits which are irritating to others, and overcoming the fear of criticism by others. In conclusion, Driver states

Small-group discussion can be an effective learning medium in preventive mental hygiene when it is focused on needs and interests of individual group members. The activity encourages objective analysis of personal strengths and weaknesses. It shows participants ways to apply principles of social adjustment in their daily lives. It gives them practice in social skills and harmonious group membership, even when controversial subjects and differences of opinion are involved (7, pp. y05-606).

Observation by other psychiatrists and counselors reported that the subjects who attended the discussion sessions regularly gained insights and improved their attitudes and behavior markedly. There was definitely a carry-over from the discussion situation to daily life activity. It should be noted, however, that the subjects in this study were those who wanted and felt they needed help in their attitudes and adjustments. This is hardly a representative sample of all who need such help. There is also possibly present a motivation variable. Even among all who come for counseling, only those who volunteered for the group discussion were used, a factor which might make the results seem more promising than they would be for a random sample.
It should be evident from this review that the variables affecting the processes of individual and interpersonal behavior in the group discussion situation are many and complex. Some of the problems in conducting efficient research in this area or in showing accurate conclusions are a result of the lack of operational definitions and adequate description of the variables. Also, an obvious lack of postulated causes for the effects of discussion behavior on personal behavior is shown in the research discussed. This study will attempt to assess the causative factors of this behavior according to the conceptual framework described by Underwood (13, pp. 208-211).
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CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN GROUP DISCUSSION AND PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS

As mentioned in Chapter I, the four instruments used yield scores which measure certain dimensions of personality and personal behavior. The TDMH yields a score reflecting positive feelings of self-worth or self-concept, ACE Inventory of Beliefs measures generalized attitudes, $e^I$ plus $W^I$ scores from the FIRO-B scale yield a measure of expressed and wanted interpersonal behavior, and the number of weighted sociometric choices received yields a measure of social status. The statistical findings for the differences between experimental and control groups on their difference scores for each test will be presented in table form. These findings will be discussed in relation to expectations derived from theoretical formulations.

Means for each group on each test before and after group discussion are presented in Table I. Means for the difference scores and statistical comparisons for the groups are presented in Table II.
An analysis of Table I reveals that self-concept was the only dimension of personality which showed an increase in mean test score, and this increase took place in the control group where there was no group discussion.

**TABLE I**

**MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON THE FOUR TESTS BEFORE AND AFTER GROUP DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Retest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMH</td>
<td>77.03</td>
<td>75.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Inventory of Beliefs</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>33.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRO-B</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Status</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>21.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this study emphasize the permanent nature of salient personality traits. These results in conjunction with the negative findings of studies (2, 3) investigating the effects of group discussion on academic achievement indicate there is little reason to believe group discussion affects personal behavior in all situations where more than one person is involved. It is possible that any changes which might have taken place are related to other dimensions of personality not measured in this
study. It should be emphasized further, because of the nature of this study and the sample used, that these results are not to be generalized to other populations.

The cases discussed, even though they concerned problems any college freshman might expect to encounter, were not discussed with regard to any particular solution. The subjects were not expected to arrive at any conclusion or to make a personal application to their own problems. The group discussion followed non-directive techniques, and no conscious effort was made to relate the discussion of the cases to personal behavior.

Concerning the classroom as a "psycho-social" unit as described by Pressey and Hanna (4) in the previous chapters, social behavior and increased social interaction may increase as a result of exposure to other students through the group discussion. However, this increase in social behavior need not be related to an increase in the FIRO-B test score. In the same sense, an increase in sociometric status would not necessarily be the result of group discussion or a product of increased social behavior. The member choices received by a person may be the same in two sociometrics, but the source of the choices may change radically; i.e., the individuals may receive the same number of choices but from different people.
Since the FIRO-B has been demonstrated to be valid in measuring the amount of social behavior desired by a person in terms of how the person describes himself, it might prove worth while to use this same discussion method to observe and record actual social behavior. The amount of actual social behavior could then be compared with the FIRO-B scores. The findings of a study of this nature would then reveal how a person's description of himself actually relates to what he does.

Self-concept which increased in the control group as much as it decreased in the experimental group suggests that some changes in this personality factor may be expected. Though not reaching significance in the study reported here, these changes were highly significant in studies reported by Faw (2) and by Ruja (5), who found that students not involved in group discussion made greater gains in personal adjustment than did those in the discussion groups.

This change in the individual is perhaps a result of being allowed to mix socially and compare oneself with others. In the control group where there was no group activity, the individual may have increased his feelings of self-worth because he was aware of only his personal accomplishment in the class and had no criteria for comparing himself except to his own previous behavior and accomplishments. Those in the experimental group, however, may have
accomplished more, in terms of performance or success on a task, but, being aware of the accomplishments of others, distorted their success and fell victim to an erroneous evaluation of personal worth. It is possible, then, that group activity serves the function of hindering individual adjustment as well as aiding it.

Inconsistent with the findings of other studies (3, 4, 5), it is apparent from a review of Table I that there was no increase in personal acquaintances as revealed by the stable number of sociometric choices which caused sociometric status for each student to remain constant. This finding is probably due to the nature of the assignment to groups for discussion. The groups were not varied or alternated after they had been assigned to groups on the basis of whom each member selected as a work partner. Students worked with the people they selected on the first sociometric and selected the people they worked with on the second sociometric. There was no opportunity for social interaction that would extend existing social relationships.

With regard to learning or improving self- and social adjustments, no improvement or change, as measured by the instruments in this study which evaluate such changes, was forthcoming. This failure to achieve a change in self-evaluation was probably due to the nature and purpose of the group discussion itself as conducted by the members of
the groups. The improvement reported by Driver (1) is directly related to the fact that her groups had as their specific purpose the achievement of an understanding of personal behavior. The purpose of the groups in the study reported here was to learn to take part in group activity. It should be noted that the function of the discussion is directly related to the results of the discussion, personal and social. From a psychological point of view, it is necessary for the individuals in a group discussion to understand and act on a definite purpose in the group discussion before the individuals will be affected by the forces operating within the group situation.

Because of the failure to achieve an acceptable level of significance for any of the test differences, as revealed in Table II, the null hypotheses in each case will be retained. This failure to achieve a change in test scores indicates the group discussion and other group activities described in this study are inadequate for affecting the personality variables, self-concept, generalized attitudes, interpersonal behavior, and sociometric status.

These findings are contrary to those reported by Ruja (5). Aside from the nature of the discussion, some of the discrepancy is due to the relatively short period of time the subjects were actually involved in group discussion. Driver (1) found a great deal of change in individuals with
TABLE II
TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN THE MEAN DIFFERENCES OF THE
GROUPS ON TEST-RETEST FOR THE
FOUR PERSONALITY VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D1-</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>-2.786</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Behavior</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>-1.089</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric Status</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regard to self-insight and personal behavior. This suggests that personality factors, which are a result of reinforcement over a long period of time and varied experience, in order to be modified will change only when an individual is given a sufficient length of time to incorporate changes in the self. Extended periods of discussion also allow the necessary reinforcement and testing of new behavior, which effect changes in personality.

Summary and Conclusions

Two elementary psychology classes at North Texas State College were compared to measure the effects of group discussion on three dimensions of personality, self-concept,
generalized attitudes, interpersonal behavior, and sociometric status as measured by the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale, The American Council on Education Inventory of Beliefs, The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation--Behavior, and the number of weighted choices received as a desired work partner on a two-criteria sociometric test. The major theoretical hypothesis of this study was that a relationship exists between personal attitudes and values, and participation in group discussion. Four null hypotheses concerning changes in the dimensions mentioned above were stated, and each one was retained.

The findings of this study in the light of others' findings suggest the possibility that group discussion, to be effective, must be related in some specific manner to the expected changes being measured. The results are in line with theoretical assumptions made by others on the basis of similar studies. It is suspected that changes in personal behavior reported by others were not changes measured by the instruments used in this study. The psycho-social phenomena operating in small groups are the result of complex interacting functions of various causes and serious consideration should be given to the specific purposes of the group discussion.
From the standpoint of future research in this area, it would be profitable to consider such problems as the differences in the subject matter of the discussions and the differences of the individuals involved in the discussions; also important are the differences in social climate and the long-run effects of small groups on the behavior of the individual. Research in this area would also benefit from a more intensive evaluation of observable behavior instead of a concentration on abstract constructs.
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APPENDIX A

Sociometric Nomination Blank

Name_________________________ Date__________ Group_______ No._____

From the list of names of your classmates given to you, select the people you would like to work with most in a group discussion project. List by their numbers the persons you would like to work with in descending order.

First choice, No._____
Second choice, No._____
Third choice, No._____

List the numbers of any others you would like to work with. __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __

You may list the numbers of as many or as few people as you wish.

Also list the numbers of the people you would like to take part in some form of informal social activity.

First choice, No._____
Second choice, No._____
Third choice, No._____

41
List the numbers of any others you wish to take part in a social activity with. __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __

You may list the numbers of as many or as few as you wish.
APPENDIX B

Discussion Case 1

Don and Fred lived in the same small town in Kansas all their lives. They would easily be classed as "inseparable" even though Don was a year older and a year ahead of Fred in school. Don went away to college and Fred went to the same school a year later. While Don was there the first year he joined a fraternity. When Fred came Don encouraged Fred to pledge the same fraternity. The two boys roomed together off campus and worked together at a spare-time job to have enough money for spending.

Fred and Don could again be called "inseparable." They were seen everywhere together and were considered the best of friends. Even though the boys were known to double date a lot and took many of the same classes together, they both had many other friends besides, and each boy liked and accepted the other's friends. Both Don and Fred were intelligent, happy, well-liked and well-adjusted boys.

Fred did not worry about being accepted in the fraternity; he wanted very much to become a member, but was confident that he would be accepted. He could think of nothing in his attitude or behavior that would prevent his being accepted.
Don was an active and enthusiastic member of the fraternity; he liked all his fraternity brothers and worked hard in all the fraternity projects.

As it turned out, Fred was blackballed during the final selection. Both Don and Fred were at a loss to understand why Fred was not accepted. Needless to say, Fred was quite disappointed and took the rejection rather hard. Naturally, Fred had a change in attitude toward Don and Don, in turn, was placed in a rather difficult position in terms of his relationship with Fred.

**Instructions**

Write a brief summary of whatever benefits you feel you gained from the discussion of this case.
APPENDIX C

Discussion Case 2

Janet is eighteen years old and a sophomore at a small college. She is a quiet and attractive girl; some might say she is even too shy. Janet makes good passing grades, but she is not what we might call a brain trust. In class she does all her work and has a good attendance record; she pays attention and takes good notes, but she never volunteers any comments. When she usually blushes and avoids answering by saying she doesn't know, in this situation it is obvious to others that she is quite uncomfortable. However, Janet wishes she could answer and doesn't like being thought of as shy—she recognizes her unusual behavior and would like to overcome her predicament but doesn't know how.

Until Janet came to college, she lived in a small town with her family. She spent a great deal of time with her mother, not because she was dominated or afraid of other children but because there were not many other children her age in the town. Janet's mother was extremely proud of Janet because of her attractiveness and took a great deal of pride in showing her off at the many bridge parties and
club meetings she went to. Janet derived a lot of satisfaction from knowing she acted in the proper fashion and won her mother's favor. It was very important for Janet to know that her mother approved of what she did.

When she went away to college, Janet's mother recognized that Janet needed to make friends and learn to socialize with people her own age, and she encouraged her along these lines. The problem here is that Janet wanted to please her mother and make friends but she didn't know how. Her mother and father just told her to pick some "nice friends" and be a good companion, but they never taught her how or gave her any suggestions concerning how to go about it.

During her entire freshman year, Janet hardly made any more than a speaking acquaintance with anyone, and these were only other girls who lived in her dormitory. She avoided any situations where she would come in social or personal contact with anyone. Others thought at times she was a snob, but many recognized she was just lonely. Janet wanted to make friends and be friendly, but she was afraid she would not select "nice friends" or that she would do something wrong; mostly, however, she just didn't know how to strike up an acquaintance.

During the first part of her sophomore year, Janet had a class with a boy who liked history as much as she did. He was not an overbearing boy nor was he very outgoing or
aggressive. His mild manners and friendly attitude soon helped to break down Janet's fears and she started dating him. They were not what you would term "madly in love" or overly preoccupied with each other—they merely had a healthy and warm relationship and enjoyed each other's company. Janet felt sure her parents would be very much pleased with her accomplishment.

Janet invited the boy to go to her home during the Thanksgiving holiday. She was very much excited and very certain that everyone would be well satisfied and pleased with her. From the time they arrived until it was time to leave, Janet's mother and father acted very cool toward the boy and almost ignored him. Toward Janet they acted as though she had committed an unpardonable mistake. Janet was confused and hurt to say the least. She didn't know whether to be mad at the boy, her parents, or herself. Evidently he did not impress her parents the way he impressed her. The boy noticed something was wrong, but did not let it affect him. He made the best of a bad situation and did everything he could to make Janet less uncomfortable without showing attention to the situation. Before Janet and her friend left to go back to school her parents told her they were disappointed in her ability to make "nice friends" and hoped she did better with her other choices.
Write a brief summary of whatever benefits you feel you gained from the discussion of this case.
APPENDIX D

TDMH Self-Concept Scale

Name________________Age____Sex__Race__Education__________

Instructions: These statements are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item. Read each statement carefully; then select one of the following responses; and next record the number that represents that particular answer in the blank space at the beginning of that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>true</th>
<th>true</th>
<th>and</th>
<th>false</th>
<th>false</th>
<th>partly</th>
<th>false</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember you are not trying to describe yourself as others see you, but only as you see yourself.

___ 1. I have a healthy body.

___ 4. I am full of aches and pains.

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

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

___ 13. I take good care of myself physically.

___ 16. I do poorly in sports and games.

___ 19. I am a decent sort of person.

___ 22. I am a moral failure.

___ 25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.

___ 28. I wish I could be more trustworthy.

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

___ 34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Partly true and false</th>
<th>Mostly false</th>
<th>Completely false</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I am a cheerful person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am a hateful person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I am satisfied to be just what I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I can always take care of myself in any situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I change my mind a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I am not loved by my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my family relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>I try to play fair with my friends and family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>I quarrel with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>I am a friendly person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>I am mad at the whole world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>I am as sociable as I want to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>I should be more polite to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>I do not feel at ease with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>I do not always tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>I get angry sometimes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I like to look nice and neat all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I consider myself a sloppy person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am neither too tall nor too short.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I would like to change some parts of my body.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good most of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I often act like I am &quot;all thumbs.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am a religious person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am a bad person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am as religious as I want to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I ought to go to church more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I do what is right most of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I sometimes do very bad things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I have a lot of self-control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I am a nobody.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I despise myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I solve my problems quite easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I do things without thinking about them first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am an important person to my friends and family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>My friends have no confidence in me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I treat my parents as well as I should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>I should trust my family more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>I do my share of work at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>I give in to my parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>I am popular with women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>I am not interested in what other people do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>I am no good at all from a social standpoint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>I see good points in all the people I meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>I do not forgive others easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>I do not like everyone I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am an attractive person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I am a sick person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I like my looks just the way they are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I should have more sex appeal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I try to be careful about my appearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am a poor sleeper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am an honest person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am a morally weak person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my relationship to God.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I shouldn't tell so many lies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36. I have trouble doing the things that are right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39. I am a calm and easy going person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42. I am losing my mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45. I am just as nice as I should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. I take the blame for things without getting mad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54. I try to run away from my problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57. I am a member of a happy family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63. I understand my family as well as I should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66. I should love my family more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69. I take a real interest in my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72. I do not act like my family thinks I should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75. I am popular with men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78. I am hard to be friendly with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84. I ought to get along better with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87. I get along well with other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90. I find it hard to talk with strangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98. At times I feel like swearing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>I would rather win than lose in a game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Inventory of Beliefs
Form A

Key: 1. I strongly agree or accept the statement.
2. I tend to agree or accept the statement.
3. I tend to disagree or reject the statement.
4. I strongly disagree or reject the statement.

1. Lowering tariffs to admit more foreign goods into this country lowers our standard of living.

2. Literature should not question the basic moral concepts of society.

3. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.

4. All objective data gathered by unbiased persons indicate that the world and universe are without order.

5. We are finding out today that liberals really are soft-headed, gullible, and potentially dangerous.

6. A man can learn as well by striking out on his own as he can by following the advice of others.

7. The predictions of economists about the future of business are no better than guesses.

8. Being a successful wife and mother is more a matter of instinct than of training.

9. A person often has to get mad in order to push others into action.

10. There is only one real standard in judging art works--each to his own taste.

11. Business enterprise, free from government interference, has given us our high standard of living.
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12. Nobody can make a million dollars without hurting other people.

13. Art which does not tell a human story is empty.

14. You can't do business on friendship: profits are profits; and good intentions are not evidence in a law court.

15. A person has troubles of his own; he can't afford to worry about other people.

16. Children should be made to obey since you have to control them firmly during their formative years.

17. New machines should be taxed to support the workers they displace.

18. Ministers who preach socialistic ideas are a disgrace to the church.

19. Labor unions can't appreciate all the advantages which business and industries have given them.

20. It's only natural that a person should take advantage of every opportunity to promote his own welfare.

21. We should impose a strong censorship on the morality of books and movies.

22. Modern paintings look like something dreamed up in a horrible nightmare.

23. The government is more interested in winning elections than in the welfare of the people.

24. Those who can, do; those who can't, teach.

25. The best government is one which governs least.

26. Philosophers on the whole act as if they were superior to ordinary people.

27. In some elections there is not much point in voting because the outcome is fairly certain.

28. The old masters were the only artists who really knew how to draw and paint.

29. Most intellectuals would be lost if they had to make a living in the realistic world of business.
30. You cannot lead a truly happy life without strong moral and religious convictions.

31. If we didn't have strict immigration laws, our country would be flooded with foreigners.

32. Miracles have always taken place whenever the need for them has been great enough.

33. A person has to stand up for his rights or people will take advantage of him.

34. Now that America is the leading country in the world, it's only natural that other countries should try to be like us.

35. Foreign films emphasize sex more than American films do.

36. Army training will be good for most modern youth because of the strict discipline they will get.

37. People who say they're religious but don't go to church are just hypocrites.

38. Pride in craftsmanship and in doing an honest day's work is a rare thing these days.

39. The United States may not have had much experience in international dealings but it is the only nation to which the world can turn for leadership.

40. No task is too great or too difficult when we know that God is on our side.

41. A sexual pervert is an insult to humanity and should be punished severely.

42. A lot of science is just using big words to describe things which many people already know through common sense.

43. Public officials may try to be honest but they are caught in a web of influence which tends to corrupt them.

44. Young people today are in general more immoral and irresponsible than young people of previous generations.

45. Americans may tend to be materialistic, but at least they aren't cynical and decadent like most Europeans.
46. The many different kinds of children in school these
days force teachers to make a lot of rules and regu-
lations so that things will run smoothly.

47. The scientist that really counts is the one who turns
theories into practical use.

48. No one can really feel safe when scientists continue
to explore whatever they wish without any social or
moral restraint.

49. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick
together and prevent other people from having a fair
chance in competition.

50. The United States doesn't have to depend on the rest of
the world in order to be strong and self-sufficient.

51. Foreigners usually have peculiar and annoying habits.

52. Some day machinery will do nearly all of man's work,
and we can live in leisure.

53. There are too many people in this world who do nothing
but think about the opposite sex.

54. Members of religious sects who refuse to salute the
flag should be punished for their lack of patriotism.

55. As young people grow up they ought to get over their
radical ideas.

56. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them
in their own districts and schools and to prevent
too much contact with whites.

57. The twentieth century has not had leaders with the
vision and capacity of the founders of this country.

58. Sexual relations between brother and sister are con-
trary to natural law.

59. Other countries don't appreciate us much as they should
with all the help that America has given them.

60. If a person is honest, works hard, and trusts in God,
he will reap material as well as spiritual rewards.
APPENDIX F

Inventory of Beliefs
Form B

Key: 1. I strongly agree or accept the statement.
  2. I tend to agree or accept the statement.
  3. I tend to disagree or reject the statement.
  4. I strongly disagree or reject the statement.

1. If you want a thing done right, you have to do it yourself.

2. There are times when a father, as head of the family, must tell the other family members what they can and cannot do.

3. Reviewers and critics of art, music, and literature decide what they like and then force their tastes on the public.

4. Why study the past, when there are so many problems of the present to be solved.

5. Businessmen and manufacturers are more important to society than artists or musicians.

6. There is little chance for a person to advance in business or industry unless he knows the right people.

7. Man has an inherent guide to right and wrong—his conscience.

8. The main thing about good music is lovely melody.

9. Any man can find a job if he really wants to work.

10. Anything we do for a good cause is justified.

11. Public resistance to modern art proves that there is something wrong with it.

12. Sending letters and telegrams to congressmen is mostly a waste of time.
13. Many social problems would be solved if we did not have so many immoral and inferior people.

14. Books and movies should start dealing with entertaining or uplifting themes instead of the present unpleasant, immoral, or tragic ones.

15. The minds of many youth are being poisoned by bad books.

16. Speak softly, but carry a big stick.

17. Ministers in churches should not preach about economic and political problems.

18. Each man is on his own in life and must determine his own destiny.

19. The successful merchant can't allow sentiment to affect his business decisions.

20. The poor will always be with us.

21. A person who is incapable of real anger must also be lacking in moral conviction.

22. If we allow more immigrants into this country, we will lower our standard of culture.

23. People who live in the slums have no sense of responsibility.

24. We acquire the highest form of freedom when our wishes conform to the will of society.

25. Voting determines whether or not a country is democratic.

26. Feeble-minded people should be sterilized.

27. In our society, a person's first duty is to protect from harm himself and those dear to him.

28. History shows that every great nation was destroyed when its people became soft and its morals lax.

29. A woman who is a wife and mother should try to work outside the home.

30. We would be better off if people would talk less and work more.
31. When things seem black, a person should not complain, for it may be God's will.

32. Science is infringing upon religion when it attempts to delve into the origin of life itself.

33. A lot of teachers, these days, have radical ideas which need to be carefully watched.

34. Most negroes would become overbearing and disagreeable if not kept in their place.

35. Our rising divorce rate is a sign that we should return to the values which our grandparents held.

36. When operas are sung in this country they ought to be translated into English.

37. What the country needs, more than laws or politics, is a few fearless and devoted leaders in which the people can have faith.

38. In practical situations, theory is of very little help.

39. Manual labor and unskilled jobs seem to fit the negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.

40. A person gets what's coming to him in this life if he doesn't believe in God.

41. Science makes progress only when it attempts to solve urgent practical problems.

42. Most things in life are governed by forces over which we have no control.

43. Jews will marry out of their own religious group whenever they have the chance.

44. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.

45. Europeans criticize the United States for its materialism but such criticism is only to cover up their realization that American culture is far superior to their own.

46. Nudist colonies are a threat to the moral life of a nation.
47. No world organization should have the right to tell Americans what they can or cannot do.

48. There is a source of knowledge that is not dependent upon observation.

49. Despite the material advantages of today, family life now is not as wholesome as it used to be.

50. Parents know as much about how to teach children as public school teachers.

51. The best assurance of peace is for the United States to have the strongest army, navy, air force, and most atom bombs.

52. Modern people are superficial and tend to lack the finer qualities of manhood and womanhood.

53. Political parties are run by insiders who are not concerned with the public welfare.

54. There are a lot of things in this world that will never be explained by science.

55. There may be a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.

56. The world will get so bad that some of these times God will destroy it.

57. Children should learn to respect and obey their teachers.

58. We would be better off if there were fewer psychoanalysts probing and delving into the human mind.

59. American free enterprise in the greatest bulwark of democracy.

60. One will learn more in the school of hard knocks than he ever can from a textbook.
APPENDIX G

FIRO-B

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation
Relations-Behavior Schle is not reproduced here because it
is published and may be obtained from

Harvard University Printing Office
Randall Hall, Divinity Avenue
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

Instructions for administration, reliability, validity,
norms, and all other necessary information may be obtained
from the book by William C. Shutz given in the Bibliography.

Instructions for administration, validity, reliability,
norms, and other information for the Tennessee Department
of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale and the American Council
on Education Inventory of Beliefs Scales may be obtained
from their respective manuals.
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